AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF MARITAL ADJUSTMENT AND THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF SPOUSES

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Kees C. Hofman

1966

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF MARITAL ADJUSTMENT AND THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF SPOUSES

by Kees C. Hofman

Several instruments purported to measure marital adjustment are described in recent literature. High correlations among the independent instruments, to be expected if marital adjustment is a valid construct, are not consistently reported. Similar ambiguity of evidence is found regarding the degree of similarity of marital adjustment between spouses. The Marital Adjustment Test (MAT), the Marital Roles Inventory (MRI), the Family Concept Q Sort (FCQ) and a provisional, time saving variation of the FCQ, the Family Concept Scale (FCT-F), were administered to twenty-five married couples under testing conditions which prevented cooperation. MAT and FCQ scores were correlated to a high degree, while MRI scores were

independent of MAT and FCQ scores, thus supporting the construct validity of marital adjustment and casting doubt on the utility of the MRI as a measure of marital adjustment. Interspouse correlations were substantially lower than those most frequently reported, suggesting the failure of previous research to control the testing conditions adequately, and that marital adjustment of spouses is relatively independent. The FCT-F was found to be internally reliable and yielded scores correlating to a high degree with FCQ and MAT scores.

Approved _____
Chairman, Thesis Committee

Date _____

Thesis Committee:

John R. Hurley, Chairman
Lucy R. Ferguson
Dozier W. Thornton

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF MARITAL ADJUSTMENT AND THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF SPOUSES

By

Kees C. Hofman

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

May, 1966

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Acknowledgment is gratefully extended to Dr. John R. Hurley, chairman of my committee. His guidance and assistance in the delineation of the problem, the execution of the investigation and the preparation of this manuscript is deeply appreciated.

I also wish to thank Dr. D. Thornton and Dr. L. Ferguson for their advice and their willingness to serve on my committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

Attempts to assess the quality of the marital relationship have been made by many researchers since the late 1920's. An early impressive, and ambitious study was made by the psychiatrist Hamilton in 1929. The same year saw the publication of a book by Davis entitled: Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-Two Hundred Women. Marital happiness was evaluated in this study by asking the subject: "Is your marriage happy or unhappy?"

A recent rise in attempts at family-unit therapy, and a heightened awareness that the origin and consequent development ofmaladaptive behavior of children may largely be determined by the family relationships, has resulted in renewed attention paid to family evaluation. Since the marital relationship appears to be of central significance it seems timely that some of the basic assumptions made regarding its measurement be re-evaluated. The earliest as well as subsequent attempts at marital evaluation were made with the assumption that the relationship between two married people has a particular quality; moreover, this quality can be measured in terms of a happy - unhappy, satisfactory - unsatisfactory, or well-adjusted - poorly-

adjusted continuum. Another assumption frequently made regarding the construct of marital happiness is that the effects of a marital relationship are present in both partners to a nearly equal degree. It is therefore expected that both partners of most marriages will be very-, moderately-, or dis-satisfied with their marriage, with relatively few instances where one partner is well-satisfied while the other is dis-satisfied or vice versa. It is the purpose of this study to investigate the tenability of these hypotheses.

Since the late 1920's many attempts at marital assessment have appeared. Most of the authors of these have entertained different theories regarding the most promising way in which to measure this construct. Kirkpatrick (1937) identified marital adjustment with the social stimulus value of a marriage. Terman (1938), however, contended that marital happiness is a subjective phenomena which can therefore be measured only by evaluating the experience of the marital partners. In recent years new approaches have appeared. Examples are the Marital Roles Inventory (MRI) developed by Hurvitz (1959) and the Family Concept Q Sort (FCQ) introduced by van der Veen, et al. (1964). The Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) developed by Locke and Wallace (1959) is an instrument which is based on several earlier ones. The authors of the three last mentioned tests all approached the problem of evaluating marital adjustment differently.

Hurvitz (1959) approached marital adjustment within the framework of role theory. Marital adjustment is assumed to exist when the partners carry out their roles in the way their spouses want or prefer them to carry out their roles. Marital strain or unhappiness is assumed, for example, when there is a discrepancy between the roles the wife would like her husband to see as important, and the roles which the husband actually considers important. Locke and Wallace (1959) approach the evaluation of a marital relationship by questioning the marriage partners directly concerning their experienced satisfaction with the marriage and the degree of cooperation and similarity of attitudes between them. Van der Veen, et al. (1964) used a Q-sort of statements descriptive of the family relationships. Marital adjustment is postulated when a member of a family describes the family similar to an ideal family as defined by the description in terms of the same Q-sort by a group of judges.

Information regarding the validity and reliability of these tests is available in the literature. Hurvitz (1959) argues, a priori, that the MRI is a measure of marital adjustment. He backs up the argument with small but significant correlations between the husband's MRI score and the marital adjustment of both the husband (r = -.22, N = 104) and wife (r = -.23, N = 104). Locke and Wallace (1959) report a split-half reliability of .90 (N = 236), and a significant difference between the MAT scores of a

high and low adjustment group as measured by an independent process. Van der Veen, et al. (1964) report that the FCQ scores of a high adjustment group were significantly higher than the scores of a low adjustment group (N = 20), and that the test-retest reliability was found to be .71.

Since all three tests attempt to measure the same construct, viz. marital adjustment, and if it is assumed that the tests are independent instruments, the validity of this construct would be supported by a high degree of agreement of the separate tests concerning the marital adjustment of individuals. The evidence available is ambiguous on this point. Van der Veen, et al., for example, report (1964) that the FCQ scores of a sample of 20 married couples correlated .67 with their MAT scores. Hurvitz (1959) also correlated the MRI scores of 104 couples with their MAT scores. He reports that the correlations between husband's MRI scores and the husband's and wife's MAT scores were -.22 and -.23 respectively. No significant relationships were found between wives' MRI scores and the MAT scores of either husbands or wives.

Similar ambiguity exists concerning the equality of two partners' marital adjustment. If this relationship does exist one would expect high correlations between the marital adjustment scores of two married partners. The interspouse correlations reported differ considerably. Burgess and Cottrell (1936), Hurvitz (1959) and van der Veen,

et al. (1964) have reported high interspouse correlations. Terman (1938) concluded that the high interspouse correlations obtained by Burgess and Cottrell were due to cooperation between spouses, but that there is a correlation between spouses' scores nonetheless (p. 81 and 82). Powell (1965) reports an interspouse correlation which is sufficiently low (r = .12, N = 47) to lead her to suggest also that the interspouse correlations reported by some researchers may have been produced by their failure to minimize communication between spouses, with the resulting performance often being a joint effort, thus creating a misleadingly high interspouse correlation.

It is plain that the available evidence falls short of supporting clearly either the construct validity of marital adjustment or the hypothesis that spouses will tend to evaluate their marriage similarly. The present study was designed to yield more definitive evidence on these problems by administering a number of marital adjustment tests to a sample of married couples under controlled testing conditions.

A secondary function of this investigation was to gain initial information regarding a possible substitute instrument for the FCQ. A substitute is desirable since the FCQ is a relatively time-consuming instrument, as the average subject needs approximately 25-35 minutes to complete the task. Another drawback of the FCQ is that if a

permanent record of a performance is needed it must be made separately by the tester. A more efficient instrument suggested is a true-false checklist (FCT-F) containing the same descriptive items as the FCQ.

To sum up, the aims of this study were: 1. to verify the construct validity of marital adjustment by investigating the relationships among the performances of a group of married couples on three independent tests of marital adjustment; 2. to verify the interspouse correlations of marital adjustment scores under controlled testing conditions; 3. to determine the correlation between the performances on the FCQ and the FCT-F.

METHOD

Marital Adjustment Tests

Family Concept Q Sort (FCQ): The FCQ consists of 80 items which are descriptive of a family. The subject is instructed to place these statements, which are presented to him in random order on cards, on a nine point scale on which the extremes are defined as "most like my family" and "least like my family", and to place only a predetermined number of cards in each category. A list of the statements appears in Appendix A. The Family Adjustment Score is determined from the 47 items which are marked. A group of judges were in high agreement that the items marked + should appear on the "like" side, and those marked - should appear on the "unlike" side of the ideal family. A high score indicates high marital adjustment.

Family Concept Scale (FCT-F): The FCT-F uses the same statements as those of the FCQ. However, the subject must now judge each statement as true or false as applied to his or her family. The subject records the answers on a form which can be machine scored. The score is determined by summing the judgments made in agreement with those indicative of the ideal family. The list of items is the same as those of the FCQ in Appendix A.

Marital Roles Inventory (MRI): The MRI consists of two sets of roles: a set for both the husband and the wife. The husband's set is made up of ten roles and the wife's set of eight roles. The husband ranks his roles in the order of importance in which he actually carries out his roles at the present time. He then ranks his wife's roles in the order of importance in which he prefers his wife to carry out her roles. Similarly, the wife ranks her roles in the order of importance in which she actually carries them out, and then her husband's roles in the order of importance in which she would prefer him to carry out his roles. Thus each set of roles is ranked twice: once by the partner to which they apply and once by his or her spouse. The numerical difference in the rank order assigned to each role is cubed and summed for all roles in each set. The cube root taken from this sum of the cubed differences for the husband's role set is the husband's Index of Strain. The wife's Index of Strain is computed in an identical manner for her role set. A low score indicates high marital adjustment. The role sets appear in Appendix A.

Marital Adjustment Test (MAT): The MAT is reproduced in Appendix A. It consists of sixteen questions with multiple-option answers. The answers to these questions had differentiated between high and low adjustment groups in previous research. Each option has been assigned a weight by the

authors. The sum of the weights of the answers is the Marital Adjustment Score. A high score indicates high marital adjustment.

Biographical Data Sheet (BDS): All subjects completed the BDS to produce information considered pertinent for comparison of the results from the present study with other studies performed in the same area. The BDS is reproduced in Appendix A.

Selection of Subjects

All 25 participating couples, except two, were associated with Michigan State University. Letters asking for the cooperation of both husband and wife were mailed to the occupants of three married housing apartment units at the university. A copy of the letter is in Appendix B. The letters were followed by a telephone call a few days after the letters could have been expected to arrive. Of the 33 couples contacted in this manner, all except one indicated a willingness to participate in the study. However only seventeen couples ultimately completed the instruments. A lack of free time was indicated in all instances as the reason for being unable to complete the instruments. Six couples were volunteers from the introductory course in psychology at the university. The remaining two couples were part of a group therapy project for the parents of patients in a psychiatric day hospital.

Testing Procedure

All couples completed the instruments either at their home in the examiner's presence or at a group research room on the campus. The couples tested at their homes completed the tests at different tables in all instances, and there was no verbal communication between partners. At the group research room the partners completed the tests in different rooms so that communication was impossible. The BDS was completed first. After the BDS the subjects completed either the FCQ or the FCT-F. The second test was either the MAT or the MRI. The third test was again either the MAT or MRI depending on which one had been completed as the second test. The last test was similarly either the FCQ or the FCT-F. To sum up: the FCQ, the FCT-F, the MAT and the MRI were completed in a random order after all subjects had completed the BDS, except that the FCQ and the FCT-F were completed either first or last. The reason for this stipulation was to minimize the reciprocal influence of these two tests which was assumed to exist since both contain the same statements.

Statistical Analysis

Means were computed for the variables for which information was gained from the BDS. Simple product-moment correlations were computed for all pairs of scores

on the separate tests. A score for each test was assigned to each couple by adding the raw scores of the partners. Simple product-moment correlations were computed between all pairs of couples' scores. An interspouse correlation was computed for each test by correlating the scores of husband and wife for that test.

RESULTS

Biographical Data Sheet

Table 1 lists the descriptive means, standard deviations and ranges of the present sample as well as those reported by Locke and Wallace (1959) and Hurvitz (1959). Van der Veen, et al. (1964) did not describe their sample in detail. Sixty percent of the couples were married less than three years, none were married less than six months. Forty-eight percent of the couples had children, of these 75 percent had one child. The annual income was reported only to the nearest $1,000. The large majority of the sample were of the caucasian race and of middle class background. Four percent of the couples were Jewish. Of the couples reporting religious affiliation 68 percent were Protestant, 12 percent Catholic, and 4 percent Jewish.

Marital Adjustment Scores

The mean scores for the separate tests and their standard deviations obtained for the individuals and the couples are shown in Table 2.

Correlations among Marital Adjustment Scores

Table 3 presents the simple correlations among couples' and individuals' scores on the different tests. Table 4 shows the correlations among the husband's and wives' scores. From these tables it is clear that the marital adjustment scores of an individual or a couple as measured by the FCQ, the MAT, and the FCT-F are highly related. The correlations between these scores are all significantly different from zero at beyond the .005 level. It is also plain from tables 3 and 4 that an individual's or couple's MRI score is independent of his or their score on any of the other tests. The correlations obtained in the present study are compared with those obtained elsewhere in Table 5.

Interspouse Correlations

The interspouse correlations obtained are presented in Table 6. All, except the MRI interspouse correlation, do not differ significantly from zero at the .05 level. Since the MRI does not seem to measure marital satisfaction, the present data do not support the hypothesis that the marital satisfaction of husband and wife tend to be nearly equal. Interspouse correlations obtained by others are also presented in Table 6.

Table 1. Sample Attribute Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges Compared with Characteristics of Locke and Wallace' and Hurvitz' Samples

Variable	Present Sample			Locke and Wallace (1959)	Hurvitz (1959)
	Means	SD	Range	Means	Means
		N = 50		N = 236	N = 208
Age					
Males	24	4.22	20 - 40	29	40
Females	23	3.12	19 - 38	30	35
Number of Years of Education					
Males	15.3	1.62	12 - 18	15	40% College
Females	14	1.88	10 - 17	14	30% Graduates
Number of Years of Marriage	3.0	4.00	.5 - 19.5	5.5	12.5
Number of Children	.76	1.10	1 - 4	44% No Children 33% One Child	Mode: 2 Children
Annual Income	5000	681	1000 - 9000	White Collar and Professional	9615
Predominant Racial Group	Caucasian 96%			Caucasian 96%	Jewish 50%
Percentage Reporting Religious Affiliation	84			88	95

Table 2. Mean Marital Adjustment Scores and Standard Deviations Compared with those Obtained by Locke and Wallace, Hurvitz, and van der Veen, *et al*.

Sample	Family Concept Q Sort		Marital Adjustment Test		Marital Roles Inventory		Family Concept Scale	
	Means	SD	Means	SD	Means	SD	Means	SD
Present Sample								
Husbands (25)	32.6	6.1	115.4	22.7	6.6	2.4	43.0	5.5
Wives (25)	33.4	3.7	119.8	15.5	4.2	1.7	43.3	4.2
Individuals (50)	33.1	5.1	117.7	19.4	4.9	2.0	43.2	4.8
Couples (25)	66.2	8.2	235.4	31.0	10.9	3.5	86.4	7.3
Locke and Wallace (1959)								
High Adj. Group (47)			135.9	nr'				
Low Adj. Group (47)			71.7	nr				
Hurvitz (1959)								
Husbands (104)					6.1	nr		
Wives (104)					5.3	nr		
Van der Veen, *et al*. (1964)								
High Adj. Group (10)	35.2	nr	121.2	nr				
Low Adj. Group (10)	27.9	nr	106.7	nr				

Note: The number enclosed in brackets indicates the N.

'nr - Not reported in original source.

Table 3. Correlations among Couples' Scores and correlations among Individuals' Scores for the Separate Tests

	FCQ	MAT	FCT-F	MRI
Family Concept Q Sort		.68	.78	.09
Marital Adjustment Test	.66		.76	.03
Family Concept Scale	.72	.77		-.02
Marital Roles Inventory	.03	-.06	.01	

Note: The correlations above the diagonal indicate correlations among couples' scores, those below indicate correlations among individuals' scores.

Table 4. Correlations among Husbands' Scores and among Wives' Scores for the Separate Tests

	FCQ	MAT	FCT-F	MRI
Family Concept Q Sort		.72	.77	-.08
Marital Adjustment Test	.51		.74	-.10
Family Concept Scale	.58	.83		-.08
Marital Roles Inventory	.22	.17	.09	

Note: The correlations above the diagonal indicate correlations among husbands' scores, those below indicate correlations among wives' scores.

Table 5. Comparison of Correlations among Individuals' Scores and those Obtained by van der Veen, *et al.* and Hurvitz

Author	Correlated Scores	Present Sample
Van der Veen, *et al.* (All *N*'s = 10)		
Family Adjustment Scores and Marital Adjustment Scores of:		
High Adjustment Group	.44	
Low Adjustment Group	.65	
Combined Sample (N = 20)	.67	.66
Hurvitz (All *N*'s = 104)		
Husbands' Index of Strain and Marital Adjustment Score of:		
Husbands	-.22	-.10
Wives	-.23	-.29
Wives' Index of Strain and Marital Adjustment Scores of:		
Husbands	-.08	.38
Wives	-.07	.18

Table 6. Interspouse Correlations for the Marital Adjustment Tests and those Reported by Others

Marital Adjustment Test	Experimenter	Correlations Others	Present
			N = 25
Family Concept Q Sort	van der Veen, et al. (1964)		
	High Adjustment Group N = 10	.66	
	Low Adjustment Group N = 10	.42	
	Combined Sample	NR*	.30
	Powell, (1965) N = 23	.12	.30
Marital Adjustment Test		NR	.28
Marital Roles Inventory	Hurvitz (1959) N = 104	.20	.41[a]
Family Concept Scale (T-F)			.14

* Not Reported

[a] Probability .05 if = o

DISCUSSION

Sampling Procedure

The response rate from the couples contacted by mail was 52 percent. The remainder of the sample consisted of six volunteers from an introductory class in psychology and two couples drawn from a group therapy project for parents of patients at a psychiatric day hospital. Even though all couples, except one, who were contacted and did not complete the instruments indicated a lack of free time as the reason for their non-participation, it is probable that other selective factors resulted in a sample biased toward being well-adjusted.

When considering the magnitude of the correlations among the scores on the separate tests, it seems quite clear that the most probable effect of the non-randomness of the sample is a restriction of the scores to the more highly adjusted range, and an associated attenuation of the correlations. Had the sample been more representative; i.e. if it had also included couples with low marital adjustment, the correlation coefficients obtained might have been higher. A similar consideration is appropriate for

the impact of the non-randomness of the sample on the correlation between the FCQ and the FCT-F scores.

A different picture emerges when considering the impact of the non-randomness with regard to the comparability of the present results with those obtained by other researchers. Here a difference in degree of representativeness would certainly have a detrimental effect on the value of any conclusion drawn. Review of the sampling procedures used by Locke and Wallace (1959), Hurvitz (1959), and van der Veen, et al. (1964) makes it plain that their samples are also far from truly randomly selected samples. The best evidence for the comparability of results is the distribution of marital adjustment scores obtained by the separate researchers as well as the distributions of biographical data. A comparison of the sample characteristics and marital adjustment scores is presented in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 shows that the average subject of the present sample was considerably younger, and had been married for a shorter period of time than that of the other studies. The subjects of the Hurvitz sample were considerably older, had been married longer, and had a greater number of children per family. The samples seem to be very similar in terms of education, religious affiliation and racial predominance with the notable exception that 50 percent of the Hurvitz sample was Jewish. The average annual income of the present

sample was considerably lower than that of the other samples but it must be remembered that at least one, and often two of the spouses of twenty-three of the twenty-five couples were students. Van der Veen, et al. (1964) do not report any of the sample characteristics in detail. Review of the selection procedure used suggests that their sample is comparable to that used by Hurvitz.

The present scores are also quite similar to those reported of the other samples. From Table 2 it can be seen that the mean scores for the present sample of the FCQ and MAT are slightly below those reported for high-adjustment sub-groups of van der Veen, et al. (1964) and Locke and Wallace (1959), while the current scores are well above those reported for their low-adjustment sub-groups. Trends in the mean Index of strain for husbands and wives are not as clear. The mean Index of Strain of the husbands is higher than that reported by Hurvitz (1959) while the reverse is true for the Index of Strain of the wives.

These comparisons suggest that the non-random selection procedure of the present sample does not produce any gross non-comparability between the present findings and the results of the pertinent prior studies.

Relationships among the FCQ, the FCT-F, and the MAT

The correlations presented in Tables 3 and 4 indicate clearly that the construct of marital adjustment has

some validity as indicated by the high correlations between the FCQ and the MAT scores across these independent instruments. The correlations obtained were likely limited by the non-random selection procedure as discussed above, but they were also attenuated by the limited reliability of the separate tests. Van der Veen, et al. (1964), for example, report a test-retest reliability coefficient of .71 for the FCQ. If it is assumed that the FCQ is a perfectly valid instrument, the maximum possible correlation between the FCT-F and the FCQ as well as between the MAT and the FCQ is .84 instead of 1.00. No test-retest reliability coefficients are available for the MAT and FCT-F.

Interspouse Correlations

From Table 6 it is apparent that the interspouse correlation under the controlled test situation which minimized communication between the spouses is considerably lower than that reported by most other researchers. The conclusion drawn is that the marriage relationship is not one which is evaluated by the partners in an identical manner. It is rather common for one partner to describe the marriage as a happy or well-adjusted one while the other considers it to be an unhappy and unsatisfactory relationship. This finding underlines the need to view the marriage relationship not as an entity in itself, but rather as two

attitudes or evaluations from two different people which tend to be related only in the sense that it is their interaction which is evaluated.

The Family Concept Scale

In view of the high correlation obtained between the FCT-F and the FCQ, and the greater efficiency of the former, it is suggested that the FCT-F be considered as a sbustitute or improved version of the FCQ. Initial results indicate that the FCT-F is internally reliable. (r = .84, estimated by Kuder Richardson formula.)

On the basis of feedback to the experimenter received from the subjects it is also suggested that a further improvement of the FCT-F might be the inclusion of a third, "does not apply" category in addition to the "true" and "false" choices. This would make the alternatives more similar to those made in the FCQ and might also increase the score variance, thus increasing the correlation between the FCQ and the FCT-F.

The Marital Roles Inventory

The MRI used in this study is now an outdated form. The experimenter became aware, after most of the data had been collected, that the MRI had been expanded to include eleven roles for both the husband's and wife's set of roles

(Hurvitz, 1960). This test has been published and is available from the publisher with a manual. The empirical evidence cited in support of the expanded version is based on correlations with the original test scores. Consequently, the validity of the expanded version stands or falls with the original version used in this study.

Even though the present sample differed substantially in several respects from that used by Hurvitz, it is concluded that the MRI does not measure the quality of a marital relationship as perceived by the partners. The only empirical evidence cited by Hurvitz in support of the validity of the instrument is the correlation between the husband's Index of Strain and the husband's and wife's MAT score. This correlation was not replicated.

Differences between Husband and Wife Scores

From the standard deviations in Table 2 it can be concluded that the wives are a more homogeneous group in terms of marital adjustment scores than the husbands. The average marital adjustment scores for the wives seem to indicate a greater marital adjustment for all tests. This may however be due to a greater conformity to social desirability on the part of the wives, or it may be that the tests are more insensitive to the important factors in the wife's evaluation of a marriage relationship.

Hurvitz' conclusion (1959) that wives are better adjusted than husbands seems puzzling. He based his conclusion on the fact that the mean Index of Strain for the wives was 5.26 and that of the husbands 6.09. Although this is a highly statistically significant difference, it can be accounted for without inferring any variation in marital adjustment by the fact that the wife's Index of Strain is based on the cube root of the cubed differences in rank order for a set of eight roles, while the husband's Index of Strain is based on a set of ten roles. To illustrate this, random samples of 25 paired role rankings for eight and ten role sets were drawn from a random digit table. Indices of Strain were computed for both of these samples. The average Index of Strain for the eight randomly matched roles for a sample of 25 was 7.17. This average score was 9.94 for the sets of ten roles. This difference is also highly statistically significant. Thus, the difference in Indices of Strain obtained by Hurvitz can be anticipated solely on the basis of the different number of roles included in each set.

Implications for Further Research

While the results supported the marital adjustment construct's validity, Hurvitz' claim that the MRI measures marital adjustment (1959) was not supported. It does not

necessarily follow that the MRI does not evaluate a useful and valid attribute of a marriage. Whether it does or not is beyond the scope of this study, but should be investigated. Similarly, other constructs may prove useful for a better understanding of a marriage. Particularly when prediction of marital relation effects on children is of interest more information is needed than the marital adjustment scores of the parents.

Further research should take into consideration that evaluation of a marital relationship may be independent across spouses.

Further investigation of the reliability and validity of the FCT-F is necessary before it can be recommended as a substitute of the FCQ.

SUMMARY

Several instruments purported to measure marital adjustment are described in recent literature. High correlations among the independent instruments, to be expected if marital adjustment is a valid construct, are not consistently reported. Similar ambiguity of evidence is found regarding the degree of similarity of marital adjustment between spouses. The Marital Adjustment Test (MAT), the Marital Roles Inventory (MRI), the Family Concept Q Sort (FCQ) and a provisional, time saving variation of the FCQ, the Family Concept Scale (FCT-F), were administered to twenty-five married couples under testing conditions which prevented cooperation. MAT and FCQ scores were correlated to a high degree, while MRI scores were independent of MAT and FCQ scores, thus supporting the construct validity of marital adjustment and casting doubt on the utility of the MRI as a measure of marital adjustment. Interspouse correlations were substantially lower than those most frequently reported, suggesting the failure of previous research to control the testing

conditions adequately, and that marital adjustment of spouses is relatively independent. The FCT-F was found to be internally reliable and yielded scores correlating to a high degree with FCQ and MAT scores.

REFERENCES

Burgess, E. W. and Cottrell, L. S. The prediction of adjustment in marriage. Amer. Soc. Rev. 1936, 1, 737-751.

Davis, Katharine B. Factors in the sex life of twenty-two hundred women. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929.

Hamilton, G. V. A research in marriage. New York: A & C Boni, Inc., 1929.

Hurvitz, N. The index of strain as a measure of marital satisfaction. Sociol. & Social Res. 1959, 44, 106-111.

Hurvitz, N. The marital roles inventory and the measurement of marital adjustment. J. Clin. Psychol. 1960, 16, 377-380.

Kirkpatrick, C. Community of interest and the measurement of marriage adjustment. The Family, 1937, 18, 133-137.

Locke, H. J., and Wallace, K. M. Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: their reliability and validity. Marriage fam. Liv., 1959, 21, 251-255.

Powell, Diane, M. A personality inventory approach to the study of marital adjustment. Michigan State University. East Lansing, Michigan, 1965. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Terman, L. M. Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Thorndike, R. L. Personnel Selection. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

van der Veen, F., Huebner, B., and Neja, P. Relationships between the parents' concept of the family and family adjustment. Amer. J. of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34 45-55.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TESTS

Marital Roles Inventory:

Instructions: Number the following statements in the order of importance in which you actually carry out your roles or functions in your family at the present time. (1 being most important; 10, the least important. No ties allowed.)

..... I do my (He does his) jobs around the house.
..... I am (He is) a companion to my (his) wife.
..... I help (He helps) the children grow by being their friend, teacher and guide.
..... I earn (He earns) the living and support (supports) the family.
..... I do my (He does his) wife's work around the house if my (his) help is needed.
..... I practice (He practices) the family religion or philosophy.
..... I am (He is) a sexual partner to my (his) wife.
..... I decide (He decides) when the family is still divided after discussing something.
..... I serve (He serves) as the model of men for my (his) children.
..... I represent and advance (He represents and advances) my (his) family in the community.

..... I help (She helps) earn the living when my (her) husband needs my (her) help or when the family needs more money.
..... I practice (She practices) the family religion or philosophy.
..... I care (She cares) for the children's everyday needs.
..... I am (She is) a companion to my (her) husband.
..... I am (She is) the homemaker.
..... I am (She is) a sexual partner to my (her) husband.

..... I represent and advance (She represents and advances) my (her) family socially and in the community.
..... I help (She helps) the children grow by being their friend, teacher and guide.

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

Instructions:

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

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

State the approximate extent of agreement between you and your mate on the following items. Please encircle the appropriate dots.

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
Handling family finances:	5	4	3	2	1	0
Matters of Recreation:	5	4	3	2	1	0
Demonstrations of affection:	8	6	4	2	1	0
Friends:	5	4	3	2	1	0
Sex Relations:	15	12	9	4	1	0
Conventionality (right, good or proper conduct):	5	4	3	2	1	0
Philosophy of life:	5	4	3	2	1	0
Ways of dealing with in-laws:	5	4	3	2	1	0

When disagreements arise, they usually result in: husband's giving in 0, wife giving in 2, agreement by mutual give and take 10.

Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? All of them 10 , some of them 8 , very few of them 3 , none of them 0 ?

In leisure time do you generally prefer: to be "on the go" - , to stay at home + ?*
Does your mate generally prefer: to be "on the go" - , to stay at home + ?*

Do you ever wish you had not married? Frequently 0 , occasionally 3 , rarely 8 , never 15 ,

If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: marry the same person 15 , marry a different person 0 , not marry at all 1 ?

Do you confide in your mate: almost never 0 , rarely 2 , in most things 10 , in everything 10 ?

* + - = 2; + + = 10; - - = 3

(Locke and Wallace, 1959, p. 252)

Family Concept Q-Sort:

Instructions:

Here is a set of cards, with a statement on each card. Please put each card on one of the spaces of this card, according to how much it is like your family. Zero means most unlike and eight means most like, and the points between are varying degrees of these. By family we mean the persons who live at your home and whom you consider to be part of your family group. We want you to describe this family group as honestly and accurately as you can. Put each card on the pile that indicates how much this statement is true for your family as it really is. It is important that you be completely accurate in describing your family. You can take as much time as you wish. It seems to go best when you work rapidly and arrange all the items and then go over the items again to arrange them more exactly. Only a certain number of items should go in each pile as is marked on the card. Please proceed carefully, and ask me if you have any questions, or if there is anything you are not sure of.

1. We like to do new and different things.
* 2. We usually can depend on each other.
* 3. We have a number of close friends.
4. We often do not agree on important matters.
5. Each of us tries to be the kind of person the others will like.
6. Good manners and proper behavior are very important to us.
* 7. We feel secure when we are with each other.
8. We want help with our problems.
* 9. We do many things together.
- 10. Each of us wants to tell the others what to do.
- 11. There are serious differences in our standards and values.
* 12. We feel free to express any thought or feeling to each other.
* 13. Our home is the center of our activities.
* 14. We are an affectionate family.
- 15. It is not our fault that we are having difficulties.
- 16. Little problems often become big ones for us.
- 17. We do not understand each other.
* 18. We get along very well in the community.
* 19. We often praise or compliment each other.
- 20. We do not talk about sex.
- 21. We get along much better with persons outside the family than with each other.

22. If we had more money most of our present problems would be gone.
* 23. We are proud of our family.
\- 24. We do not like each other's friends.
\- 25. There are many conflicts in our family.
* 26. We are usually calm and relaxed when we are together.
27. We are not a talkative family.
* 28. We respect each other's privacy.
\- 29. Accomplishing what we want to do seems to be difficult for us.
\- 30. We tend to worry about many things.
31. We often upset each other without intending it.
32. Nothing exciting ever seems to happen to us.
33. We are a deeply religious family.
* 34. We are continually getting to know each other better.
35. We need each other.
36. We do not spend enough time together.
37. We do not understand what is causing our difficulties.
38. Success and prestige are very important to us.
* 39. We encourage each other to develop in his or her own individual way.
40. We are ashamed of some things about our family.
* 41. We have warm, close relationships with each other.
42. There are some topics which we avoid talking about.
* 43. Together we can overcome almost any difficulty.
* 44. We really do trust and confide in each other.
45. We make many demands on each other.
46. We take care of each other.
47. Our activities together are usually planned and organized.
* 48. The family has always been very important to us.
\- 49. We get more than our share of illness.
* 50. We are considerate of each other.
* 51. We can stand up for our rights if necessary.
52. We are all responsible for our family problems.
53. There is not enough discipline in our family.
* 54. We have very good times together.
55. We depend on each other too much.
56. We often become angry at each other.
\- 57. We live largely by other people's standards and values.
58. We are not as happy as we might be.
59. We are critical of each other.
60. We are satisfied with the way in which we now live.
\- 61. Usually each of us goes his own separate way.
\- 62. We resent each other's outside activities.
* 63. We have respect for each other's feelings and opinions even when we differ strongly.

- 64. We sometimes wish we could be an entirely different family.
* 65. We are sociable and really enjoy being with people.
- 66. We are a disorganized family.
  67. It is important to us to know how we appear to others.
- 68. Our decisions are not our own, but are forced upon us by circumstances.
- 69. We are not really fond of one another.
* 70. We are a strong, competent family.
- 71. We just cannot tell each other our real feelings.
- 72. We are not satisfied with anything short of perfection.
* 73. We forgive each other easily.
  74. We are usually somewhat reserved with each other.
  75. We rarely hurt each other's feelings.
  76. We like the same things.
* 77. We usually reach decisions by discussions and compromise.
* 78. We can adjust well to new situations.
  79. We are liked by most people who know us.
  80. We are full of life and good spirits.

(van der Veen, et al., 1964)

---

* indicates items indicative of the perfectly adjusted family.
- indicates items indicative of the poorly adjusted family.

Family Concept Scale:

Instructions:

Indicate whether each of the following items is mostly true or mostly false as it applies to your immediate family, (Husband or wife and children) and fill in the appropriate response on the accompanying answer form. First impressions are satisfactory, and most people are able to complete the scale in less than 15 minutes. It is quite important that you give a response to each item, even though it may sometimes be difficult to make a decision.

The rest of the instrument consists of the same items as those of Family Concept Q-Sort.

Biographical Data Sheet:

Date:_____ Number_____

Age:_____

Date of Marriage:_____
month year

Occupation_____

List the age and sex of your children, oldest first.

_____
_____
_____
_____

Is this your first marriage?_____

Highest grade attained in school_____

Your approximate income annually_____

Your religious affiliation if any_____

APPENDIX C

RAW MARITAL ADJUSTMENT SCORES FOR ALL COUPLES

Couple	FCQ	MAT	MRI	FCT-F	fcq	mat	mri	fct-f
1.	13	44	5.43	21	37	132	3.36	48
2.	31	118	3.17	46	35	129	4.51	43
3.	31	140	7.14	46	30	127	7.69	45
4.	32	124	5.87	46	34	121	4.55	46
5.	29	104	9.23	44	34	77	4.51	33
6.	35	151	7.18	47	37	122	4.24	43
7.	30	108	7.02	43	32	123	1.59	44
8.	38	107	6.80	47	31	125	4.88	45
9.	34	151	5.58	44	36	141	3.73	45
10.	37	100	10.51	45	34	106	4.61	46
11.	41	132	9.82	43	39	123	8.02	44
12.	30	108	6.54	44	36	130	6.16	44
13.	31	117	4.04	41	29	111	2.41	43
14.	38	142	8.77	41	32	121	7.11	43
15.	40	111	3.58	46	38	118	2.15	48
16.	35	133	4.70	46	37	119	2.52	44
17.	36	117	2.41	48	36	143	3.11	48
18.	29	112	7.44	41	31	112	4.12	44
19.	21	77	9.37	37	23	93	1.82	35
20.	38	127	8.01	48	37	138	6.00	46
21.	29	92	9.02	38	31	110	3.17	38
22.	34	116	6.74	45	33	111	4.93	41
23.	34	118	2.80	40	27	96	3.58	34
24.	33	115	9.68	43	32	133	4.51	46
25.	42	125	4.76	46	34	134	2.71	47

Note: Columns headed by capital letters indicate male scores, columns headed by lower case letters indicate female scores.