

MARITAL QUALITY REVISITED: DO CLASSIC PREDICTORS OF MARITAL
QUALITY PREDICT POSITIVE & NEGATIVE FEELINGS OF MARRIAGE?

by

CHANTAL PRÉVOST

B.A.Sc., The University of Guelph, 1996

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

School of Family and Nutritional Sciences

Family Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April 1999

© Chantal Prévost, 1999

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Family Studies (Family + Nutritional Sciences)
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date April 12, 1999.

ABSTRACT

Marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction have traditionally been conceptualized as opposite ends of the same continuum. The marriage literature has largely assessed people's moods by placing them on a bipolar continuum, rather than allowing for positive and negative evaluations to be expressed independently. To assess marital quality, Fincham and Linfield (1997) have developed a 2-dimensional construct comprising positive and negative evaluations. In the present project, 101 married individuals were recruited through the University of British Columbia Child Care Services and randomly selected from the UBC telephone directory. In the present study, classic predictors of marital satisfaction were selected and applied to Fincham and Linfield's (1997) 2-dimensional model to determine if the correlates of satisfaction and dissatisfaction differed. Overall findings indicated mixed results concerning separate positive and negative dimensions in marital quality. Factor analysis supported Fincham and Linfield (1997), yet correlational analysis showed each factor was predicted by a more or less similar set of correlates. This study helped to further explore one approach to the construct of marital quality intended to increase conceptual clarity in the field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract		ii
Table of Contents		iii
Acknowledgements		iv
List of Tables		v
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Traditional Measures of Marital Quality	5
	The Positive and Negative Quality in Marriage Scale	9
	Predictors of Marital Quality	16
	Statement of the Problem	19
Chapter 3	Methodology	21
	Recruitment of Subjects	21
	Data Collection Procedures	22
	Instruments	23
Chapter 4	Results	29
	Sample Demographics	29
	Findings	29
Chapter 5	Discussion, Limitations and Implications	45
References		53
Appendix A	Marital Quality Survey	56
Appendix B	Descriptive Statistics	65

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks to my thesis advisor, Dr. Dan Perlman, for his invaluable guidance, for his constant support, and most importantly, for his strong dedication to this project. My appreciation to Dr. Jim White and Dr. Lesley Andres for their constructive feedback and many helpful suggestions. Thank-you also to my family and loving partner Alan, for their much needed support, encouragement, and patience.

List of Tables

Table 1	Summary of Correlations for Variables Predicting Positive & Negative Dimensions of Marriage and Marital Stability	32
Table 2	Testing the Differences in Correlations	34
Table 3	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Positive & Negative Dimensions of Marital Quality and Marital Stability	37
Table 4a	Analysis of Variance for Marital Satisfaction Typologies	39
Table 4b	Analysis of Variance for Marital Satisfaction Typologies: The Difference in Means	41
Table 5	Principal Components Analysis - Rotated Factor Matrix for Positive & Negative Quality in Marriage	44

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When individuals are asked to rank their life goals, having a happy marriage is always among the most important. Marital difficulties are the most common problem for which individuals seek professional help (Norton, 1983). There exists substantial reliable documentation about the deleterious effects of marital discord on the physical and psychological well-being of individuals (Karney & Bradbury, 1995). Given the prominence of marital satisfaction in our lives, and the fact that many marriages encounter difficulty, it is not surprising that family scientists and psychologists have been trying to assess the extent to which couples attain marital satisfaction and have attempted to identify the conditions under which it is likely to be attained. These efforts have been extensive, and the academic and clinical literature that deals with marital happiness and marital satisfaction is huge (Fincham & Bradbury, 1987). In broad terms, since the 1930s, the marital satisfaction literature has been theoretical and empirical in nature and has been concerned, among other foci, with the correlates of marital satisfaction and measurement issues.

The prescientific and the scientific are two stages which can be identified with the development of research on marriage and the family. Firstly, the prescientific stage was characterized by the preresearch stage and social Darwinism (Christensen, 1993). The preresearch stage in the 1850s encompassed very few systematic thoughts about the family and reflected ideas regarding 'traditional beliefs, religious pronouncements and philosophical speculation' (Christensen, 1993). Next, Darwin's theory of evolution was

applied to a variety of social institutions, including marriage and the family and gave rise to a period of social Darwinism.

By the turn of the century, changing economic and social conditions called attention to problems in families and heightened a period of emerging science. This period, referred to as the scientific stage, emphasized direct study using empirically based procedures rather than value-laden assumptions about family life. The scientific stage has been characterized by the three following traditions; the sociological tradition, the behavioral tradition and the mediational tradition (Fincham & Bradbury, 1990).

The sociological tradition of research, which was the first of these three, was conducted largely by sociologists and included large-scale surveys that investigated a variety of potential correlates of marital quality, ranging from demographic variables to individual psychological variables. Nye (1988) characterized the late 1930's as a new era in which scientific research on family behavior blossomed. It was a time when researchers began to look inside the institution to the values, behaviors, relationships, and feelings of live women, men, and children. Higher goals for the well-being of individuals were emerging, beyond just survival, in the belief that scientific research could be employed to discover how people could find the best person to marry, the best age at which to marry, and the best patterns of interaction in the marriage to produce happy relationships, and in finding marital happiness, to have a large start on a happy life (Nye, 1988).

Nye (1988) has argued that sociological advances beyond those made by early researchers have been limited. He concludes: "Early on, Burgess and Cottrell...took

every individual characteristic they could think of and correlated it with marital success, producing an R of about .50 and an R^2 of .25, or 25% of the variance in the dependent variable. Not a bad start, but we have not progressed much beyond that point in 50 years” (Nye, 1988, p. 315).

The second major tradition of marital research, the behavioral tradition, began in 1961 when the overt behaviors of couples engaged in improvised marital conflicts in the laboratory were examined (Sternberg & Hojjat, 1997). This gave rise to behavioral marital therapy in which the application of operant conditioning principals (positive and negative reinforcement) was used in the treatment of marriage. The emphasis given to the observation of overt behavior was an important development. The behavioral tradition never fully relinquished reliance on self-report as the criterion variable to which behavior was related. Marital quality was assessed via this modality. Psychologists’ interest in close relationships has created a favorable climate for the study of marriage, and articles on this relationship have appeared with increased frequency in mainstream psychology journals.

In the 1980s the recognition of the limitations of a purely behavioral account of marriage gave rise to the emergence of mediational tradition of research. In this tradition, subjective factors such as thoughts and feelings, that might mediate between overt behavior and marital satisfaction have assumed greater significance. Unlike the behavioral tradition, which arose out of dissatisfaction with earlier research, the mediational phase of research represented an acceptance and expansion of behavioral approaches (Sternberg & Hojjat, 1997).

A further understanding of the development of the marital satisfaction literature will be outlined in the next chapter, in which traditional measures of marital quality will be reviewed. It questions whether evaluations of marriage are really just one dimension. The research I have conducted for thesis was designed to shed light on this question.

CHAPTER 2

TRADITIONAL MEASURES OF MARITAL QUALITY

The measurement of marital satisfaction can be dated back at least as far as Katherine Davis's 1929 groundbreaking book Factors in the sex life of 2200 women. As the field grew, subsequent researchers offered an ever-evolving series of new measures to assess marital adjustment. In 1939, Burgess and Cottrell's classic Predicting success or failure in marriage contained an index to predict marital success. A decade later, Terman and Wallin (1949) published a psychometric article on marital prediction and adjustment scales that contained their own efforts at a superior measure. At the end of the 1950s, Locke and Wallace (1959) published their well-regarded Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

By the 1970s, family scientists were discussing the lack of clarity surrounding the many concepts used in the marriage literature. In that decade, researchers did not widely agree on the meaning and use of terms such as marital adjustment, marital satisfaction and marital happiness. Spanier and Lewis (1979) analyzed this confusion and chose to employ the general concept of marital quality to encompass the entire range of terms.

Consistent with Spanier and Lewis' interpretation of the marital quality domain as being multifaceted, Spanier (1976) published the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS), a four-dimensional measure intended to assess marital satisfaction among individuals. The four factors of this scale are Dyadic Consensus, Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion, and Affectional Expression. The questions involve the respondents making a range of

evaluations, typically along a continuum, reflecting numerous characteristics of marital interaction. Lewis and Spanier (1979) argued that one of the most significant developments in marital research in the seventies had been the recognition that the quality of marriage involved a multidimensional phenomena. Certainly the scale has gained extremely widespread use.

In the next decade, the 1980s, there was an increase in the number of studies using large, representative national samples. In the early marital satisfaction measures, marital happiness was one of many questions. Generally speaking, the large national data sets used for marital quality research did not include multiple items designed to measure marital quality. Instead, there was an increase in the use of one-item and two-to-three-item indicators of marital quality during the 1980s (Glenn, 1990). Often these short scales focused on the affective domain. Within it, marital satisfaction measures have typically included straightforward questions that ask respondents to rate their marriages on a scale of happiness (Glenn, 1990). Up to ten points may be included on some scales, but most often there are only three or four. One of the most widely used data sets for studies of marital quality during the past 20 years was the General Social Survey Cumulative File in which the only data on marital quality are responses to the simple question, "Taking things altogether, how would you describe your marriage? Would you say that your marriage is very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?" (Glenn, 1990).

Unfortunately, in the past couple of decades, there has not been a consensus on either the nature of marital quality or the best way to assess it. Both short measures and

multifaceted measures such as the DAS have been criticized. Discussion of these measurement issues have become integrally intertwined with debates on the best way of conceptualizing marital quality (Glenn, 1990).

Critics have identified several classic reasons for the alleged inferiority of one-item indicators in comparison to scales (e.g., the lack of reliability of single-item measures). Rebuttals to some of these criticisms can be offered (for instance, greater random measurement error with one-item indicators is not a serious problem when marital quality is the dependent variable if one is not excessively concerned about maximizing explained variance). Yet, questions such as those posed in the General Social Survey are deficient even in comparison to other one-item indicators (Glenn, 1990). The General Social Survey Question has only three response alternatives (very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy), which precludes fine distinctions. Furthermore, the responses to it are highly skewed, with up to two-thirds of the respondents saying their marriages are "very happy." So few respondents say their marriages are "not too happy" that the responses are commonly dichotomized into "very happy" versus all others. Because the assumption that the interval between "very happy" and "pretty happy" is the same as that between "pretty happy" and "not too happy" seems untenable, dichotomized scoring is probably justifiable. Nonetheless, dichotomous measures of continuous variables are at best quite crude (Glenn, 1990).

Of greater relevance to the present study are the criticisms leveled against multidimensional measures, especially the DAS. In 1983, Norton considered past measures of marital quality and critically examined the dependent variables used to

assess satisfaction. Norton (1983) used both semantic and empirical criteria to judge the development of marital quality scales. In marital quality scales, he found a confounding of the antecedents of satisfaction with marital satisfaction itself. For instance, he argued that questions such as the extent to which partners disagree on the handling of finances may be an antecedent of marital satisfaction rather than an indication of the couple's satisfaction per se. Norton's (1983) views moved research toward a more affective domain of understanding marital quality. He shifted the focus to marital quality rather than analyzing complex factors that are identified as enhancing or destroying marital quality.

Consistent with his conceptual analysis of marital satisfaction, Norton developed a unidimensional scale to assess the phenomena of marital quality. Using data from 430 people living in four different states he constructed the Quality Marriage Index (QMI) to reflect the "goodness" of the marriage. For instance the QMI includes an item that reads "We have a good marriage," and another question on how satisfied the respondents are with their marriages. Essentially, the QMI represented a more restrictive indicator of a quality marriage, but it did not obscure marital phenomena. The final recommendation by Norton (1983) was that researchers who were interested in a better indicator of marital quality use a set of evaluative items similar to the QMI.

In the article entitled, "The Assessment of Marital Quality: A Reevaluation", Fincham and Bradbury (1987) supported both multidimensional and unidimensional measures of marital quality. Essentially, Fincham and Bradbury (1987) suggested that a multidimensional approach to understanding marital quality would be most effective for

practitioners, therapists and individuals working with clients to improve marital relations. Fincham and Bradbury (1987) suggested that a unidimensional measure would be best, however, for researchers and academics wanting to study the complex phenomenon associated with marital satisfaction. Like Norton, Fincham and Bradbury wanted to avoid confounding the antecedents of marital satisfaction with the indicators used to measure it. Again they advocated assessing marital quality in terms of partners' evaluations of their relationships.

Finally, in their 1997 article, Fincham and Linfield identified two dimension of marital quality, evaluation of satisfaction and evaluation of dissatisfaction. Based on their findings, they contended that these two dimensions were largely independent and experienced simultaneously. The second dimension (negative marital quality) identified by Fincham and Linfield (1997) was not in itself a predictor of positive marital quality but rather, a dimension of marital satisfaction in and of itself. Thus their expansion of marital satisfaction to two dimensions was not inconsistent with Fincham and Bradbury's (1987) or Norton's (1983) earlier criticisms of multidimensional scales.

The Positive and Negative Quality In Marriage Scale (PANQIMS)

In the past, marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction have been conceptualized as opposite ends of the same continuum (Fincham & Lindfield, 1997). To avoid the problem of interpretation that arises in many omnibus measures of marital quality, Fincham and Bradbury (1987) defined marital quality in terms of a spouse's sentiment as reflected in subjective, evaluative judgments of the marriage or partner. In order to

assess marital quality, Fincham and Linfield (1997) have developed a two-dimensional model intended to increase conceptual clarity in the field. The measure is called the Positive and Negative Quality in Marriage Scale (PANQIMS) and is a six-item measure designed as a brief, global assessment of positive and negative quality in marriage. A sample question includes; "Considering only the positive qualities of your partner, and ignoring the negative ones, evaluate how positive these qualities are." The items are modeled on the format used by researchers to assess positive and negative dimensions of attitudes (Watson, Clark & Tellegan, 1988). The items in Fincham and Linfield's (1997) study instructed respondents to evaluate one dimension (positive or negative) at a time in three areas. For each item, respondents were instructed to indicate their response by circling a number from 0 (not at all) to 10 (extremely). Responses to the three items for each dimension were summed so that higher scores on each dimension reflected more positive and more negative evaluations, respectively. The internal consistency of each dimension was high (coefficient alpha for husbands = .87 and .91, and for wives = .90 and .89, for positive and negative dimensions, respectively). Overall, results of confirmatory factor analyses indicated that the two-dimensional model provided a better fit to the obtained data compared with one- and three-dimensional models that did not fit the data at all (Fincham & Linfield, 1997). The positive and negative dimensions were moderately, but not highly correlated ($r = -.37$ for men, and $r = -.39$ for women).

Therefore, based on Fincham and Linfield's (1997) view, marital quality is not bipolar in which satisfaction and dissatisfaction represent opposite ends of a single dimension. Rather, positive and negative aspects of marriage are viewed as largely

independent and can be experienced simultaneously. Traditionally, the use of items anchored by positive (e.g. happy) and negative (e.g. unhappy) end points have not allowed positive and negative evaluations to be expressed independently. In this sense, the marital literature is similar to the literature on affect (see below) in which people's moods have been assessed by placing them on a bipolar continuum. Fincham and Linfield (1997) are among the first scholars to propose the idea of independent dimensions in the marriage literature. As a result, much controversy exists over this issue and some researchers argue that traditional demonstrations of the separateness of positive and negative affect are flawed. A more comprehensive analysis of this controversy will be reviewed in the limitations section of this paper.

However, it must be noted that recent research on affect has provided support for the view that positive and negative dimensions are more accurately seen as separate and are only moderately negatively correlated (Fincham & Linfield, 1997). In a study entitled "The Independence of Positive and Negative Affect", researchers Diener and Emmons (1985) reported on the relation between positive and negative affect. These researchers found that positive feelings were remembered as being nearly independent of negative feelings in the past year. The principal finding was that positive and negative affect were independent in terms of how much people felt in their lives over longer time periods (Diener & Emmons, 1985). Similarly, in a study conducted by Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988) two 10-item mood scales comprising the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) were developed. The two scales showed different and distinct patterns of relations with external variables (see below) that have been seen in other

studies, which supported the independent expression of positive and negative dimensions (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). Furthermore, positive and negative sets of items were negatively correlated, although in a factor analysis the positive and negative sets of items emerged as separate factors.

In addition, two-dimensional models have been used in other areas of research. For example, Constantinople (1973) used a two-dimensional model to test masculinity-femininity in adults, thus challenging the traditional view that the construct was unidimensional in nature and could be adequately measured by a single score. Finally, in a study conducted by Gilford and Bengtson (1979) a two-dimensional measure was developed to measure marital satisfaction across the life span. The construct of marital satisfaction was operationalized in this research by asking respondents to read a list of "some things husbands and wives may do when they are together," and to indicate how often it occurred between themselves and their spouse. Five of the items referred to positive interaction; five to negative sentiment from interaction. The positive interaction items included the following; 1) you calmly discuss something together, 2) you work together on something (dishes, yardwork, hobbies), 3) you laugh together, 3) you have a stimulating exchange of ideas, 4) you have a good time together. The negative sentiment items were the following; 1) one of you is sarcastic, 2) you disagree about something important, 3) one of you refuses to talk in a normal manner, 4) you become critical and belittling, 5) you become angry. In light of the critiques of the 1979's Gilford and Bengtson probably have confounded antecedents with marital satisfaction. Nonetheless, their findings indicated that the five positive interaction items were highly positively

correlated with one another and the five negative sentiment items were positively correlated. Furthermore, positive and negative sets of items were negatively correlated. Each positive item and each negative item was correlated to the total marital satisfaction scale score in the expected direction. The average correlations among the positive items, among the negative items, and between positive and negative items were generally the same among pairs of generational groups.

Therefore, research in the areas of affect, masculinity-femininity and marital satisfaction have developed two-dimensional models in which the results of the studies support that positive and negative dimensions are more accurately seen as separate. From the perspective of this research, conceptualizing marital quality as a two-dimensional construct comprising correlated positive and negative evaluative judgments may be more enlightening than continuing to treat it as a single-dimensional, bipolar construct captured by heterogeneous measures that have an unclear theoretical implication (Fincham & Linfield, 1997).

If there are two separate dimensions, then a logical next question is: Does each dimension have unique correlates? In the affect literature, Watson et al. (1988, p.1063) write: "NA [Negative Affect] - but not PA [Positive Affect] - is related to self-reported stress and poor coping (Clark & Watson, 1986; Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981; Willis, 1986), health complaints (Beiser, 1974; Bradburn, 1969; Tessler & Mechanic, 1978; Watson & Pennebaker, in press), and frequency of unpleasant events (Stone, 1981; Warr, Barter, & Brownbridge, 1983). In contrast PA - but not NA - is related to social activity and satisfaction and to frequency of pleasant events."

In the literature on job satisfaction, Herzberg (1973) claimed that motivator factors (e.g., responsibility, recognition, work itself) were related to job satisfaction and hygiene factors (e.g., company policies and administration, working conditions, supervision) were related to dissatisfaction. Fincham and Lindfield (1997) did not test to determine whether any of their variables differentially predicted marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but inspection of their data suggests some did.

Although researchers have made considerable progress in measuring variability in marital quality, they have failed to specify adequately the subject of their inquiries, while at the same time proceeding as though the referent for the construct were clear (Sternberg & Hojjat, 1997). It can be argued that at the level of measurement the referent is clear, owing to the widespread use of a limited number of instruments (most often the MAT and the DAS). However, the interpretation of scores obtained from these measures is often not clear.

As mentioned, Fincham and Bradbury (1987) have developed a new conception of marital quality in which their approach builds on the theoretically straightforward conception of marital quality as the spouses' global, evaluative judgments of the marriage. According to Fincham and Linfield (1997), the first step toward addressing the complexity of relationships is to conceive of evaluative judgments of the marriage as multidimensional, comprising positive marital quality (PMQ) and negative marital quality (NMQ) dimensions. Another implication of this two-dimensional approach is that it has the potential to provide a more differentiated view of those who are neither high nor low in marital quality. Therefore, a distinction can be made between

“indifference,” or caring about neither of the two endpoints, and “ambivalence,” or caring strongly about both. As a result, the two dimensions, PMQ and NMQ, can be crossed to produce a fourfold typology of couples that can be distinguished in terms of important characteristics of their marriages. Two of the categories are already identified through established measures. Those high on PMQ and low on NMQ seem to fit the traditional understanding of “happy” or “satisfied” spouses, just as those high on NMQ and low on PMQ fit the traditional understanding of “distressed” spouses. The two other categories of spouses (high PMQ - high NMQ and low PMQ - low NMQ), however, are not currently distinguished in most measures of marital quality and correspond to our distinction between “ambivalent” and “indifferent” spouses.

Fincham and Linfield (1997) formed four groups of spouses, using median scores on the PMQ and NMQ dimensions. Those scoring above the median were classed as high on that dimension, and those scoring below the median were classed as low on the dimension. The MAT scores of ambivalent and indifferent spouses were significantly lower than those of happy spouses and significantly higher than those of distressed spouses. However, in keeping with our earlier analysis, ambivalent and indifferent the groups did not differ from each other in overall marital quality (MAT scores), despite differences between them on the correlates of marital quality. That is, ambivalent and indifferent wives differed in reports of behavior and in attributions. Ambivalent wives attributed significantly more cause and responsibility to their partners for negative events, and reported higher ratios of negative to positive partner behaviors. In contrast,

ambivalent and indifferent husbands did not differ significantly in attributions or in reports of behavior.

Predictors of Marital Quality

There exists a large body of literature on the predictors of marital satisfaction which have been reviewed and/or reflected upon by several scholars (Glenn, 1990 ; Nye, 1988; Karney & Bradbury, 1995). Although some general and mini-theories have been developed, as Nye (1988) noted, precise and specific predictions of marital satisfaction fail to exist. Essentially, this literature has identified numerous factors that have at least modest correlation's with marital happiness. In reviewing the findings, many of the propositions will parallels those in Lewis and Spanier's (1979) classic presentation of "Theorizing about the Quality and Stability of Marriage." In addition, the findings of Cate and Lloyd (1988) regarding premarital predictors of marital satisfaction will be referred to in this paper. It must be noted that this section covers a large variety of variables which have been identified in the literature; however, for the purpose of this paper, only select variables will be measured based on the importance of the findings in the literature and the feasibility to include the variables in this project.

In this section several propositions relating various factors to marital quality will be identified. Some of the earliest research on courtship undertaken by family studies scholars examined the power of premariage factors in predicting later marital success (Terman, 1938). These studies emphasized the roles of background factors in later marital happiness. Over time the focus of such predictive studies shifted from

characteristics of the individual to dyadic factors (Reiss, 1960). This shift from individual to dyadic factors parallels the corresponding shift in the history of courtship from choosing a quality person to enhancing the quality of the relationship (Cate & Lloyd, 1988).

A great deal of research suggests that homogamy operates as a norm in mate selection (Burgess & Wallin, 1953). Therefore, it is not surprising that when the norms of homogamy are violated, the possibility of negative consequences for marital quality is increased. Based on the research conducted by Lewis and Spanier (1979), couples exhibiting greater premarital homogamy, were more likely to experience higher levels of marital quality. On the other hand, Renne (1970) found the following variables to be associated with lower marital quality among couples: different socioeconomic status, different religious affiliations, and differences in age.

Based on the conclusions from Lewis and Spanier (1979) the following variables have been associated with high marital quality among couples: high level of education, older age at first marriage, higher social class, longer courtship before marriage, higher level of interpersonal skill functioning, good emotional health, positive self-concept and greater physical health.

Similarly, Cate and Lloyd (1988) have found that older age at first marriage has been related to greater marital satisfaction. These findings were consistent with those of Burr (1973) in which the older the members of the couple at marriage, the higher the level of marital happiness.

In addition, Cate and Lloyd (1988) supported the findings that length of courtship was positively related to marital adjustment. Longer courtship's are believed to allow partners the time to test their compatibility and gain important information about one another (Cate & Lloyd, 1988). Similarly, Locke (1951) found that partners who have dated for longer periods of time and who have been engaged longer report higher marital happiness. Finally, Cate and Lloyd (1988) also supported the finding that level of education is positively related to both marital adjustment and stability.

One variable which was identified as having a negative effect on marriage included the following: "the greater the amount of neurotic behavior, the lower the marital quality." This finding was consistent with the research of Vaillant (as cited in Cate and Lloyd, 1988) who assessed the marital satisfaction of 51 men and found that maritally satisfied men had been rated as significantly more mentally healthy (versus mentally ill) in college than were subsequently divorced or maritally dissatisfied men.

The following propositions identify as correlates of marital quality a number of dyadic factors: perceived physical, sexual attractiveness (Kirkpatrick & Cotton, 1951) positive evaluations of the other (Tharp, 1963), value consensus (Schellenberg, 1960) and validation of self by the other (Lewis, 1973).

In addition, the following aspects of emotional gratification were all found to be linked to marital quality: the expression of affection (Levinger, 1965), respect between partners (Holstein, Goldstein & Bem, 1971), egalitarian power structures (Stryker, 1964) boundary maintenance (Lewis, 1973), emotional interdependence (Pineo, 1961), sexual satisfaction (Levinger, 1965), and the couple's identity as a couple (Lewis, 1972).

In addition, Lewis and Spanier (1979) suggested that the greater the interaction among a couple, the greater the marital quality. In a study conducted by Christensen (1987) gender differences in marital conflict in relation to demand/withdrawal interaction patterns were assessed. The demand/withdrawal pattern is essentially an interaction pattern which makes two important assumptions. Firstly, that its occurrence is related to marital dissatisfaction and secondly, that gender is linked to the roles in the patterns, with women more likely to be demanders and men more likely to be withdrawers. Results indicated that a demand/withdraw pattern was strongly related to marital dissatisfaction. Some evidence also existed to demonstrate that the pattern may be predictive of long-term dissatisfaction in marriage with the reversal of the typical pattern being predictive of positive changes in marital satisfaction (Christensen, 1987).

Statement of the Problem

Despite the very extensive literature on the correlates of marital satisfaction, the concerns regarding the conceptualization and measurement of marital quality suggest that further advances might be made in the understanding of marital satisfaction if renewed attention was focused on these concerns. Based on Fincham and Linfield's (1997) article, "A New Look at Marital Quality: Can Spouses Feel Positive and Negative About Their Marriage?", the present paper will explore one approach to the construct of marital quality intended to increase conceptual clarity in the field.

It will explore whether positive and negative aspects of marriage are largely independent and can be experienced simultaneously. Specifically, the five following questions will be looked at:

- 1) Do marital satisfaction and marital dissatisfaction again emerge as two relatively separate dimensions with only a moderate correlation between them?
- 2) Will the predictor variables of marital quality (presented in the above section) predict satisfaction and dissatisfaction in marriage? What will be the strength of the association?
- 3) Will the variables predict one dimension (e.g. satisfaction) better than the other dimension (e.g. dissatisfaction)? What will be the relative strength of the associations?
- 4) What set of variables best predicts satisfaction or dissatisfaction in marriage?
- 5) Which variables are associated with Fincham and Linfield's (1997) four typologies of marriage (satisfied, dissatisfied, ambivalent, indifferent) and what is the difference between the 4 groups?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Recruitment of Subjects

The subjects were couples who were legally married. Subjects were recruited by two different methods. Firstly, a current list of 17 group daycare sites was obtained from the University of British Columbia Child Care Services. Five of the centers provided care for children under 3 years of age, 5 centers provided care for children in the preschool years and 7 centers provided care for school age children. Of the 17 sites listed, 2 were excluded from the target centers because of the special nature of the centers (one center for special needs children or integrated daycare, and 1 center providing only after school care). It was believed that the characteristics of couples with children in such centers would not be representative of the larger population of group day care users.

The daycare director, who was the supervisor of the 15 remaining daycare sites, was contacted in person and asked (1) if any of the couples with children at their center met the eligibility requirements and (2) if they were willing to allow the researcher to recruit subjects through their center. The daycare director agreed to participate and signed the permission form, required by the UBC Ethics' Committee, for the recruitment of subjects through their daycare center.

The second way in which couples were recruited was by mail-out questionnaires. The UBC faculty and administrative telephone directory was used to randomly select

individuals from the university. The directory includes a listing of all full time faculty and administrators. It must be noted that support staff are not listed in the UBC faculty directory. Essentially, every 10th individual was randomly selected from the UBC directory. A package containing a covering letter, the Marital Quality Survey, and an addressed interdepartmental envelope was mailed to a total of 200 individuals drawn randomly from a sampling frame of approximately 5,550 addresses. The covering letter briefly explained the purposes of the study and indicated participation was voluntary.

Data Collection Procedures

Over a period of 4 months, questionnaires were hand delivered to the 15 daycare sites that were included in the recruitment process. From 5 to 25 questionnaires were initially left at each center depending on the number requested by the site supervisor. A total of approximately 200 questionnaires were delivered at this time. Notices outlining the eligibility requirements for subjects were posted, and questionnaires were placed in the parents' mail boxes. Volunteer participants picked up questionnaires at their daycare center and were asked to return their completed questionnaire to the School of Family and Nutritional Sciences in the self addressed campus envelope provided. A follow-up call was made to the daycare supervisor 15 days after questionnaires were initially distributed to each center to see whether additional questionnaires were required and to arrange a time for the researcher to return to the center to pick up any questionnaires that had not been taken. During the second and final visit to the daycare sites, approximately 4 weeks after the initial visit, additional questionnaires (approximately 50 in total) were

dropped off at each of the centers. At this time, questionnaires were left on a counter in the main entrance, rather than placed in the individual mail boxes. A total of approximately 30 questionnaires were returned from individuals at the daycare centers.

In terms of the subjects who were randomly sampled from the UBC telephone directory, the procedures differed. Approximately three weeks after the first mailing (to 150 individuals) individuals not responding received an additional questionnaire encouraging participation in the study. One month later, 50 new addresses were randomly selected and mailed a copy of the questionnaire. From the 150 questionnaires delivered in the first round and the 50 questionnaires reissued to new subjects, 71 questionnaires were returned. Therefore, the response rate was 36%.

Instruments

In order to measure and assess marital quality, an instrument developed by Fincham and Linfield (1997) was used. In Fincham and Linfield's (1997) study, the Positive and Negative Quality in Marriage Scale (PANQIMS) was used to assess marital quality. It is a six-item measure designed as a brief, global assessment of positive and negative quality in marriage. The items are modeled on the format used by Kaplan (1972) and subsequent researchers to assess positive and negative dimensions of attitudes (Thompson et al., 1995). The items in Fincham and Linfield's (1997) study instructed respondents to evaluate on dimension (positive or negative) at one time in three areas. For each item, respondents were instructed to indicate their responses by circling a number from 0 (not at all) to 10 (extremely). Responses to the three items for each

dimension were summed so that higher scores on each dimension reflected more positive and more negative evaluations, respectively. Although the concept of using a 2-dimensional construct is appealing, it must be noted that Fincham and Linfield's (1997) scale is indeed brief.

In order to assess a range of the potential predictors of marital quality, participants answered a variety of questions regarding premarital factors, individual factors and interpersonal factors which may have influenced satisfaction in marriage. The first few items of the survey included standard questions regarding the respondent's age, sex, ethnicity, religious background and level of education. The format of the questions and response items used have been modeled based on population surveys conducted by Statistics Canada. Essentially, each of the above questions address the issue of homogamy and serve as subcategories to test the proposition that "the greater the premarital homogamy, the higher the marital satisfaction".

Next, age at first marriage and length of courtship prior to marriage were measured. Self concept was measured next by using the Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale, which is a 10 item scale designed to optimize ease of unidimensionality and face validity. Respondents were required to report feelings about the self directly. It is scored using a four-point response format (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree), resulting in a scale range of 10-40 with higher scores representing higher self-esteem. Specific examples of questions include the following: 1) I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others 2) I feel I have a number of good qualities

3) I wish I could have more respect for myself. The Rosenberg (1965) has had widespread use and utility as a unidimensional measure of self-esteem.

In order to assess interpersonal skill functioning, the Social Anxiety Subscale of the Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975) was used. The variable, social anxiety, is defined as discomfort in the presence of others. The scale consists of six items that are answered on a five-point scale (0, extremely uncharacteristic; 4, extremely characteristic). In terms of reliability, Cronbach's alpha for the original scale is about .70. For the Scheiser and Carver revision, Cronbach's alpha is .79. Two-week test-retest reliability of the original scale is .73. The 4 week test-retest correlation for the Scheier and Carver version is .77. The original Social Anxiety Subscale of the Self-Consciousness Scale correlates significantly with the Interaction Anxiousness Scale ($r=.78$), test anxiety ($r=.23$), and self-esteem ($r=-.35$) (Turner, Scheier, Carver, & Ickes, 1978). Due to its novelty, the Scheier and Carver (1985) revision has not been validated, but there is little reason to expect it to be less valid than the original. Sample questions include: 1) I don't find it hard to talk to strangers and 2) It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.

Based on the research conducted by Lewis and Spanier (1979), physical health has been found to be associated with high marital quality. For the purposes of this study, physical health was measured to test the proposition, "the greater the physical health of the marital partners, the greater the marital quality." On a scale from 1 to 10, respondents were asked to respond to the following question "In the past few months, how healthy have you felt physically?" Happiness was also measured on a scale from 1

to 10 in which respondents answered the following question “On a scale from 1 to 10 how happy would you say you are with your life?” Lewis and Spanier (1979) also identified happiness and good emotional health as being associated with higher marital satisfaction.

The next proposition is “the greater the amount of neurotic behavior, the lower the marital quality.” In order to assess the above statement, the NEO Five Factor Inventory was used (Costa & McCrea, 1992). Only the questions related to emotional stability were used and the questions regarding extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness will be omitted.

Interpersonal characteristics of the couple was the next broad category examined. Firstly, positive regard was assessed in the following way: On a scale from 1 to 10 (with 10 being the highest degree and 1 being not at all) please indicate to what degree you feel you: a) perceive your partner as sexually attractive (Kirkpatrick & Cotton, 1951) b) have positive evaluations of your partner (Tharp, 1963) c) agree with your partners values (Schellenberg, 1960) f) receive validation from your partner (Lewis, 1973). Please refer to the attached survey for a complete list of each item.

Similarly, emotional gratification was assessed using a 10 point scale (with 10 being the highest degree and 1 being not at all). Sample items to the question include: indicate the extent to which you a) express affection to your partner (Levinger, 1965) and, b) develop an identity as a couple (Lewis, 1972). Please refer to the attached survey for a complete list of each item.

In addition, questions assessed the interaction patterns among couples. In order to assess common interaction patterns in marriage, Christensen's (1993) Demand/Withdraw Interaction Scale was used. Essentially, marital participants rate the extent to which demand and withdraw behaviors occur on a 9-point likelihood scale, ranging from none to a lot. Examples include; 1) Tries to discuss the problem 2) Blames, accuses, or criticizes partner 3) Requests, demands, nags, or otherwise pressures for changes in partner 4) Avoids discussing the problem 5) Withdraws, becomes silent, or refuses to discuss a particular topic. It must be noted that Christensen (1987) has consistently found a significant negative relationship between self-reported measures of demand/withdrew interaction and self-reported marital satisfaction. In a study of a diverse sample of 142 couples Christensen (1987) found a Pearson correlation of $-.55$ between the CPQ measure of demand/withdraw interaction and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976), a standard measure of marital satisfaction.

In addition, three scales were used to assess marital satisfaction. Firstly, a subscale of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale was used to measure how the responding partner perceives the level of agreement in his or her relationship. The scale consisted of 15 items, scored on a 5 point scale with response categories ranging from always agree to always disagree. Sample questions involved agreeing about issues such as; family finances, the division of household tasks and dealing with in-laws. Secondly, Norton's Quality Marriage Index (QMI) was used to assess marital satisfaction. The scale consisted of 5 items, scored on a 7 point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Sample questions included; 1) My relationship is stable, 2) My relationship

makes me happy. Finally, a subscale of the marital instability index consisting of 5 items was used to measure satisfaction in marriage. Response categories ranged from 'very often' to 'never' in response to questions such as the following; 'Have you or your husband/wife ever seriously suggested the idea of divorce within the last three years?'

Lastly, Fincham and Linfield's (1997) 2-dimensional construct comprising positive and negative evaluations was used to assess marital quality. See attached questionnaire for a complete listing of all survey items.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Sample Demographics

The sample consisted of 101 participants, including 68 wives and 33 husbands. Of the sample, 63% of the participants identified themselves as belonging to the Canadian cultural group. The average age of first marriage was 26.12 for sample participants. The average number of children living in the same household as their parents was 1.88 per family. Study participants were well educated, with 15% holding at least a Bachelor's degree and 26% holding a Master's degree. In addition, this was an affluent sample, in which 80% reported their total personal income to be greater than \$30 000 in the past 12 months. Of the sample, 40% did not identify with any religious affiliation. Most participants identified with belonging to the Roman Catholic (27%) and Protestant (24%) groups.

Findings

As indicated in the introductory section, key variables have been outlined from previous literature identifying classic predictors of marital quality. These variables were applied to Fincham and Linfield's (1997) two-dimensional model in order to further advance research in the area of marital satisfaction. As proposed by Fincham and Linfield (1997), marital quality may be studied in terms of separate positive and negative dimensions. The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a correlation

between these two dimensions and each of the variables presented in the introductory section. This was achieved by completing the following:

- 1) Determining the correlation between PMQ and NMQ scores.
- 2) Determining the correlation between classic predictors of marital satisfaction and each of the marital satisfaction measures (Norton's Marital Quality Measure, the PMQ and NMQ).
- 3) Determining if the magnitudes of correlations between the classical predictors of marital satisfaction and each of the three measures of marital satisfaction in this study are different.
- 4) Separate regression equations will be obtained to determine what sets of variables predict Norton's marital satisfaction inventory, PMQ scores and NMQ scores.
- 5) Analysis of variance will be conducted to determine what sets of variables predict Norton's marital satisfaction inventory, PMQ scores and NMQ scores.
- 6) Correlations will be calculated to determine how well each of the marital satisfaction measures predicts marital instability. Tests will be performed to determine if the measures differ in their association with marital instability.

As stated previously, the hypotheses were outlined in the introductory section. The results of each specific hypothesis will be outlined in the following section.

- 1) The first objective was that of determining the correlation between positive marital quality scores and negative marital quality scores. Results indicated that the correlation between positive marital quality scores and negative marital quality scores was $-.521$.

The correlation was found to be significant at the 0.01 level. Overall, high positivity was found to be associated with lower levels of marital dissatisfaction.

2) The second objective was that of determining the correlation between classic predictors of marital satisfaction and each of the marital satisfaction measures. The correlation between traditional predictors of marital satisfaction and each of the marital satisfaction measures were determined using a simple linear model. The pattern of results was the same for all three outcome measures. Significant predictor variables for each of the three measures, which were found to be associated with higher levels of marital satisfaction included longer courtship duration, less social anxiety, greater happiness, high self esteem, good physical health, positive interaction patterns, low marital instability, high agreement, positive regard for one's partner and high levels of emotional gratification. Those variables which were not found to be significant included homogeneity in income, education and relationship duration. In addition, age at first marriage and neuroticism were not significantly correlated with the measures of marital quality (Table 1).

Table 1

Summary of Correlations for Variables Predicting Positive & Negative Dimensions Of Marriage and Marital Stability (N = 101)

Variable	Finch Pos	Finch Neg	Norton
Income	.003	-.035	-.036
Education	-.068	-.072	.074
Religion	.025	-.049	-.069
Age 1st marriage	.071	-.147	-.167
Courtship	-.186	.240*	.199*
Social anxiety	-.058	.228*	.166
Happiness	.638***	-.437**	-.581**
Self-esteem	-.160	.262**	.161
Physical health	.221*	-.195	-.212*
Neuroticism	-.109	.195	.110
Positive regard	.456**	-.509**	-.682**
Emotional regard	.492**	-.475**	-.641**
Interaction patterns	-.213	.397	.424**
Marital instability	.534**	-.584**	-.764**
Agreement	-.258**	.424**	.549**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

3) In order to determine the magnitude of correlations between the classic predictors of marital satisfaction and each of the three measures of marital quality, calculations for testing the differences in correlations were obtained. The simple results without a correction for Type 1 errors indicated that three variables were significant at the .05 level. It must be remembered however that the sample size consisted of 101 individuals and that chance alone accounts for some of the significant findings. If a Bonferroni correction were applied to take into account that 10 tests were performed, none of the tests would be found to be significant at an alpha-adjusted level. Therefore, although results indicated that three variables were significant at the .05 level, it must be remembered that chance alone accounts for some of the significant findings due to the significant number of tests performed (Table 2).

Table 2

Testing the Differences in Correlations (N = 101)

Variable	Finch Pos	Finch Neg	diff	dom	t
Happiness	.638	.437	.201	.842	2.67*
Income	.003	.035	.032	1.45	.324
Religion	.025	.049	.024	1.45	.243
Education	.068	.072	.004	1.45	.041
Age1st	.071	.147	.076	1.43	.777
Courtship	.186	.24	.054	1.37	.564
Social anxiety	.058	.228	.17	1.37	1.77*
Self-esteem	.16	.262	.102	1.35	1.06
Physical health	.221	.195	.026	1.37	.271
Neuroticism	.109	.195	.086	1.40	.887
Positive Reg	.456	.509	.053	1.01	.645
Emotional Reg	.492	.475	.017	1.01	.206
Interaction	.213	.397	.184	1.23	2.03
Instability	.534	.584	.05	.855	.660
Agreement	.258	.424	.166	1.19	1.86*

Note: In all cases the numerator = 149.058 and the correlation for Fincham + and - was = .521 * $p < .05$

Formulas for testing differences in correlation:

E, Diff = (B2-C2)

F, Num = $98 * (1 + D2)$

G, Denom = $2 * (1 - (B2 * B2) - (C2 - C2) - (D2 - D2) + (2 * B2 * C2 * D2))$

H, $t = E2 * (\text{SQRT } (F2/G2))$

4) Next, three separate regression equations were obtained, each with a different outcome variable, to determine the sets of variables which predicted (a) Norton's marital satisfaction inventory, (b) PMQ scores and (c) NMQ scores. Only those variables which were found to be significantly correlated with any one of the outcome variables were used in the analysis as the independent variables. The type of regression obtained was a simultaneous solution in which all of the independent variables were entered in the equation concurrently.

The overall multiple R square was found to be high in each of the three marital quality analyses. An R square value of .532 was evident for Fincham and Linfield's (1997) PMQ score and an R square value of .365 was found for the NMQ score. Norton's measure of marital satisfaction, the Quality in Marriage Index (QMI), resulted in an R square value of .641. The variables which were found to best predict Fincham and Linfield's (1997) positive dimension of marriage were high degrees of overall happiness, low levels of social anxiety and receiving emotional gratification from one's partner. Fincham and Linfield's (1997) negative dimension of marriage was best predicted by the following variables: low levels of overall happiness and high levels of social anxiety. The variables which best predicted Norton's Quality in Marriage Index included; high levels of general happiness, receiving positive regard from one's partner, having high self-esteem and having low levels of social anxiety. Overall, having a happy life was the variable to statistically best predict both positive and negative dimensions in marriage and was the statistically best predictor for Norton's Quality in Marriage Index. All variables were found to predict marital satisfaction to a greater degree than marital

dissatisfaction. Finally, the variables which predicted positive dimensions were the same variables which predicted negative dimensions of marriage (Table 3).

Table 3

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Positive & Negative Dimensions of Marital Quality and Marital Stability (N = 101)

Variable	Finch Positive Beta	Finch Negative Beta	Norton Beta
R	.729	.604	.801
R Square	.532	.365	.641
Courtship	-.060	.132	.054
Happiness	.572*	-.210*	-.379*
Social anxiety	.202*	.054	-.154*
Physical health	.001	-.022	-.010
Positive regard	.226	-.220	-.393*
Emotional regard	.243*	-.104	-.161
Interaction patterns	-.046	.178	.115
Self-esteem	.108	.016	-.163*
Agreement	.186	.031	.074

* $p < .05$

5) Next, analysis of variance was conducted to determine established correlates of marital satisfaction that were associated with Fincham and Linfield's (1997) four typologies of marriages. To classify participants into four marital groups, median values were obtained for the satisfaction and dissatisfaction scales. Fincham and Linfield's (1997) four typologies of marriages were created and denoted as groups 1, 2, 3 and 4. Group 1 was comprised of those individuals whose marriage was characterized as being highly *satisfied*. Those subjects with a score greater than 28 on Fincham and Linfield's (1997) marital satisfaction dimension and less than 7 on the marital dissatisfaction dimension, were deemed satisfied. The numbers to select the criteria were drawn from the satisfaction and dissatisfaction scales. Group 2 included individuals who had a marriage characterized as *indifferent*. These subjects had scores less than 27 and less than 7 on from the satisfaction and dissatisfaction scales respectively. Group 3 was characterized by those individuals who felt *ambivalent* about their marriage. These subjects had high satisfaction scores (over 28) and high dissatisfaction scores (greater than 8). Finally, group 4 was comprised of individuals who were categorized as having a *dissatisfied* marriage. These subjects had scores less than 27 and higher than 8 in order to fit the criteria of this specific group. In conducting an analysis of variance for marital satisfaction typologies, the following variables were found to be significant: courtship, happiness, neuroticism, interaction patterns, marital instability, agreement, positive regard and emotional gratification (Table 4a).

Table 4a

Analysis of Variance for Marital Satisfaction Typologies (N = 101)

Variable	F	Significance
Courtship	2.927	.038*
Happiness	10.846	.000**
Neuroticism	3.126	.029*
Positive regard	7.099	.000**
Emotional regard	8.025	.000**
Interaction patterns	6.868	.000**
Marital instability	11.172	.000**
Agreement	3.492	.019*
Age 1st	.862	.463
Physical health	.917	.436
Neuroticism	3.12	.029**
Social anxiety	.994	.399
Self-esteem	2.11	.104

Note. In all cases, the degrees of freedom between groups and within groups were 3 and 97 respectively.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Finally, by using Tukey's honestly significant difference test (HSD) test, the differences among the means for each of the variables was calculated to determine if the difference between any two means were significantly different. Results indicated that the dissatisfied group had a longer courtship duration than the satisfied group. The satisfied group, followed by the ambivalent group was found to have higher levels of overall happiness than the dissatisfied group. Higher levels of neuroticism were found among the ambivalent group than the satisfied group. The satisfied group had more positive regard for their partners, better interaction patterns and greater levels of agreement than the dissatisfied couples. The satisfied group received the most emotional gratification from their partner followed by the indifferent group and lastly by the dissatisfied group. Low levels of marital instability were experienced by the satisfied group, followed by the indifferent group and next by the dissatisfied group (See Table 4b).

Table 4b

Analysis of Variance for Marital Satisfaction Typologies - The Difference of Means (N = 101)

Variable	Satisfied <i>Group 1</i> n = 39	Indifferent <i>Group 2</i> n = 12	Ambivalent <i>Group 3</i> n = 15	Dissatisfied <i>Group 4</i> n = 35
Courtship	4.03 ^a	4.17	4.60	4.83 ^a
Happiness	8.82 ^a	7.83	8.27 ^b	7.14 ^{a,b}
Neuroticism	27.26 ^a	29.42	30.87 ^a	29.49
Positive regard	22.05 ^a	20.08	20.07	19.29 ^a
Emotional gratif.	43.87 ^{a,b}	39.92 ^b	41.00	39.00 ^a
Interaction patterns	6.54 ^a	7.92	8.27	8.77 ^a
Marital instability	19.59 ^a	19.58 ^b	18.33	17.46 ^{a,b}
Agreement	25.69 ^a	26.58	28.67	31.20 ^a

Any two means with the same superscript are significantly different than the other at the * $p < .05$ level as determined by Tukey's HSD test.

6) The next task was that of calculating correlations to determine how well each of the marital satisfaction measures would predict marital instability. Finally, it would be determined if the measures differed in their association with marital instability. Results indicated that marital instability was found to be significantly correlated with each of the three marital satisfaction measures. The correlation between marital instability and Fincham and Linfield's (1997) positive and negative dimensions of marriage were .534 and -.584 respectively. The correlation between marital instability and Norton's measure of marital quality was -.764. Therefore, Norton's measure was found to be a better predictor of instability than both the positive and negative dimensions identified by Fincham and Linfield (1997). Please refer to Table 2 at the end of the document.

7) Next, confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 3.61 was conducted to examine whether the PMQ and NMQ items reflected one, two or three underlying dimensions. When all six items were used as indicators of a single latent construct, a poor fit was found between the model and the obtained data, chi-square (9, $n = 101$) = 336.55, goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = .55.

A two-factor model in which positive and negative items were hypothesized to load on separate factors was examined next. The two-factor model provided a much better fit for the data, chi-square (8, $n = 101$) = 14.20, GFI = .96. Finally, it could be argued that the positive and negative items having the same referent (e.g., feeling good vs feeling bad) might give rise to separate dimensions, and hence a three-factor model was also examined. Each factor in this model was defined by a pair of corresponding items, one positive and one negative. This model did not fit the data, chi-square (6, $n = 101$) =

235.95, GFI = .62. Thus, it appears that the data obtained for marital quality items are best accounted for by a two-dimensional model defined, respectively, by the positive and negative items. These findings are consistent with those obtained by Fincham and Linfield (1997).

8) Finally, principal components analysis without rotation and with rotation were conducted. In the principal components analysis without rotation, two factors emerged. The Eigen value for factor 1 was found to be 4.19, accounting for 70% of the variance. Factor 2 had an Eigen value of 1.34, and accounted for 22% of the variance. Therefore, factor 1 was found to be a very strong factor and the second factor which emerged, accounted for a much smaller portion of the variance.

In the principal components analysis with rotation, negative dimensions of marriage were found to load heavily on the first factor. Positive dimension of marital quality were found to load heavily on the second factor (Table 5).

Table 5

Principal Components Analysis - Rotated Factor Matrix for Positive and NegativeQuality in Marriage (N = 101)

Scale items	Factor 1	Factor 2
Bad feelings	.928	-.261
Good feelings	-.325	.899
Negative feelings	.935	-.293
Negative qualities	.920	-.214
Positive feelings	-.269	.928
Positive qualities	-.182	.932

For a complete list of the Positive and Negative Quality in Marriage Scale items please refer to the attached questionnaire survey.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In most existing measures of marital quality, there has been an assumption that negative and positive elements are opposite poles of a single dimension. Although a bipolar hypothesis is intuitively appealing, recently researchers have challenged this position. In particular Fincham and Linfield (1997) have suggested that marital quality is not bipolar in which satisfaction and dissatisfaction represent opposite ends of a single dimension. Rather positive and negative aspects of marriage are viewed as largely independent and can be experienced simultaneously. Building on Fincham and Linfield's (1997) research, the present study offers another attempt at examining whether marital quality is best conceptualized as a two-dimensional construct comprising correlated positive and negative evaluative judgments.

Overall findings provided mixed results concerning separate positive and negative dimensions in marital quality. Factor analysis supported Fincham and Linfield (1997), yet correlational analysis showed each factor was predicted by a more or less similar set of correlates. Therefore, factor analysis indicated that two separate dimensions can in fact be identified, however, they are strongly correlated with one another. In light of the overlap, it is difficult to find differential correlates of the two.

That the predictors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were more or less similar can possibly be explained by three primary reasons. Firstly, results of the present study indicated a high correlation between the two dimensions, higher than in Fincham and

Linfield's (1997) study ($r = .52$ vs $r = .37$ and $.39$ for males and females, respectively).

Secondly, the small sample size ($N = 101$) may have reduced the likelihood of finding differential predictors of positive and negative satisfaction. Finally, predictor variables were not selected on the grounds that they would differentially predict positive and negative dimensions of marital satisfaction. Rather, the classic, strongest predictors of marital satisfaction were selected.

In comparing the overall pattern of results in this study versus Fincham and Linfield's (1997) study, the findings of the present study differ somewhat from those of Fincham and Linfield's (1997) findings. One plausible explanation may be due to the different objectives of each study. That is to say, Fincham and Linfield (1997) were not interested in focusing on the predictor variables of satisfied marriages, as was the case in the present study. Instead, Fincham and Linfield (1997) studied the assessments of marital quality, behavior, attributions, and general affect. Fincham and Linfield's (1997) primary focus was that of explaining unique variance in reported behavior and attributions beyond that explained by a conventional marital quality measure. The present study did replicate Fincham and Linfield's (1997) two-factor psychometric solution for the positive and negative marital items. Beyond that, the present study focused on predictor variables. Fincham and Linfield (1997) did have some predictors of marital satisfaction (e.g., attributions, Spouse Adjective Checklist) that they related to positive and negative marital satisfaction. However, they did not focus on how these variables correlated differentially with his two measures. It does not appear from Fincham and Linfield's (1997) results that significantly different patterns of correlation

were obtained. Therefore, the results of the two studies are actually fairly similar, although in reaching an overall conclusion about marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the differential correlation evidence has weighted more heavily in my study than in Fincham and Linfield's (1997).

In terms of the factor analysis, in which two factors emerged, consideration must be given to the possibility that one factor may have been representative of a methods factor. It must be noted that all of the items in Fincham and Linfield's (1997) scale are geographically close together. Having the positive and negative dimension questions so close together, may have resulted in higher correlations between the items.

In terms of finding differential correlates of marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the present study built upon several aspects of Fincham and Linfield's (1997) procedures and measures. Firstly, the same outcome measure was used in both studies in order to assess the positive and negative dimensions of marital quality. Next, it must be noted that the instruments used to measure the predictor variables were generally highly reliable and valid measures (e.g. Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, Norton's Marital Stability Scale etc.). Thus, the failure to find differential correlates of positive and negative marital satisfaction does not seem to be due to either deficiencies in the outcome scales or the predictor measures.

The sample sizes in each of the studies were similar. The present study, however, had a slightly smaller sample size ($N = 101$) than Fincham and Linfield's (1997) study ($N = 123$), which may have accounted for some of the difference in significance. On behalf of Fincham and Linfield's (1997) position, the smaller sample size may have reduced the

likelihood of finding differential predictors of positive and negative satisfaction.

However, it must be noted that Fincham and Linfield's (1997) sample size consisted of only 22 more subjects than the current study.

In terms of the sample used in the current study, three key issues need to be highlighted. Firstly, the sample reflected a highly educated group of individuals. As a result, participants may have been more intellectually consistent in responding to questions regarding both positive and negative dimensions of marital quality. This may account for the high correlation observed between positive and negative dimensions. However, at the same time, the opposite may in fact be more accurate. That is to say, it has been suggested that individuals with higher levels of education may have a greater capacity to conceptualize ideas along a continuum rather than dichotomize items into two categories (Loevinger, 1970). If the latter is true, greater variability in both positive and negative dimensions should be reflected in a highly educated sample. Finally, the sample consisted of young individuals, in which the mean age at first marriage was 26 years old. Although the beginning of marriage is often viewed as the honeymoon period in which partners are very happy, the most common time for divorce is within the first half dozen years after marriage. Therefore, a young sample may be reflective of an age in which variability in marital satisfaction is high.

As previously stated, Fincham and Linfield (1997) are among the first to suggest the concept of independent dimensions in the field of marital quality. Some researchers argue that traditional demonstrations of the separateness of positive and negative affect are flawed. For example, Russell and Carroll (1998) examined the question "Is positive

affect (PA) the bipolar opposite of, or is it independent of, negative affect (NA)?” These researchers found that the actual prediction varied with time frame, response format, and the items selected to define PA and NA (Russell & Carroll, 1998). Finally, Russell and Carroll (1998) suggest that when measurement error which tends to reduce correlations and the actual predictions of a bipolar model are considered, there is little evidence for independence of what were traditionally thought opposites, and bipolarity provides a parsimonious fit to existing data. Despite the controversy surrounding this issue, the notion that positive and negative affect are bipolar opposites must be subjected to careful and continuing empirical scrutiny. Our aim in conducting the research is similar to the nature of all scientific pursuits, that our conclusions will not be final but part of a dialectic. After all, in science, all assumptions must be subjected to empirical scrutiny.

Limitations

The limitations of the present study suggest the need for caution in interpreting the findings. One clear limitation concerns the sample, which did not reflect the diversity in race, ethnicity, and type of relationship (e.g., cohabitation) representative of intimate relationships in society as a whole. Generalizing the findings to the population as a whole awaits replication with a more diverse sample. Using predominantly Caucasian and middle-class samples has been a recurring limitation in the marriage literature (Glenn, 1990). Among the current study's limitations was its homogeneous sample. Study participants identified themselves as belonging primarily to the Canadian cultural group (63.4%). Therefore, an analysis by cultural group can not be made. In addition, most participants were affluent (80% reported their personal income to be over \$30 000 in the

past year). Finally, all participants were well educated, with 26% holding a Master's degree. Therefore, any generalizations from the current study should be made with caution.

Another limitation is the fact that an analysis in terms of age and length of current marriage can not be inferred. This makes for a more difficult interpretation of findings if those couples in earlier stages of marriage differ in significant ways than couples in latter stages of marriage. In addition, the degree of congruency between partners responses can not be interpreted. Findings reflect subjective perceptions of the individual.

Some might criticize the present study for a lack of power. Non-significant trends for some variables to correlate more (or less) strongly with positive than negative marital satisfaction were found. Perhaps with enough participants, these trends would have reached statistical significance. Even if they did, however, they would be modest and presumably of little practical value. Some might criticize the present approach for failing to select variables on the grounds that they would differentially predict positive and negative marital satisfaction. Perhaps specifically selected variables would have shown sharper contrasts. Yet, the classic, strongest predictors of satisfaction were selected. In the absence of a clear model of what should be uniquely associated with satisfaction or dissatisfaction, this is a reasonable starting point.

Finally, a new measure of marital quality was used in the current study. Although the two-item global marital quality scale demonstrated strong inter-item reliability, critics might claim a longer, more reliable instrument would be preferable. Therefore, the findings of these may be limited in generalizability.

Implications

The implications of the present study's findings suggest that future studies of marital satisfaction should include Fincham and Linfield's (1997) measure of marital quality (PANQIMS), presented in the present study, to further assess its use and strength.

In addition, researchers should give consideration to other means of data collection as well, including open-ended interviewing to best assess the influence of marital satisfaction predictors on overall evaluations of marital quality. Furthermore, there remains a strong need for longitudinal research on marriage, however, there is a greater need for longitudinal theory to guide this research.

Researchers should continue to consider which variables best differentially predict positive and negative dimensions of marriage. In absence of a clear model of what should be uniquely associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction, it was a reasonable starting point to select the classic predictors of marital satisfaction in this study. However, continued empirical explorations of these variables are essential to understanding the influence of predictors on overall evaluations of marital satisfaction.

In addition, researchers should continue to examine overall happiness as it relates to marital satisfaction. Results of the study indicated that general happiness was found to be the best predictor of marital satisfaction. Therefore, practitioners should recognize a potential need to focus on general happiness in all sectors of life (e.g. work, home, leisure) in order to enhance marital quality.

If one accepts the position that positive and negative satisfaction overlap substantially in marriage, a focus on positive and negative aspects of marital evaluation

still may be profitable. Perhaps we have some way of combining across episodes and properties of a relationship. Yet most of us know what bugs and what pleases us in a relationship. Future researchers might want to investigate those elements more extensively and how each side weights in the overall summary judgment partners make.

REFERENCES

- Burgess, E.W. & Wallin, P. (1953). *Engagement and marriage*. Chicago: J.B. Lippincott.
- Burgess, E. W. & Cattrell, L.S. (1939). *Predicting success or failure in marriage*. New York: 1.
- Burr, R. (1973). *Theory construction and the sociology of the family*. New York: Wiley.
- Cate, R. & Lloyd, S. (1988). The importance of courtship. In Cate and Lloyd (Eds.), *Courtship* (pp.1-11). London: Sage.
- Christensen, A. & Heavey, C. (1993). Gender differences in marital conflict: The demand/withdraw interaction pattern. In Oskamo & Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 113-141). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-Femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 389-407.
- Davis, K. (1929). *Factors in the sex life of 2200 women*. New York: Harper & Row
- Diener, E. & Emmons, R. (1985). The independence of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 1105-1117.
- Fincham, F. & Linfield, K. (1997). A new look at marital quality: Can spouses feel positive and negative about their marriage? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 11, 489-501.
- Fincham, F. & Bradbury, T. (1993). Marital satisfaction, depression, and attributions: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 442-452.
- Fincham, F. & Bradbury, T. (1992). Assessing attributions in marriage: The relationship attribution measure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 457-468.
- Fincham, F. & Bradbury, T. (1990). Psychology and the study of marriage. In Fincham & Bradbury (Eds.), *The psychology of marriage: Basic issues and applications* (pp.1-12). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fincham, F. & Bradbury, T. (1987). The assessment of marital quality: A reevaluation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 797-809.

- Gilford, R. & Bengtson, V. (1979). Measuring marital satisfaction in three generations: Positive and negative dimensions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 40, 387-396.
- Glenn, N. (1990). Quantitative research on marital quality in the 1980s: A critical review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 818-831.
- Green, D., Goldman, S., & Salovey, P. (1993). Measurement error masks bipolarity in affect ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 1029-1041.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. & Capwell, D. (1957). *Job attitudes*. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Holstein, C. M., Goldstein, J. & Bem, D. (1971). The importance of expressive behaviors, sex, and need-approval in inducing liking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 7, 534-544.
- Karney, B. & Bradbury, T. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3-34.
- Kirkpatrick, C. & Cotton, J. (1951). Physical attractiveness, age and marital adjustment. *American Sociological Review*, 16, 81-86.
- Levinger, G. (1965). Marital cohesiveness and dissolution: An integrative review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 27, 19-28.
- Lewis, R. A. & Spanier, G. B. (1979). Theorizing about the quality and stability of marriage. In W. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye and I. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family*. New York: A Division of MacMillian Publishing Co. .
- Lewis, R. A. (1973). A longitudinal test of a developmental framework for premarital dyadic formation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 35, 16-25.
- Lewis, R. A. (1972). A developmental framework for the analysis of premarital dyadic formation. *Family Process*, 11, 17-48.
- Locke, H. J. (1951). *Predicting adjustment in marriage: A comparison of a divorced and happily married group*. New York: Holt.
- Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. (1970). Measuring ego development (Vol. 1-2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 141-151.

- Nye, F. (1988). Fifty years of family research, 1937-1987. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 305-316.
- Pineo, P. C. (1961). Disenchantment in the later years of marriage. *Marriage and Family Living*, 23, 3-11.
- Reiss, I. L. (1960). Toward a society of the heterosexual love relationship. *Marriage and Family Living*, 22, 139-145.
- Renne, K. S. (1970). Correlates of dissatisfaction in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 32, 54-66.
- Robinson, J., Shaver, P., & Wrightsman, L. (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. New York: Academic Press.
- Schellenberg, J. A. (1960). Homogamy in personal values and the field of eligibles. *Social Forces*, 39, 157-162.
- Sternberg, R. & Hojjat, M. (1997). *Satisfaction in close relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Stryker, S. (1964). The interactional and situational approaches. In H.T. Christensen (ed.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Terman, L. M., & Wallin, P. (1949). The validity of marriage prediction and marital adjustment tests. *American Sociological Review*, 14, 497-504.
- Tharp, R. G. (1963). Psychological patterning in marriage. *Psychological Bulletin*, 60, 97-117.
- Watson, D., Clark, L., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

APPENDIX A

MARITAL QUALITY SURVEY

8. Please indicate your cultural/ethnic background (some examples of cultural groups are: Scottish, Native Indian, Canadian, German, Japanese, Japanese-Canadian, etc.)

I belong to the _____ cultural group.

9. What religious affiliation do you and your partner belong to? (check one)

	Yourself		Partner	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Roman Catholic	28	28	29	29
Jewish	3	3	2	2
Moslem	2	2	2	2
Protestant	24	24	24	24
Hindu	1	1	0	0
Other	4	4	5	5
None	40	40	39	39

10. What is your best estimate of your and your partner's total personal income before taxes and deductions of all sources (e.g. wages, salaries, interest and all other incomes) in the past 12 months? (check one)

	Yourself		Partner	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
less than \$10 000	3	3	8	8
\$10 000 to \$ 14 999	4	4	2	2
\$15 000 to \$ 19 999	4	4	5	5
\$20 000 to \$ 29 000	11	11	5	5
\$30 000 to \$ 39 000	27	27	21	21
\$40 000 to \$ 49 000	17	17	19	19
\$50 000 to \$ 74 999	24	24	28	28
\$75 000 and over	10	10	12	12

11. What is the highest level of education that you and your partner have completed? (check one)

	Yourself		Partner	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
a. Less than a high school diploma	2	2	3	3
b. Secondary school diploma	4	4	3	3
c. Apprenticeship, vocational, or trade school	4	4	8	8
d. Some community college diploma/certificate	15	15	10	10
e. Some university, no degree	8	8	7	7
f. Completed Bachelors Degree	16	16	20	20
g. Completed Professional Degree (medicine, law)	10	10	16	16
h. Completed Masters Degree	27	27	20	20
i. Completed Doctoral Degree	15	15	14	14

SECTION B - Intrapersonal Factors

We would like to ask you some questions about yourself and your personality.

12. Please indicate the extent to which you feel the following:

	Extent of Agreement:			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %
a. I feel that I am a person of worth	73 72	28 28	0 0	0 0
b. I feel that I have a number of good qualities	73 72	28 28	0 0	0 0
c. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure	0 0	0 0	30 30	71 70
d. I am able to do things as well as other people	44 44	55 55	1 1	1 1
e. I feel I do not have much to be proud of	2 2	4 4	31 31	63 63
f. I take a positive attitude toward myself	43 43	55 55	2 2	1 1
g. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	36 36	59 58	6 6	0 0
h. I wish I could have more respect for myself	3 3	19 19	35 35	44 44
i. I certainly feel useless at times	4 4	24 24	31 31	42 42
j. At times I think I am no good at all	1 1	4 4	32 32	64 63

13. Please rate the degree to which each statement is true of you:

	Extent of Truth:				
	False	More false than true	In between	More true than false	True
	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %	<i>n</i> %
a. I need time to overcome my shyness	27 27	27 27	26 26	15 15	6 6
b. I have trouble working when one is watching me	31 31	30 30	20 20	18 18	2 2
c. I get embarrassed very easily	36 36	28 28	21 21	13 13	3 3
d. I don't find it hard to talk to strangers	9 9	16 16	17 17	26 26	33 33
e. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group	25 25	22 22	17 17	19 19	18 18
f. Large groups make me nervous	29 29	24 24	25 25	13 13	9 9

14. On a scale of 1 to 10, in general how happy would you say you are with your life? (circle one)

1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7..... 8..... 9..... 10
 unhappy very happy

15. In the past few months, how healthy have you felt physically? (circle one)

1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6..... 7..... 8..... 9..... 10
 very bad very good

16. Please indicate the frequency with which the following occurs in your life:

	Extent of Frequency:									
	Never		Seldom		Some- times		Often		Always	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
a. I am not a worrier	7	7	22	22	46	46	23	23	3	3
b. I often feel inferior to others	13	13	58	58	28	28	2	2	0	0
c. When I'm under a great deal of stress, I feel like I'm going to pieces	17	17	52	52	23	23	8	8	1	1
d. I rarely feel alone or blue	13	13	40	40	29	29	8	8	10	10
e. I often feel tense and jittery	17	17	48	48	29	29	5	5	1	1
f. Sometimes I feel completely worthless	62	62	31	31	6	6	0	0	1	1
g. I rarely feel fearful or anxious	12	12	30	30	40	40	15	15	3	3
h. I get angry at the way people treat me	8	8	58	57	29	29	6	6	0	0
i. When things go wrong, I get discouraged & feel like giving up	21	21	54	54	24	24	2	2	0	0
j. I am seldom sad or depressed	9	9	42	42	29	29	15	15	6	6
k. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems	48	48	41	41	10	10	2	2	0	0
l. I've been ashamed I just wanted to hide	61	60	33	33	6	6	0	0	1	1

SECTION C - Interaction Patterns

We would like to ask you some questions about your relationship with your partner.

17. Please indicate the amount with which you feel you:

	Extent of Frequency:									
	Never		Seldom		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
a. communicate well with your partner	0	0	4	4	17	17	56	55	24	24
b. see your partner as sexually attractive	1	1	3	3	9	9	51	51	37	37
c. have positive evaluations of him/her	0	0	1	1	7	7	52	52	41	41
d. agree with his/her values	0	0	0	0	15	15	59	58	27	27
e. receive validation from him/her	0	0	10	10	15	15	46	46	30	30

18. Please indicate the extent to which you:

	Extent of Frequency:									
	Never		Seldom		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
a. express affection to your partner	0	0	4	4	13	13	58	58	26	26
b. show respect for your partner	0	0	1	1	8	8	56	55	36	36
c. have emotional support for your partner	0	0	1	1	6	6	52	52	42	42
d. encourage personal growth	0	0	1	1	13	13	40	40	47	47
e. share tasks equally with him/her	0	0	5	5	22	22	46	46	28	28
f. know his/her limits	0	0	0	0	13	13	65	65	23	23
g. feel independent from him/her	1	1	1	1	19	19	53	53	27	27
h. express love to your partner	0	0	4	4	18	18	49	49	30	30
i. experience sexual satisfaction	0	0	5	5	21	21	46	46	29	29
j. have an identity as a couple	0	0	3	3	8	8	49	49	40	40

19. Please indicate the extent to which you:

	Extent of Frequency:									
	Never		Seldom		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
a. try to discuss problems	0	0	2	2	10	10	56	55	33	33
b. blame, accuse or criticize your partner	4	4	43	43	44	44	9	9	0	0
c. pressure partner to change	20	20	39	39	36	36	5	5	0	0
d. avoid discussing problems with partner	34	34	40	40	22	22	5	5	0	0
e. refuse to talk about a particular topic	47	47	39	39	13	13	2	2	0	0

21. Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

	Extent of Agreement:									
	Always agree		Almost always agree		Occasionally disagree		Frequently disagree		Always disagree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
a. family finances	10	10	50	50	35	35	6	6	0	0
b. recreation matters	25	25	54	54	19	19	3	3	0	0
c. religious matters	42	42	33	33	23	23	3	3	0	0
d. demonstrate affection	26	26	54	54	16	16	4	4	1	1
e. friends	29	29	47	47	22	22	3	3	0	0
f. sex relations	21	21	52	52	20	20	8	8	0	0
g. proper behaviors	28	28	43	43	26	26	4	4	0	0
h. philosophy of life	36	36	40	40	19	19	6	6	0	0
i. dealing with in-laws	26	26	42	42	24	24	7	7	1	1
j. aims & goals	36	36	47	47	15	15	3	3	0	0
k. time spent together	27	27	55	55	17	17	1	1	1	1
l. making decisions	25	25	55	55	20	20	1	1	0	0
m. household tasks	13	13	41	41	40	40	6	6	1	1
n. leisure time activities	27	27	48	48	22	22	4	4	0	0
o. career decisions	39	39	48	48	12	12	2	2	0	0

22. On the scale below, indicate the point with which you agree with the following statements.

	Extent of Agreement:							
	Strongly agree	Agree	Tend to agree	No opinion	Tend to disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
a. we have a good relationship	62 61	20 20	13 13	1 1	2 2	1 1	2 2	
b. my relationship is stable	68 67	22 22	7 7	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	
c. our relationship is strong	66 65	19 19	7 7	4 4	2 2	2 2	2 2	
d. my relationship makes me happy	60 59	22 22	11 11	2 2	3 3	0 0	3 3	
e. I'm part of a team with my partner	64 63	23 23	7 7	3 3	1 1	1 1	2 2	

23. Have you or your husband/wife ever seriously suggested the idea of divorce within the last three years?

very often	often	occasionally	never
0 0	0 0	18 18	83 82

24. Have you discussed divorce or separation with a close friend?

very often	often	occasionally	never
0 0	2 2	18 18	80 80

25. Even people who get along quite well with their spouse sometimes wonder whether their marriage is working out. Have you thought of your marriage to be in trouble in the last three years?

very often	often	occasionally	never
0 0	8 8	34 34	59 59

26. Did you talk about consulting an attorney?

very often	often	occasionally	never
0 0	1 1	2 2	98 98

27. Has the thought of getting a divorce or separation crossed your mind in the past three years?

very often	often	occasionally	never
0 0	5 5	27 27	69 68

28. For each of items below, indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

a. Considering only the **positive qualities** of your partner, and ignoring the **negative** ones, evaluate how **positive** these **qualities** are.

Not at all											Extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

b. Considering only **positive feelings** you have toward your partner, and ignoring the **negative** ones, evaluate how **positive** these **feelings** are.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

c. Considering only **good feelings** you have about your relationship, and ignoring the **bad** ones, evaluate how **good** these **feelings** are.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

d. Considering only the **negative qualities** of your partner, and ignoring the **positive** ones, evaluate how **negative** these **qualities** are.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

e. Considering only **negative feelings** you have towards your partner, and ignoring the **positive** ones, evaluate how **negative** these **feelings** are.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

f. Considering only **bad feelings** you have about your relationship, and ignoring the **good** ones, evaluate how **bad** these **feelings** are.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

29. Do you have any final comments or thoughts regarding marital satisfaction that you want to share with us?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

All responses will be kept confidential. Identification codes are used only for statistical purposes.

Please use the postage-paid return envelope provided.

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table A (Qu #2) - Age at First Marriage

	Frequency	Percent
> 20	6	6.0
20 - 25	44	43.6
26 - 30	28	27.7
31 - 35	20	19.9
< 35	3	3.0

Table B (Qu #8) - Cultural Background

	Frequency	Percent
None	1	1.0
Scottish	7	6.9
Canadian	64	63.4
Japanese	1	1.0
Japanese-Canadian	1	1.0
East Indian	0	0.0
Irish	4	4.0
English	6	5.9
British	7	6.9
French-Canadian	3	3.0
Chinese	6	5.9
Arab	1	1.0
Total	101	100.0

Table C (Qu #14) - Overall Happiness with Life (rated on scale from 1 to 10)

	Frequencies	Percent
1 (unhappy)	0	0.0
2	1	1.0
3	1	1.0
4	1	1.0
5	2	2.0
6	6	5.9
7	14	13.9
8	39	38.6
9	23	22.8
10 (very happy)	14	13.9
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table D (Qu #15) - Physical Health (rated on a scale from 1 to 10)

	Frequency	Percent
1 (very bad)	1	1.0
2	1	1.0
3	2	2.0
4	7	6.9
5	8	7.9
6	12	11.9
7	26	25.5
8	16	15.8
9	16	15.8
10 (very good)	12	11.9
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table E (Qu # 28a) - Fincham & Linfield's (1997) 2-dimensional Model of Marital Quality
Positive **Qualities** of your Partner

	Frequency	Percent
0 (not positive)	0	0.0
1	0	0.0
2	0	0.0
3	1	1.0
4	0	0.0
5	2	2.0
6	1	1.0
7	4	4.0
8	19	18.8
9	29	28.7
10 (very positive)	45	44.6
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table F (Qu # 28b) - Positive **Feelings** Toward Your Partner

	Frequency	Percent
0	0	0.0
1	0	0.0
2	0	0.0
3	1	1.0
4	0	0.0
5	2	2.0
6	1	1.0
7	10	9.9
8	14	13.9
9	31	30.7
10	41	40.6
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table G (Qu # 28c) - Good **Feelings** About Your Relationship

	Frequency	Percent
0 (not positive)	1	1.0
1	0	0.0
2	0	0.0
3	1	1.0
4	0	0.0
5	2	2.0
6	1	1.0
7	10	9.9
8	14	13.9
9	31	30.7
10 (very positive)	41	40.6
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table H (Qu # 28d) - Negative **Qualities** About Your Partner

	Frequency	Percent
0 (not negative)	2	2.0
1	22	21.8
2	21	20.8
3	16	15.8
4	7	6.9
5	10	9.9
6	8	7.9
7	6	5.9
8	6	5.9
9	2	2.0
10 (very negative)	1	1.0
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table I (Qu # 28e) - Negative **Feelings** Toward Your Partner

	Frequency	Percent
0 (not negative)	12	11.9
1	24	23.8
2	15	14.9
3	11	10.9
4	6	5.9
5	13	12.9
6	8	7.9
7	5	5.0
8	3	3.0
9	3	3.0
10 (very negative)	1	1.0
	-----	-----
Total	101	100.0

Table J (Qu # 28f) - **Bad Feelings** You Have About Your Relationship

	Frequency	Percent
0 (not negative)	25	24.8
1	20	19.8
2	11	10.9
3	11	10.9
4	6	5.9
5	8	7.9
6	7	6.9
7	7	6.9
8	2	2.0
9	3	3.0
10 (very negative)	1	1.0
	-----	-----
Total	101	100