AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Paul Roy Banta   for the degree of Master of Science

in Family Life   presented on December 17, 1980

Title: SPOUSE THERAPEUTIC ROLE ATTITUDES AND PERFORMANCES: AN

EXPLORATORY STUDY

Abstract Approved: Redacted for privacy

Professor Arthur E. Gravatt

This study examined the relationship between a spouse's thera-
peutic role attitude and the mate's evaluation of the spouse's
therapeutic role behaviors. The therapeutic role consists of
supportive behaviors directed towards one's spouse. Twenty-five
couples were recruited from Oregon State University classes.
Attitude questionnaires were administered to all respondents.

The Pearson r was used to test four hypotheses. Hypothesis
one predicted a positive relationship between the spouse's thera-
peutic role attitude and the mate's evaluation of the spouse's role
performance. Hypothesis two predicted a positive relationship
between a spouse's therapeutic role attitude and the mate's marital
happiness. Hypothesis three predicted a positive relationship
between the spouse's therapeutic role attitude and the mate's degree
of approval of the spouse's positive behavior. Finally, hypothesis
four predicted a negative relationship between a spouse's therapeutic
role attitude and the mate's degree of disapproval of the spouse's
negative behaviors.

A t-test of the Pearson r found that only hypothesis four was significant. Pearson r correlations by sex indicated that the significance of hypothesis four was due solely to the negative relationship between the husband's therapeutic role attitude and the wife's degree of disapproval of the husband's negative behaviors. An exchange theory perspective was used in the interpretation of the results. Corollary analyses, limitations and implications of the results were also discussed in the thesis.

Spouse Therapeutic Role
Attitudes and Performances:
An Exploratory Study

by

Paul Roy Banta

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

Completed December 1980

Commencement June 1981

APPROVED:

Professor of Family Life in Charge of Major

Head of Department of Family Life

Dean of Graduate School

Date Thesis is presented   December 17, 1980

Typed by Violet Campbell for   Paul Roy Banta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SPOUSE THERAPEUTIC ROLE
ATTITUDES AND PERFORMANCES:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

I. RESEARCH PROBLEM AND METHOD

A. Statement of the Problem

Recently, Nye and his associates have developed the concept of

the therapeutic role (Nye & Gecas, 1976) which they found to be

associated with marital happiness (Nye & McLaughlin, 1976). Nye

and Gecas (1976) conceive of the therapeutic role as a form

of spouse therapy in which the spouse listens to the mate's problems,

giving sympathy, reassurance, understanding and constructive advice.

Using multiple regression analysis, Nye and McLaughlin (1976)

found that the spouse's evaluation of the effectiveness

of the mate's therapeutic role was the best predictor of the

spouse's marital happiness.

Chadwick, Albrecht and Kunz (1976) also had spouses evaluate

their mate's role competencies. They had spouses rate, on a scale

from one to five, how competently their mates performed the thera-

peutic role. From the results, Chadwick, Albrecht and Kunz (1976,

p. 434) found that the mean spouse evaluation of mate therapeutic

role competency grouped around the "about average" category of

role performance. For example, the mean competency score of the

wife's therapeutic role performance was "3.4," while the husband's

mean competency score on therapeutic role performance was "3.3."

From the studies cited above, then, two tenable conclusions are:

first, the therapeutic role appears to be important

for marital satisfaction and secondly, spouses perceive their mates as having at least average competency in therapeutic role performance.

At this point one could ask how the mate's therapeutic role behavior and/or attitude is related to the spouse's evaluation of the mate role competency. An indirect answer may come from exchange theory research conducted by both role theorists (Nye & McLaughlin, 1976) and reinforcement theorists (see Jacobson, 1979 for a review of marital reinforcement research). Nye and McLaughlin (1976) hypothesized that spouses would exchange role competency evaluations. A spouse's evaluation of the mate's role competency was correlated with the mate's evaluation of the spouse's role competency. Correlations were obtained for all combinations of five marital roles for each spouse pair. The therapeutic role was one of the five roles. Nye and McLaughlin (1976) found general support for their hypothesis; yet many of the correlations were not significant. However. They did not specify which correlations were statistically significant. Nevertheless, this study does suggest that a mate may reciprocate a spouse's competency evaluation on certain roles.

The second source of indirect evidence comes from reinforcement theorists. Patterson and Reid (cited in Jacobson, 1979) hypothesized that over time marital couples would exchange reinforcing behaviors at about equal rates. Wills, Weiss and Patterson (1974; also cited in Jacobson, 1979) found some support for this hypothesis. Couples were asked to record the frequency of each other's behaviors over a 14 day period. Spouses used the Spouse Observation Checklist (SOC) to record

the mates' daily frequency of certain "pleasing" and "displeasing" "affectionate" behaviors. When mean levels of spouses' behaviors were compared across all couples, spouses were more similar to each other in average exchange of "pleasing" behaviors than they were to other couples.

However, when Wills, Weiss and Patterson (cited in Jacobson, 1979) examined immediate behavioral exchanges within each couple over the 14 day period, they found greater exchanges of "displeasing" behaviors than "pleasing" behaviors. These findings lend support to the "bank account" model of spouse exchange (Gottman, Notarius, Markman, Bank, Yoppi & Rubin, 1976; also cited in Jacobson, 1979). Gottman and his associates conceived of positive behavior exchange between nondistressed couples as a form of investment in the marriage. Each spouse invests rewarding behaviors in the relationship. These investments sustain the rewarding quality of the relationship even when rewards are not immediately reciprocated or when one spouse punishes the other. The bank account model is similar to the schedules of reinforcement principle (see Nevin & Reynolds, 1973, for a review, Ch. 6).

Spouse reinforcement of mate may not have to be continuous in order to maintain the mate's output of rewards. The mate's rate of investment of rewarding behaviors which are not immediately reciprocated is based on the spouse's rate (schedule) of reinforcement of the mate.

In terms of the therapeutic role enactment, the spouse's positive evaluation of the mate's therapeutic role behaviors may maintain

certain of the mate's positive behaviors or attitudes. This assumes, of course, that the spouse's evaluation is somehow communicated to the mate. Indeed, Jacobson (1979) stressed the importance of spouse evaluation in his model of the etiology of marital distress. He views each spouse's appraisal of the adequacy of the mate's behaviors as crucial in determining each spouse's tendency to reinforce or punish the mate.

Therefore, a spouse's positive evaluation of a mate's behavior may lead a spouse to invest in behaviors reinforcing to the mate. The mate may then reciprocate, over time, with reinforcing behavior and/or attitudes toward the spouse. The mate's reinforcement may increase the spouse's positive evaluation thus producing a positive cyclical exchange relationship.

Marital therapists, working with distressed couples, could start the positive exchange cycle going by either increasing a spouse's positive appraisals or by increasing the mate's reinforcing behaviors. When therapeutic treatment time is limited, a therapist may find that changing attitudes is faster than changing behaviors, especially with limited resources.

The question therefore becomes: Would a spouse's attitude toward a set of spousal behaviors known to be rewarding (such as therapeutic role behavior) increase a mate's tendency to reciprocate with reinforcing behaviors, evaluations or attitudes toward the spouse? As a first step toward answering this question, this thesis will examine the general proposition that there is a significant relationship between a mate's therapeutic role attitude and

the spouse's evaluation of the mate's behavior.

B. Research Hypotheses

(See Table 1)

- Research Hypothesis 1

There is a positive relationship between the spouse's rating of the mate's therapeutic role performance and the mate's therapeutic role attitude score.

Given the findings that spouses view their mate's as average therapeutic role performers (Chadwick, Albrecht & Kunz, 1976), an exchange theorist might argue that increasing a mate's attitude toward the therapeutic role might increase the spouse's positive evaluation of the mate's role competency. Therefore, this hypothesis posits a non-causal significant relationship between a mate's therapeutic role attitude and the spouse's role competency (performance) evaluation.

- Research Hyposthesis 2

There is a positive relationship between a spouse's happiness with the marriage and the mate's therapeutic role attitude score.

Nye and McLaughlin (1976) did find that the best predictor of a spouse's marital satisfaction was a spouse's evaluation of the mate's therapeutic role effectiveness. An exchange orientation might suggest that a spouse's evaluation and marital satisfaction are partly determined by the mate's therapeutic behavior and/or attitude. Therefore, this hypothesis suggests a non-causal significant relationship between a mate's therapeutic role attitude

and the spouse's happiness.

- Research Hypothesis 3

There is a positive relationship between the spouse's approval score for the mate's positive behaviors and the mate's therapeutic role attitude score.

Wills, Weiss and Patterson (1974) have found a mean rate of "pleasing" exchanges occurring between partners. One might suggest that a spouse's "pleasing" behaviors associated with the therapeutic role could also influence the mate's attitudes. Therefore, this hypothesis posits that there is a non-causal significant relation-ship between a spouse's approval of the mate's positive behaviors and the mate's therapeutic role attitude. One must assume, of course, that the spouse's approval will be communicated to the mate.

- Research Hypothesis 4

There is a negative relationship between a spouse's disapproval score for the mate's negative behaviors and the mate's therapeutic role attitude score.

According to the bank account model (Gottman, Notarius, Markman, Bank, Yoppi, & Rubin, 1976) happily married couples have more "deposits" than "withdrawals" in their relationship. Perhaps the deposits can be viewed as security against the time when a mate's displeasing behaviors will draw upon the spouse's satisfaction with the marriage. It might also be suggested that the spouse will make a less negative evaluation of the mate's "displeasing" withdrawals if the mate has previously deposited a generous

amount of "pleasing" behaviors. Therefore, this hypothesis posits that the greater the mate's therapeutic role attitude, the less the spouse will disapprove of the mate's "displeasing" negative behaviors.

C. Method

1. Subjects

The sample consisted of 25 childless couples, recruited from Family Life, psychology, sociology, counseling and home economics classes at Oregon State University. The ages of the respondents ranged from 19 to 30 years old, with the mean age being 23. The length of marriage ranged from six months to three years, three months. The average length of marriage was one year, six months. This was the respondent's first marriage. All respondents were Caucasian.

Hollingshead's (c. 1977) Four Factor Index scores were used to determine the social status of the respondents. The index scores can range from a low of eight to a high of 66. The respondents' index scores, in this study, ranged from 25 to 63. The median score was 43. Following the analysis of social status recommended by Hollingshead (c. 1977), the social status distribution of scores for respondents is shown in Table 8.

2. Instruments

In order to test the hypotheses, four measuring instruments were used.

a. Therapeutic Role Attitude Scale (TRAS). The "mate's therapeutic role attitude score" (hypotheses 1 to 4) was obtained

by using Strang's (1979) <u>Therapeutic Role Attitude Scale (TRAS)</u> (see appendix B). Strang (1979) developed the TRAS, a Likert scale, using a random sample of 99 married residents of Corvallis, Oregon, consisting of 44 husbands and 55 wives.

The reliability of the scale, determined by a split-half correlation and adjusted by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula, was .94. The validity of the scale was not directly assessed. However, Strang may have obtained a degree of concurrent validity by asking spouses how they felt about their mate's enactment of the therapeutic role. Since overall analysis of these questions showed that respondents tended to perceive the therapeutic role in a positive direction, some concurrent validity may have been secured for the TRAS. Yet, Strang did not correlate these questions with scores on her TRAS. My hypothesis "1" may be a form of concurrent validity for the TRAS, given that the measurement of the "therapeutic role performance" in hypothesis "1" is similar to Strang's questions on therapeutic role competency (see next section b).

The TRAS is scored in the following way. A high score on the questionnaire indicates a favorable attitude while a low score indicates an unfavorable attitude toward the therapeutic role. Therefore, favorable items are coded from "5" to "1," while unfavorable items are coded from "1" to "5." The respondent's total score is the sum of scores from all 32 statement items. A total score for each respondent may range from 32 to 160 (5 x 32).

b. <u>Therapeutic Role Index of Performance (TRIP)</u>. The
Therapeutic Role Index of Performance (TRIP) was developed by this
author to measure a spouse's perception of the mate's role per-
formance (see appendix C). The TRIP measured the "therapeutic
role performance" variable of hypothesis "1." The TRIP items are
based upon Nye and Gecas' (1976) definition of the therapeutic
role. Based on their description of the therapeutic role, the
basic ingredients of the role are performances of: listening,
giving sympathy, support and reassurance, and providing ideas and
actions to help solve the mate's problems. The TRIP consists of
two subscales. The quality subscale (TRIPQ) measured the quality
(or competency) of the role performance, while the frequency sub-
scale (TRIPF) measured the frequency of the role performance.
Each subscale is a single unit and was presented to the respondent
on separate forms.

Each subscale of the TRIP is scored separately in the following
manner. Each scale item has eight interval choices. On the TRIPQ,
these choices range from "extremely well" to "not well at all."
The intervals are numbered from "8" to "1," with "8" being
"extremely well" and "1" being "not well at all." The respondent's
score on each item is determined by the number of the interval
chosen. If the respondent chose the second interval from the left,
for example, his/her score would have been "7." The respondent's
total score is the sum of scores from all six subscale questions.
The range of total scores is from six to 48 (8 x 6).

Although only the quality subscale was used in testing hypothesis "1," a separate analysis was performed on the correlation between the two subscales.

c. <u>Measure of Marital Happiness (MMH)</u>. The Measure of Marital Happiness (MMH) for hypothesis "2," consisted of the question (see appendix D): "How happy are you with your marriage?" The response category consists of a rating scale of ten units from "extremely happy" to "extremely unhappy." The intervals are numbered from "8" to "1," with "8" being "extremely happy" and "1" being "extremely unhappy." The respondent's score on the question is determined by the number of the interval chosen. For example, if the respondent had chosen the third interval from the right, his/her score for the question would be a "3." The range of total scores is from one to eight.

The MMH is a subjective measure of marital happiness. Although Hicks and Platt (1970) have stressed that the concept of marital happiness is an ambiguous and poorly defined scientific term, the spouse's own subjective evaluation of his or her own marital happiness may be justified as an indicator of the spouse's feelings.

d. <u>Spouse Behavior Rating Scale (SBRS)</u>. Developed by this author, the Spouse Behavior Rating Scale (SBRS) measures a spouse's evaluation of the mate's hypothetical behaviors (see appendix E). The SBRS consists of 10 positive mate behavior items and 10 negative mate behavior items. The ten positive items are designated by the abbreviations SBRSP, while the ten

negative items are designated by the abbreviations SBRSN. The "approval score for the mate's positive behaviors" in hypothesis "3" was obtained by summing all the positive behavior items of the SBRSP, while the "disapproval score for the mate's negative behaviors" in hypothesis "4" was obtained by summing all the negative behavior items of the SBRSN.

A high score on each item indicates an approving attitude, while a low score indicates a disapproving attitude toward the therapeutic role. Therefore, SBRSP items are coded from "7" to "1," while SBRSN items are coded from "1" to "7." The range of total scores for both the SBRSP and SBRSN items is from ten to 70 (7 x 10).

The SBRS was adapted from Weiss' (1975) Spouse Observation Checklist (SOC). The SOC consists of around 400 one sentence statements grouped into categories, such as "companionship" and "consideration" statements. Spouses use the SOC to record the number of times (frequency) that their mates engage in one or another of the 400 behaviors during a specified period of time. About half the statements are "pleases" (positive behaviors), while half the statements are "displeases" (negative behaviors). An example of a positive statement from SOC is : "Spouse comforted me when I was upset"; while an example of a negative statement is: "Spouse criticized me in front of others."

In the research of Weiss and his associates (Birchler, Weiss & Vincent, 1975; Wills, Weiss & Patterson, 1974), the spouse uses the SOC to record the actual frequency of mate's "pleases" and "dis-

pleases" that specifically concern the spouse. The behavior thera-
pist, using the data from the SOC, can help the spouse, through
couple contracting or behavior shaping, to increase low frequency
behavior and decrease high frequency displeasing behaviors.

Wills, Weiss, and Patterson (1974) obtained an empirical
basis for classifying the SOC behaviors as "pleases" or "dis-
pleases." They presented an extensive list of mate behaviors
to 20 distressed and nondistressed married couples. The couples
were asked to determine whether each behavior statement was
"pleasing" or "displeasing" to them.

In terms of this thesis, the positive and negative behaviors
of the SBRS were adapted from the SOC category called "considera-
tion" (Weiss, 1975). The "consideration" category has behavior
statements that could be viewed as specific behaviors of the
therapeutic role (Nye & Gecas, 1976). For example, item ten of
the SBRS is: "Your wife listened sympathetically to your problems."

By comparing Strang's TRAS with SBRS (hypotheses "3" and
"4"), the mate's attitude toward the therapeutic role was com-
pared with the spouse's degree of approval of the mate's specific
consideration (or therapeutic role) behaviors.

3. Procedure

Before the main research was undertaken, five married couples
were asked to fill out the four instruments. These respondents
were recruited from classes. The purpose of this pretest analysis
was to determine whether the directions and questionnaire items
were clear to the respondents. On the basis of the pretest,

minor changes were made in the questionnaire directions.

The 25 experimental couples were recruited in the following manner. The experimenter (E) went to individual classes. The E and in some cases the classroom instructor, explained the nature of the study and asked for volunteers. The E gave the respondents two questionnaire envelopes, one for the husband and the other for the wife. The respondent was told he/she could complete the questionnaire at home and return it through the campus mail.

Each envelope contained a cover letter outlining the purpose of the study, a consent form, the questionnaires and a three page background information sheet (see appendices). The attitude questionnaires were randomly ordered for each respondent's envelope. Since the designation "husband" and "wife" is used in the questionnaire stems of the SBRS, spouse questionnaires were sequentially numbered to avoid confusion during computer coding. To insure that the spouses did not confuse the envelopes, "husband" and "wife" labels were placed on the appropriate envelopes and questionnaires. When giving the envelopes to the respondent, E encouraged the respondent not to confer with mate while completing the questionnaires. Most envelopes were given to one spouse, since one spouse was usually recruited in classes, and the spouses did not both have to be students.

II. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A. Results

1. Research Hypotheses

The Pearson-Product Moment Correlations are the statistical tests for all four hypotheses, using the SPSS computer program (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975). The coefficients were obtained by correlating each spouse's TRAS score with the mate's score on each of the other scales. Since all the hypotheses are directional, the Pearson rs are one tailed tests. Significance tests, derived from Student's t, were obtained for all Pearson rs. The significance (Alpha) level for all Pearson rs was set at .05.

Table 2 shows the correlation coefficient r^2 and significance level for each of the hypotheses. No significant correlations were found for research hypotheses "1," "2" or "3" (H_1, H_2, H_3). There-fore, the null hypothesis (H_0: p x y $\leq$ 0) is not rejected for these research hypotheses. However, research hypothesis "4" (H_4) was found to be statistically significant(H_4: p x y < .01). Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0: p x y $\geq$ 0) is not confirmed for research hypothesis "4."

2. Sex Differences

In Tables 3, 4 and 5, the Pearson r correlations are by sex of respondent. The 'correlated scales' of Tables 3 and 4 are the same as the 'correlated scales' in Table 2. This facilitates the comparison of the hypothesis correlations of Table 2 with the correlations by sex of Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3 gives the coefficients of the husbands' TRAS with the

wives' score on the TRIPQ, MMH, SBRSP and the SBRSN. The only
significant coefficient in Table 3 is the correlation between the
husbands' TRAS and the wives' SBRSN. The correlation, in Table 2,
between respondents' TRAS (both husband and wife) and spouses'
SBRSN, is also significant. However, none of the Pearson r
correlations between the wives' TRAS and the husbands' scores on
the TRIPQ, MMH, SBRSP and the SBRSN are significant (Table 4).

Table 5 gives the Pearson r correlations of both husbands' and
wives' scores on the same scale. The only significant correlation
is between husbands' MMH and wives' MMH.

3. Comparison of Respondents' Scores on Different Scales

The correlations between the respondents' TRAS scores and their
scores on the TRIPQ, MMH, SBRSP and SBRSN are given in Table 6. All
of the coefficients are significant.

4. The TRIPF

Table 7 gives the Pearson r correlations of TRIPF with TRAS and
TRIPQ across different respondent groups. The TRIPF measures a
respondent's perceived frequency of the spouse's therapeutic role
performance (see p. 9). Three significant coefficients were ob-
tained with the TRIPF. When husbands' TRIPF were correlated with
wives' TRIPF, the p value was less than .05. When respondents'
TRAS was correlated with their TRIPF, the coefficient was also
significant (p x y < .01). And, finally the correlation between
respondents' TRIPQ and their TRIPF was the most significant of all
three (p x y < .001), accounting for 76.8% of the variance.

B. <u>Discussion</u>

1. Research Hypotheses and Sex Differences

The results of the hypothesis tests indicate that variability in the mates' TRAS is not significantly correlated with either variability in the spouses' marital happiness (MMH) or the spouses' positive evaluations of the mates' role behaviors (TRIPQ and SBRSP). However, the test of hypothesis "4" is significant, while the test of hypothesis "3" is close to being significant.

Hypothesis "4" does indicate a significant negative relationship between the spouses' evaluations of the mates' negative behaviors (SBRSN) and the mates' TRAS (Table 2). In hypothesis "3," the correlation between the mates' TRAS and the spouses' SBRSP is close to being significant (p = .006, Table 2). At the same time, the correlation is negative, contrary to the predicted direction of the relationship in hypothesis "3." An analysis of sex differences (Table 3 and 4) shows that the negative relationships of both hypotheses "3" and "4" (Table 2) are due to the negative relationships between the husbands' TRAS and the wives' evaluations of the husbands' behaviors (Table 3).

Can certain explanations be made concerning these relationships? Since the Pearson r correlation coefficient is only a measure of the strength of a relationship, causal relations between variables cannot be determined in this study. Therefore, future studies will have to examine the causal relationship between the spouses' TRAS and the mates' evaluations. Still,

certain predictions can be put forward concerning the negative relationships in hypotheses "3" and "4."

Beginning with hypothesis "4," the wife's SBRSN can be considered a measure of tolerance towards the husband's negative behaviors. Predicting that the husband's degree of support for the therapeutic role (the husband's TRAS) determines the wife's degree of tolerance, two relationships are possible. First the higher the husband's TRAS, the higher the wife's degree of tolerance (or the lower the wife's SBRSN). Secondly, the lower the husband's TRAS, the lower the wife's degree of tolerance or the higher the wife's SBRSN (see p. 11 for an explanation of the scoring method for the SBRSN). In other words, wives may have less tolerance of husbands who do not support the therapeutic role, but may have more tolerance of husbands who do support the therapeutic role.

Indeed, as Bernard (1972; also cited in Knox, 1979) suggests, some wives may feel the need to show tolerance for their husbands. Some wives, according to Bernard, find that supporting their husbands' self-image is a full time job.

However, although wives may tolerate their husbands' proscriptive behaviors, they may not necessarily shower their husbands with approving opinions. The case in point is hypothesis "3."

One prediction for hypothesis "3" is that the higher the husband's TRAS, the lower the wife's evaluation of the husband's positive behaviors (the wife's SBRSP). Even though marital life

is becoming more egalitarian, wives may still feel that husbands should not perform therapeutic role duties. Therefore, wives disapprove of husbands with therapeutic role attitudes and behavior.

However, some what of an opposite prediction can be made. The less the wife is tolerant of the husband's positive behaviors (SBRSP), the more the husband may support the therapeutic role (TRAS). In this instance, the husband may feel a need to support the therapeutic role when his wife shows less tolerance of his behaviors. By showing an interest in therapeutic role behavior through the support or performance of therapeutic acts, the husband may hope to increase his wife's tolerance of his behaviors.

Still, given a high TRAS for the husband, the wife may be less approving of the husband's SBRSP, but may be more tolerant of the husband's SBRSN. This speculation may be similar to Luckey's (1966) finding that, with length of marriage, happily married respondents view their mates as "less admirable" while unhappily married respondents view their mates as "more undesirable." Happily married respondents may be viewing their mates as having less positive attributes than the mate should ideally have, rather than viewing the mates as having more negative attributes than are desirable. Happy respondents might, therefore, have more tolerance for less than ideal mate behavior, especially mate therapeutic role behavior. Given the wife's supposed concern for the self-concept of her husband, the wife may particularly tolerate "less admirable" mate behaviors and yet at the same time withhold her approbations for

such behaviors. The wife's tolerant view of the husband may not adversely effect their joint view of marital happiness. The correlated MMH scores of both spouses is significant, accounting for 16.5% of the variance (Table 5).

The bank account theory (Gottman, Notarius, Markman, Bank, Yoppi & Rubin, 1976) may also explain the findings from hypothesis "4." The therapeutic attitude of the mate may not, by itself, contribute to increased spouse investments of positive evaluation but may rather cause the spouse to decrease withdrawals in negative evaluations (a spouse tolerance level).

Of course, since the Pearson r correlation coefficient does not measure causal relationships, the spouse's tolerance of the mate's behavior could just as well increase the mate's TRAS. Or, an unknown variable could cause both spouse tolerance and mate TRAS.

Given that hypotheses "1," "2" and "3" are not significant a positive therapeutic exchange theory, exchanging mate therapeutic attitudes for spouse positive evaluations, is less tenable. Hypothesis "4" might indicate a 'negative' exchange proposition in which a mate's positive therapeutic attitude is exchanged for a less negative spouse evaluation.

2. Comparison of Respondents' Scores on Different Scales

Table 6 represents the same respondent's scores on different scales. The fact that they are all significant may indicate a high degree of response consistency for each respondent. Cognitive

consistency theories, such as Heider's balance theory or Festinger's cognitive-dissonance theory, argue that individuals have a need for consistent groups of attitudes (see Wrightsman, 1977 for a review). Barring certain possible limitations in the instrument or procedures (see Limitation Section), cognitive consistency may be one explanation for the findings in Table 6.

3.   The TRIPF

The TRIPF was developed as a measurement of perceived frequency of spouse therapeutic role behavior. Such a scale could be used in conjunction with in vivo spouse rating scales, such as Weiss' (1975) SOC. A therapist or experimenter could use a rating scale such as the TRIPF as a fast convenient estimate of actual in vivo spouse behavior ratings. The accurateness of the rating scale could be improved by reliability and validity studies with in vivo scales. As a first step, the TRIPF rating scale is correlated with the TRAS and TRIPQ. The results are in Table 7.

The TRIPF score for the husbands was correlated with the TRIPF score for the wives. The significant correlation accounts for 22.2% of the variance. This correlation may represent an exchange of perceived TRIPF between husband and wife. The exchange need not be a one to one exchange of TRIPFs. The bank account view (Gottman, Notarius, Markman, Bank, Yoppi & Rubin, 1976) is that one spouse can invest more in the marriage at any one time and still sustain the rewarding quality of the relation-ship.

The respondent's TRIPF was also significantly correlated with his or her TRAS, with 22.3% of the variance accounted for by the coefficient. Also, the TRIPF and TRIPQ scores for each respondent were significantly correlated, with 76.8% of the variance accounted for by the coefficient. As with the correlations in Table 6, the cognitive consistency theory may account for the two correlations above.

III. CONCLUSION

A. Possible Limitations

1. Sample Limitations

The respondents make up what could be called a convenience sample. The data gathered from college students does have limited generalizability to the general population. Moreover, students in family life or psychology classes, even if they are freshmen, may have social science knowledge that might increase the chances that they will make socially desirable responses to questionnaire items.

2. Instrument Limitations

The wording of certain of the statement stems of the TRAS may bias the results of any correlational test using this scale. Thirteen (40%) of the 32 TRAS stems have a husband as the subject of the stem. For example, respondents are asked in item six to express an opinion as to whether "a husband should show appreciation for his wife's efforts to make him happy (see appendix B)."

The effect of having 40% of the items as 'husband stems' may cause traditional spouses to have underestimated TRAS scores and non-traditional spouses to have overestimated TRAS scores. The traditional spouses, those who hold that wives should be the main expressive therapeutic role enactors, might make anti-therapeutic role evaluations of the husband stems, thus underestimating their scores. On the other hand, non-traditional spouses, those who hold that husbands should take an active role in therapeutic role behavior, may make pro-therapeutic role evaluations of the husband

stems, thus overestimating their scores.

As an indication of how the husbands and wives in the sample answered the husband stem items, a Pearson r correlation was obtained for the husband stem items of the TRAS. The correlation coefficient was .053, which was not significant, indicating no correlation between husbands and wives on the husband stem items. Future analyses of the TRAS should examine the validity of husband stem items.

However, Strang (1972) did obtain an indirect measure of validity for the whole scale (see p. 8). But, the correlations obtained in this thesis do not constitute a concurrent valida-tion for the TRAS; since the correlations between the TRAS and the MMH, TRIPQ or SBRSP were not significant.

In looking at the individual items of the other scales, item six of the SBRS (see appendix E) was found to have an extremely skewed response distribution. In responding to item six ("He/She said he/she loved you"), 49 respondents out of 50 indicated they "Strongly" approved of the item. The remaining respondent indicated moderate approval for the item. If the SBRS is used in the future, item six may have to be deleted. (In the "Procedural Limitations" section below see also the item analysis of the MMH).

The SBRS was adapted from some of Weiss' (1975) SOC "considera-tion" items. Although most SBRS items conform to Nye and Gecas' (1976) definition of therapeutic role behaviors, a few SBRS items may not conform. For example, item five: "Your wife called to tell you where she was" may indicate spouse consideration but not be a

therapeutic role behavior. Of course, one can operationally define the therapeutic role as being the positively worded items on the SBRS. However, such a definition may limit the comparisons which can be made between this research and other studies which use Nye and Gecas' (1976) therapeutic role concepts.

As a final note on possible instrument limitations, no reliability or validity tests were done on the TRIP, SBRS or MMH prior to this study.

3. Procedural Limitations

Even though E encouraged the respondent not to confer with mate while completing the instruments, couple conferring may have occurred. The MMH scores may have been influenced by allowing couples to complete instruments in an uncontrolled environment. The range of possible MMH scores is from "1" to "8," "8" being "extremely happy" with marriage (see appendix D). However the mean score, including all respondents, is 7.38. In an uncontrolled environment, spouses may wish to make a socially acceptable response for fear their mates may want to see their response. Given that MMH has only one response stem, it is easier for a mate to observe that the spouse indicated a "5" or, even worse, a "1." In the controlled laboratory-like setting, the respondent may feel more secure as he or she can immediately turn in the completed instruments to the E.

Before giving the instruments to each respondent, the instruments were randomly ordered in each packet to avoid response bias. The cover letter asks respondents to do the questionnaires in the in-

dicated order. However, the E neglected to ask respondents to complete each questionnaire before going on to the next and not to refer back to questionnaires already done. When respondents' scores on different scales were correlated, the significance was very high, indicating that respondents could have compared their responses on different scales (see Tables 6 and 7).

For example, respondents' TRIPQ scores correlated with their TRIPF scores have a significance p value of .0001 (Table 7). Such a significance level may have to be treated with suspicion. Further correlations of the TRIPQ and TRIPF should be done under more controlled conditions.

4. Statistical Limitations

One of the assumptions of the Pearson r is that the data to be correlated be interval or ratio data. Although, Strang's (1979) TRAS can be assumed to have equal intervals, being a Likert scale, the TRIP, SBRS and MMH, which are rating scales, may be ordinal scales of measurement. Harshbarger (1977) asserts that one can use the Pearson r when correlating interval with ordinal data. At least with the hypothesis tests, use of the Pearson r may not be a limitation.

B. Implications

1. Implications for Research

Since the test of hypothesis "4" is significant, future research could examine specific aspects of the negative relationship between husbands' therapeutic role attitudes and wives' evaluations of husbands' negative behaviors. Certain husband therapeutic role attitudes

and/or behaviors could be correlated with measures of wife tolerance. For example, which type of therapeutic behaviors, such as emotional support or problem-solving behaviors, contribute more to a wife's tolerance of a husband's negative behavior?

Conversely, certain wife tolerance evaluations could be correlated with husband therapeutic role attitude. For example, which type of wife tolerance evaluations, such as tolerance of verbal abuse or tolerance of inconsiderate behavior, contribute to a husband's positive therapeutic attitude?

Given the possibility (pp. 17-18) that happily married wives may be tolerant of their husbands without increasing their positive regard for their husbands, future research could look at the relationship between a wife's SBRSP and her SBRSN. One might predict that the higher the husband's TRAS score, the smaller the correlation between the wife's SBRSP and SBRSN.

2. Implications for Instruments

Perhaps the TRAS should be revised in order to correct possible sex biases in the instrument (pp. 22-23). "Husband" and "wife" designations in the stems could be changed to "spouse." Another alternative might be to have two scales, one for husbands and one for wives.

Regarding the measurement rating scales, validity and reliability tests should be performed on the TRIP, SBRS and the MMH. Test-retest reliability could be performed on all three rating scales. Validity for the MMH could be determined by comparing the MMH with another well known marital happiness scale. Validity tests for

TRIP and SBRS may be more difficult. Comparative standardized scales may be hard to find. The validity of the SBRS cannot be determined by comparing the SBRS with the SOC (Weiss, 1975).

Although the SBRS stems are derived from the SOC, the two instruments measure two different things; the SOC measures the perceived frequency of mate behaviors, while the SBRS measures evaluations of mate behaviors.

The TRIPQ could be correlated with items from The Washington Family Role Inventory (Nye & Gecas, 1976). Both scales measure similar evaluations. The TRIPF, which measures perceived general mate therapeutic role behavior, could be correlated with certain items on the SOC. However, the SOC measures the perceived frequency of specific mate behaviors; and therefore may not be suitable as a validity test comparison with the TRIPF.

3. Implications for Marriage Therapists

One important goal in the early stages of marital therapy may be the development of tolerance in both husband and wife. The therapy for a couple with a long history of marital problems may have to be extensive and lengthy. With such a couple, the therapist has the double task of providing therapy and keeping the couple together long enough for the therapy to have an effect. The therapist's problem, therefore, is to devise a way to stabilize the relationship so that the therapist has time to deal with the central conflicts of the marriage, be they sexual problems, low self-esteem or lack of intimacy. One way for the therapist to stabilize the relationship is to increase each spouse's tolerance

of the mate.

The therapist could train the couple in the mutual enactment of the therapeutic role. Enactment of the therapeutic role by the couple may at least increase the wife's tolerance for the spouse's negative problem behaviors. Given the increase in spouse tolerance, the therapist may have more time to correct the problem behaviors of the couple; and therefore a better chance for a successful therapeutic intervention.

TABLE 1:   Summary of Research Hypotheses $(H)_s$ and Measurement Instruments

Research Hypothesis	Correlated Scales*
H_1: Positive relationship between spouse's rating of mate's therapeutic role performance and mate's therapeutic role attitude score.	TRIPQ-TRAS
H_2: Positive relationship between spouse's marital happiness and mate's therapeutic role attitude score.	MMH-TRAS
H_3: Positive relationship between spouse's approval score of mate's positive behaviors and mate's therapeutic role score.	SBRSP-TRAS
H_4: Negative relationship between spouse's disapproval score and mate's therapeutic role attitude score	SBRSN-TRAS

* Key for instrument abbreviations
   1.   TRAS-Therapeutic Role Attitude Scale
   2.   TRIPQ-Therapeutic Role Index of Performance-Quality Subscale
   3.   MMH-Measure of Marital Happiness
   4.   SBRSP-Spouse Behavior Scale-Positive Items
   5.   SBRSN-Spouse Behavior Scale-Negative Items

TABLE 2: Pearson r Correlation Coefficient, r Squared and t-Test for the Significance of r for each Research Hypothesis, N = 50

Hypothesis	r Coefficient	r^2	Significance of r**
H_1: TRAS-TRIPQ	-.067	.004 (.4%)*	p x y > .05 (.320)
H_2: TRAS-MMH	-.145	.021 (2.1%)*	p x y > .05 (.157)
H_3: TRAS-SBRSP	-.215	.046 (4.6%)*	p x y > .05 (.066)
H_4: TRAS-SBRSN	-.329	.108 (10.8%)*	p x y < .01 (.009)[a]

[a] Significant correlations

* Percent of variance accounted for by each coefficient

**Exact p values given in parentheses

TABLE 3:   Pearson r Correlation Coefficients of Husbands' TRAS Scores with Wives' Scores
on Other Scales, N = 25

Correlated Scales	r Coefficient	r^2	Significance of r**
TRAS-TRIPQ	.023	.0005 (.05%)*	p x y > .05 (.456)
TRAS-MMH	-.124	.015 (1.5%)*	p x y > .05 (.276)
TRAS-SBRSP	-.197	.038 (3.8%)*	p x y > .05 (.172)
TRAS-SBRSN	-.357	.127 (12.7%)*	p x y < .05 (.039)[a]

[a] Significant correlation

* Percent of variance accounted for by each coefficient

**Exact p values given in parentheses

TABLE 4: Pearson r Correlation Coefficients of wives' TRAS Scores with Husbands' Scores
on Other Scales, N = 25

Correlated Scales	r Coefficient	r^2	Significance of r**
TRAS-TRIPQ	.074	.005 (.50%)*	p x y > .05 (.361)
TRAS-MMH	-.037	.001 (.10%)*	p x y > .05 (.430)
TRAS-SBRSP	.035	.001 (.10%)*	p x y > .05 (.433)
TRAS-SBRSN	.035	.001 (.10%)*	p x y > .05 (.432)

* Percent of variance accounted for by each coefficient

**Exact p values given in parentheses

TABLE 5: Pearson r Correlation Coefficients of Husbands' Scale Scores with Wives' Scale Scores on the Same Scales, N = 25

Correlated Scales	r Coefficient	r^2	Significance of r**
TRAS	-.291	.085 (8.5%)*	p x y > .05 (.078)
TRIPQ	.272	.074 (7.4%)*	p x y > .05 (.093)
MMH	.407	.165 (16.5%)*	p x y < .05 (.021)[a]
SBRSP	.273	.074 (7.4%)*	p x y > .05 (.093)
SBRSN	-.08	.007 (.70%)*	p x y > .05 (.338)

[a] Significant correlation

* Percent of variance accounted for by each coefficient

**Exact p values given in parentheses

TABLE 6: Pearson r Correlation Coefficients of Respondents' TRAS Scores with Their
Scores on Other Scales, N = 50

Correlated Scales	r Coefficient	r^2	Significance of r[a][**]
TRAS-TRIPQ	.504	.254 (25.4%)[*]	p x y < .001 (.0001)
TRAS-MMH	.389	.151 (15.1%)[*]	p x y < .01 (.002)
TRAS-SBRSP	.372	.138 (13.8%)[*]	p x y < .01 (.003)
TRAS-SBRSN	.334	.111 (11.1%)[*]	p x y < .01 (.008)

[a] All correlations are significant

[*] Percent of variance accounted for by each coefficient

[**]Exact p values given in parentheses

TABLE 7: Pearson r Correlation Coefficients of TRIPF for Different Combinations of Respondent Groups

Correlated Respondent Groups	Correlated Scales	r Coefficient	r^2	Significance of r**
Respondents with Spouses, N = 50	TRAS-TRIPF	.029	.0008 (.08%)*	p x y > .05 (.419)
Husband's TRAS with Wife's TRIPF, N = 25	TRAS-TRIPF	.130	.016 (1.6%)*	p x y > .05 (.267)
Wife's TRAS with Husband's TRIPF, N = 25	TRAS-TRIPF	.053	.002 (.2%)*	p x y > .05 (.399)
Husbands with wives, N = 25	TRIPF-TRIPF	.471	.222 (22.2%)*	p x y < .05 (.008)[a]
Respondents with Themselves, N = 50	TRAS-TRIPF	.472	.223 (22.3%)*	p x y < .01 (.0002)[a]
Respondents with Themselves, N = 50	TRIPQ-TRIPF	.876	.768 (76.8%)*	p x y < .001(.00001)[a]

[a] Significant Correlation

* Percent of variance accounted for by each coefficient

**Exact p values given in parentheses

TABLE 8: Percentage of Respondents in each Social Strata of Hollingshead's Four Factor Index of Social Status

Hollingshead's Social Strata Categories	Hollingshead's Range of Computed Scores	Percent of Respondents in Each Strata
1. Major business and professional	66-55	18
2. Medium business, minor professional, technical	54-40	50
3. Skilled craftsmen, clerical, sales workers	39-30	20
4. Machine operators, semi-skilled workers	29-20	12
5. Unskilled laborers, menial service workers	19-8	0
TOTAL N = 50		100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bernard, J., _The Future of Marriage_, New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

2. Birchler, G.R., Weiss, R.L. & Vincent, J.P., Multimethod analysis of social reinforcement exchange between maritally distressed and nondistressed spouse and stranger dyads. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 1975, _31_, 349-360.

3. Chadwick, B., Albrecht, S. & Kunz, P., Marital and family role satisfaction. _Journal of Marriage and the Family_, 1976, _38_, 431-440.

4. Gottman, J., Notarius, C., Markman, H., Banks, S., Yoppi, B., & Rubin, M.E., Behavior exchange theory and marital decision making. _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 1976, _34_, 14-23.

5. Harshbarger, T.R., _Introductory Statistics: A Decision Map_ (2nd ed.), New York: Macmillan, 1977.

6. Hicks, M.W. & Platt, M., Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research of the sixties. _Journal of Marriage and the Family_, 1970, 32, 553-574.

7. Hollingshead, A.B., _Four Factor Index of Social Status_, Yale University, c. 1977, mimeo.

8. Jacobson, N.S., Behavior treatments for marital discord: A critical appraisal. In M. Hersen, R.M. Eisler & P.M. Miller (Eds.), _Progress in Behavior Modification_, Volume 8, New York: Academic Press, 1979.

9. Knox, D., _Exploring Marriage and the Family_, Glenview, IL: Foresman, 1979.

10. Luckey, E.B., Number of years married as related to personality perception and marital satisfaction. _Journal of Marriage and the Family_, 1966, _28_, 44-48.

11. Nevin, J.A. & Reynolds, G.S. (Eds.), _The study of behavior: learning, motivation, emotion, and instinct_. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1973.

12. Nie, N.H., Hull, G.H., Jenkins, J.S., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D.H., _SPSS: statistical package for the social sciences_ (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

13. Nye, F.I. & Gecas, V., Family role analysis: The Washington Family Role Inventory (Technical bulletin 82). Washington State University, Pullman, College of Agriculture Center, January, 1976.

14. Nye, F.I. & McLaughlin, S., Role competency and marital satisfaction. In F.I. Nye (Ed.), Role constructs and analysis of the family. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1976.

15. Strang, N.L., Husbands' and wives' attitudes toward the therapeutic role. Unpublished masters thesis, Oregon State University, 1979.

16. Weiss, R.L., Spouse Observation Checklist, Psychology Department, University of Oregon, 1975, mimeo.

17. Wills, T.A., Weiss, R.L. & Patterson, G.R., A behavioral analysis of the determinants of marital satisfaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 802-811.

18. Wrightsman, L.S., Social Psychology (2nd ed.), Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1977.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RESPONDENT'S COVER LETTER

School of
Home Economics

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Family Life Department
(503) 754-4765

Dear Participant:

Thank you for taking time to participate in this research.

A long time belief of the Family Life Department is that help to families should be based on knowledge gained from studying "real" families. As part of this commitment, we want to measure husbands' and wives' attitudes toward different aspects of family life.

We would like you to fill out the following questionnaires in the order they appear in your folder. The specific directions for filling out the questionnaires are on the first page of each questionnaire.

The last paper in your folder is a background information sheet. Please fill out this sheet after you have finished the questionnaires. All data sheet information will be strictly confidential. No names will be requested. The information will be used only in this research project. This study has been approved by the Oregon State committee that reviews human research.

All responses will remain strictly confidential and no names will be used in reporting the findings.

It will take about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Thank you for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Paul R. Banta
Graduate Student
  in the Masters
  Degree Program

Arthur E. Gravatt
  Professor

APPENDIX B

THERAPEUTIC ROLE ATTITUDE SCALE (TRAS)

Number_____

DIRECTIONS

Listed below are a number of statements of opinion collected from a variety of sources. There are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some statements and disagree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the corresponding alternative to the left of each item. The number of alternatives and their meanings are:

If you disagree strongly	Circle 1
If you disagree	Circle 2
If you have no opinion	Circle 3
If you agree	Circle 4
If you agree strongly	Circle 5

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Please read each statement carefully. Decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion. Then circle the appropriate alternative to the left. Work as rapidly as you can. Give your opinion on every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel. Circle only one alternative for each item.

---

1 2 3 4 5   1. If a husband has a bad day at work he should keep quiet about it.

1 2 3 4 5   2. A wife should be sympathetic to her husband's moods.

1 2 3 4 5   3. Even when a husband disagrees with his wife's opinion he should listen to her side of the issue.

1 2 3 4 5   4. A wife shouldn't burden her husband with her emotional problems.

1 2 3 4 5   5. The spouse who talks the most should have the final say in an argument.

1 2 3 4 5   6. A husband should show appreciation for his wife's efforts to make him happy.

1 2 3 4 5   7. A husband should know what's troubling his wife without having to ask.

1 2 3 4 5   8. Working out a problem successfully should be a satisfying experience for both the husband and wife.

1 2 3 4 5   9. A display of affection begun by the husband shows that he is less masculine than he should be.

1 2 3 4 5 10. A wise spouse should not tell her/his partner the real reason why she/he is upset.

1 2 3 4 5 11. A spouse should ignore one's partner's comments when she/he doesn't want to hear what the other is going to say.

1 2 3 4 5 12. More affection should be shown by the wife than the husband.

1 2 3 4 5 13. If a husband isn't firm with his wife she will become too independent.

1 2 3 4 5 14. It's important for a husband and wife to express their personal feelings about one another.

1 2 3 4 5 15. A wife should offer her husband other points of view at times when he is undecided.

1 2 3 4 5 16. It's permissible for a husband to neglect his wife's needs because he works long hours.

1 2 3 4 5 17. A spouse should keep her/his mouth shut in an argument to hide how she/he really feels.

1 2 3 4 5 18. It is good for a husband and wife to talk about those problems that are troublesome for their marriage.

1 2 3 4 5 19. A common understanding should provide the basis for a healthy marital relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 20. A husband places a lower value on emotional support than does a wife.

1 2 3 4 5 21. A husband should be disappointed when his wife wants to spend some time alone rather than with him.

1 2 3 4 5 22. Disagreements in marriage are a natural process of developing a closer relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 23. If the husband forgets to write down a check in the checkbook and recognizes the mistake, he shouldn't tell his wife for fear she'll scold him.

1 2 3 4 5 24. A husband can't be expected to understand the demands a wife is confronted with at home.

1 2 3 4 5 25. A husband should be sympathetic to his wife's moods.

1 2 3 4 5 26. It is wrong for a spouse to get angry with one's partner without telling her/him why.

1 2 3 4 5 27. A husband that is late coming home for dinner should call to let his wife know he'll be late.

1 2 3 4 5 28. The wife and the husband should respect each other's ethical, moral, political, and religious beliefs even when they differ.

1 2 3 4 5 29. A wife can't be expected to understand the demands her husband is confronted with at work.

1 2 3 4 5 30. A spouse should be encouraged to talk about one's problems rather than ignoring them.

1 2 3 4 5 31. A couple should avoid talking about issues in their marriage that can't be agreed upon.

1 2 3 4 5 32. A husband and wife should show an interest in each other's work activities.

NOTE: Unfavorable items are: 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 29 and 31.

APPENDIX C

THERAPEUTIC ROLE INDEX OF PERFORMANCE (TRIP)

Quality Subscale - (TRIPQ)
Frequency Subscale - (TRIPF)

DIRECTIONS

These questions ask how <u>well</u> your spouse does certain behaviors. Please answer the following questions by placing a checkmark |✓| in the space on the scale beneath each question. Place a checkmark in only one space for each question.

1. How <u>well</u> does your spouse listen to your problems?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Not Well
Well   At All

2. How <u>well</u> does your spouse sympathize with your problems?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Not Well
Well   At All

3. How <u>well</u> does your spouse show affection toward you?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Not Well
Well   At All

4. How <u>well</u> does your spouse provide reassurance when you need it?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Not Well
Well   At All

5. How <u>well</u> does your spouse help you solve your personal problems?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Not Well
Well   At All

6. How <u>well</u> does your spouse provide emotional support?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Not Well
Well   At All

DIRECTIONS
These questions ask how <u>frequently</u> your spouse does certain behaviors. Please answer the following questions by placing a checkmark ⌊✓⌋ in the space on the scale beneath each question. Place a check-mark in only one space for each question.

1. How <u>frequently</u> does your spouse listen to your problems?

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Extremely
Frequent   Extremely
                                                                 Infrequent

2. How <u>frequently</u> does your spouse sympathize with your problems?

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Extremely
Frequent   Extremely
                                                                 Infrequent

3. How <u>frequently</u> does your spouse show affection towards you?

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Extremely
Frequent   Extremely
                                                                 Infrequent

4. How <u>frequently</u> does your spouse provide reassurance when you need it?

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Extremely
Frequent   Extremely
                                                                 Infrequent

5. How <u>frequently</u> does your spouse help you solve your personal problems?

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Extremely
Frequent   Extremely
                                                                 Infrequent

6. How <u>frequently</u> does your spouse provide emotional support?

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Extremely
Frequent   Extremely
                                                                 Infrequent

APPENDIX D

MEASURE OF MARITAL HAPPINESS (MMH)

DIRECTIONS

Please answer the following question by placing a checkmark ☑ within the appropriate space. Place a checkmark in only one space.

1. How happy are you with your marriage?

|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|_____|

Extremely   Extremely
Happy   Unhappy

APPENDIX E

SPOUSE BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE (SBRS)

Husband's Scale
Wife's Scale

DIRECTIONS

Listed on the next page are statements concerning an individual's behavior. We would like to know how *you* would feel if your spouse performed each behavior. There are no right or wrong answers. You will probably approve of some behaviors and disapprove of others. We are interested in the extent to which you approve or disapprove of each statement.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you approve or disapprove by placing a check (√) under the corresponding alternative listed at the top of the questionnaire. Please check only one alternative for each statement.

Number _____

How would you feel about your husband's behavior if:	Strongly Approve	Moderately Approve	Slightly Approve	Neither Approve Nor Disapprove	Slightly Disapprove	Moderately Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove
1. He asked you how your day was.							
2. He did not tell you that he was coming home late.							
3. He fell asleep while you were talking to him.							
4. He talked while you were trying to sleep.							
5. He called to tell you where he was.							
6. He said he loves you.							
7. He said your jokes were stupid.							
8. He did not respect your opinion.							
9. He talked to you when you asked for some attention.							
10. He listened sympathetically to your problems.							
11. He said your jokes were good.							
12. He met you on time.							
13. He was tolerant of you when you were late.							

Number _____

How would you feel about your husband's behavior if:	Strongly Approve	Moderately Approve	Slightly Approve	Neither Approve Nor Disapprove	Slightly Disapprove	Moderately Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove
14. He criticized you in front of others.							
15. He would not accept your apology.							
16. He lectured you rather than listened to you.							
17. He ignored you when you asked for some attention.							
18. He comforted you when you were upset.							
19. He behaved patiently when you were cross.							
20. He was sarcastic with you.							

NOTE: Disapproval items (SBRSN) are: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20.

Number _____

How would you feel about your wife's behavior if:	Strongly Approve	Moderately Approve	Slightly Approve	Neither Approve Nor Disapprove	Slightly Disapprove	Moderately Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove
1. She asked you how your day was.							
2. She did not tell you that she was coming home late.							
3. She fell asleep while you were talking to her.							
4. She talked to you while you were trying to sleep.							
5. She called to tell you where she was.							
6. She said she loves you.							
7. She said your jokes were stupid.							
8. She did not respect your opinion.							
9. She talked to you when you asked for some attention.							
10. She listened sympathetically to your problems.							
11. She said your jokes were good.							
12. She met you on time.							
13. She was tolerant of you when you were late.							

Number _____

How would you feel about your wife's behavior if:	Strongly Approve	Moderately Approve	Slightly Approve	Neither Approve Nor Disapprove	Slightly Disapprove	Moderately Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove
14. She criticized you in front of others.							
15. She would not accept your apology.							
16. She lectured you rather than listened to you.							
17. She ignored you when you asked for some attention.							
18. She comforted you when you were upset.							
19. She behaved patiently when you were cross.							
20. She was sarcastic with you.							

NOTE: Disapproval items (SBRSN) are: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20.

APPENDIX F

BACKGROUND DATA SHEET

Number_____

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please fill out the following questionnaire. All information is
strictly confidential. The information is necessary in order to analyze
the results of the attitude scales.

1. Your sex (circle number of your answer):

    1. MALE

    2. FEMALE

2. Your age at last birthday:

    YEARS_____

3. Your racial or ethnic background (circle only one):

    1. AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE
    2. BLACK, NOT HISPANIC
    3. HISPANIC
    4. WHITE, NOT HISPANIC
    5. ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
    6. OTHER (specify):_____

4a. Your education (circle or check highest grade completed):

    PRIMARY SCHOOL   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8

    HIGH SCHOOL   9   10   11   12

    COLLEGE   1   2   3   4

    _____ STUDY BEYOND B.A./B.S. DEGREE

    _____ HAVE MASTERS DEGREE

    _____ HAVE DOCTORATE DEGREE

    _____ OTHER (specify):_____

 b. Are you enrolled at Oregon State University?

    Yes_____   No_____

 c. If YES, what is your college or school?

    _____
    (Example: Liberal arts, Science, Home Economics, Agriculture, etc.)

 d. What is your major?_____

5. If you work for pay, what is your main current occupation?

    _____

    Briefly describe the type of work you do.

    _____

    _____

6. If you work but do not receive pay, briefly describe what you do. (Example: homemaking activities, volunteer in social agency, etc.)

_____

7. How long have you been married? (YEARS)_____ (MONTHS)_____

8. Is this your first marriage? Yes_____ No_____

9. If your spouse works for pay, what is your spouse's main current occupation?_____

Briefly describe the type of work your spouse does.

_____

10. Father's education (circle or check highest grade completed):

PRIMARY SCHOOL   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8

HIGH SCHOOL   9   10 11 12

COLLEGE   1   2   3   4

_____ STUDY BEYOND B.A./B.S. DEGREE

_____ HAVE MASTERS DEGREE

_____ HAVE DOCTORATE DEGREE

_____ OTHER (specify):_____

11. Mother's education (circle or check highest grade completed):

PRIMARY SCHOOL   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8

HIGH SCHOOL   9   10 11 12

COLLEGE   1   2   3   4

_____ STUDY BEYOND B.A./B.S. DEGREE

_____ HAVE MASTERS DEGREE

_____ HAVE DOCTORATE DEGREE

_____ OTHER (specify):_____

12. Father's occupation in the labor force (please be specific):

_____

Briefly describe the type of work your father does (please be specific): NOTE: If your father is retired, disabled or deceased, indicate the last type of work he did.

_____

_____

13. Father's approximate income for the past year (circle only one appropriate number):

    1. Under $5,000
    2. $5,000 to 9,999
    3. $10,000 to 14,999
    4. $15,000 to 19,999

    5. $20,000 to 24,999
    6. $25,000 to 29,999
    7. $30,000 or more
    8. Father is deceased

14. Mother's occupation in the labor force (please be specific):

    _____

    Briefly describe the type of work your mother does (please be specific):
    NOTE: If your mother is retired, disabled or deceased, indicate the
          last type of work she did.)

    _____

    _____

15. Mother's approximate income for the past year (circle only one appropriate number):

    1. Under $5,000
    2. $5,000 to 9,999
    3. $10,000 to 14,999
    4. $15,000 to 19,999

    5. $20,000 to 24,999
    6. $25,000 to 29,999
    7. $30,000 or more
    8. Mother is deceased

16. Your approximate income for the past year (circle only one appropriate number):

    1. Under $5,000
    2. $5,000 to 9,999
    3. $10,000 to 14,999
    4. $15,000 to 19,999

    5. $20,000 to 24,999
    6. $25,000 to 29,999
    7. $30,000 or more

17. Your spouse's approximate income for the past year (circle only one appropriate number):

    1. Under $5,000
    2. $5,000 to 9,999
    3. $10,000 to 14,999
    4. $15,000 to 19,999

    5. $20,000 to 24,999
    6. $25,000 to 29,999
    7. $30,000 or more