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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the Problem

"Marriage counseling is one of the recent significant developments in the field of interpersonal relations" (8, p. 121). The areas of diagnosis of marital difficulties and the prediction of marital success through psychometric testing, however, are severely limited due to sporadic development and lack of perfection. That is not to say there is no demand for such psychological testing instruments related to marriage counseling. Table I illustrates the use of specific areas of testing by marriage counselors responding to Haggerty's 1969 survey of the clinical membership of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projective</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Knowledge Inventories</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Inventories</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic Inventories</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Prediction Scales</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Adjustment Scales</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Marital Scales</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Association of Marriage Counselors, in which he found that 73 per cent indicated they used psychological instruments in their work (4, pp. 4377-B-4378-B).

Research involving marital prediction scales has been sporadic, due to the wide range of controversy which surrounds them. Haggerty found, however, that despite the present limitations of marital prediction tests, 31 per cent of his sample of professional marriage counselors report administering predictive instruments in their work (4, p. 4377-B).

In this nation it is estimated that one in every four marriages ends in divorce. Burgess and Cottrell emphasize the potential value of tests which can accurately predict the probable success or failure of marriage for engaged couples (2, p. 737). Kirkpatrick optimistically notes "to assume that similar conditions lead to similar effects opens the way to scientific prediction, even though the failure of complex configurations to repeat themselves restricts prediction to useful approximation" (5, p. 182). Locke emphatically points out that prediction "simply indicates the probability that a person will succeed or fail. . . . Prediction is always an actuarial frame of reference" (7, p. 5). Thus, the problem of predicting the success or failure of marriage, though admittedly complex, does not appear to be insurmountable. Despite the numerous difficulties encountered in attempting to objectively predict marital success, Adams states "marriage prediction inventories produce better than chance results when used to predict success in marriage" (1, p. 56).
One of the obvious barriers to predicting marital success or failure is that "little research has been done on factors relating to marital success to state with any assurance just what qualities or traits should be included in any instrument purportedly predicting the outcome of marriage" (1, p. 55). In a study completed by Corsini, however, it was found that "a measure of similarity of personality adds considerably to the post-diction of marital happiness and indicates that such measurement may add to prediction" (3, p. 24). This is confirmed by Burgess and Cottrell who describe the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) as "an adequate, accurate personality description, as well as indicating a person's attitude toward his spouse" (2, p. 4). Thus, researchers are becoming increasingly interested in the importance of the interaction of personality variables in predicting a couple's future marital success or failure.

In addition to the MMPI, the instrument in this investigation combines a sentence completion method, which shows potentiality as a means for studying attitudes due to freedom of response, with a self-rating technique, which allows objective scoring. About this testing method, Walker has concluded that "the self-rating of finished sentence-completion items is a fruitful method of testing for marriage difficulties" (10, p. 51). It is proposed that the Polyfactor Test of Marital Difficulties can also be used to predict the future marital status of couples seeking marriage counseling.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation is to determine if the Polyfactor test can be used to predict the success or failure of marriage. The Polyfactor test is an indirect scale assessing the present marital adjustment of each spouse and the overall marital adjustment of the couple. The criterion for this prediction study is a couple’s marital status following the termination of marriage counseling. Terman and Wallin note that "apart from ratings by friends, the only criterion available for checking the validity of marriage prediction tests is the break-up of a marriage by separation or divorce" (9, p. 502). In addition "predictive items show whether or not marital adjustment will be present and do not indicate the conditions and relationships which produce adjustment in marriage" (7, p. 5).

It is hypothesized that for each of the four Polyfactor test scores—Total Column Score, Total Difference Score, Husband’s Total Score, and Wife’s Total Score—there will be a significant difference between the clients married and living together following marriage counseling (Group I) and the clients separated or divorced and not living together following marriage counseling (Group II). Secondly, it is hypothesized that there will be a significant relationship...
between the two Polyfactor individual test scores—Husband's Total Score and Wife's Total Score—and the MMPI scales measuring Depression (Scale 2), Psychopathy (Scale 4), and Psychosthenia (Scale 7) for Group I and Group II, and that there will be a significant difference between the two groups. Thirdly, it is hypothesized that the scores made on the Polyfactor test prior to marriage counseling will allow the prediction of the future marital status of a couple using the criterion of living together or not living together.

Definition of Terms

The Polyfactor test consists of two divisions. First, it is a sentence completion test in which the testee responds to designated sentence stems in any way he wishes. Secondly, the person gives a self-rating, using the categories "Much," "Some," "Little," or "None," to designate the degree of marital difficulty projected in each sentence.

Marital adjustment refers to "the working arrangement which exists in marriage and the state of accommodation which is achieved in different areas where conflict may exist in marriage" (6, p. 666).

Marital prediction refers to forecasting from Polyfactor test scores made prior to marriage counseling the marital status of a couple at the termination of marriage counseling.
Counselor is operationally defined as the psychiatrist, psychologist, or marriage counselor seeing a couple for marriage counseling at the time of testing.

Client is operationally defined as a person who voluntarily seeks marriage counseling with a counselor and who has taken both a Polyfactor test and an MMPI. The terms client and subject will hereafter be used interchangeably in this study.

Emotionally healthy includes the concepts of increasingly better personal adjustment in the client's home situation, improving self-attitudes, and increased self-actualization with an improved felt sense of personal well-being.

Emotionally unhealthy includes the concept of feeling defeat in goals significant to the individual in which his home situation is contributing little to decrease these attitudes.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

Research in marriage prediction, although still experimental, has become more necessary with the development of many community centers since 1930 doing marriage counseling. Kirkpatrick emphasizes the increasing need for improved marriage prediction tests with his observation that social workers, psychiatrists, and others who are more or less forced into the role of guiding the lives of others, must rely on the principle of balancing benefits, and making exceedingly crude predictions as to the future behavior of their clients. . . . there is every reason to think that science will ultimately throw light on marital situations that are interwoven with the extremes of joy and misery as experienced by human beings (27, p. 178).

This chapter surveys marriage prediction schedules as compared with clinical interviews and what prediction tests are designed to do. Criticisms of prediction schedules and their reliability and validity are reviewed, as well as direct versus indirect testing methods for analyzing marital relationships and the use of projective techniques in marital prediction tests. The strengths and weaknesses of using marital status as the criterion for a prediction study, and the arguments of whether to gather predictive data before or after marriage are discussed. Determining factors related to marital adjustment and subsequent prediction of marital success or failure, personality factors of spouses related to potential marital
success, and the significance of interaction of marital partners as related to marital success or failure are also reviewed.

Many professional marriage counselors, psychologists, and psychiatrists differ concerning the feasibility, as well as the necessity, of predicting marital success or failure. Some share Ellis' viewpoint that

marriage prediction scales should be designed realistically for the practical purposes for which they seem to be most logically applicable: namely, for supplementing intensive and extensive marriage counseling interviews, rather than for attempting to act as a clinical substitute for them (16, p. 718).

It is not proposed in this investigation that a marital prediction schedule should be used as a substitute for the clinical interview, but rather that it be an important part of the total counseling process. Clinical interviews, according to Burgess, are better than tests for gaining insight into trends occurring in a marital relationship (4, p. 55). Moreover, Skidmore and McPhee reflect that tests are not adequate in themselves, but are useful tools in establishing rapport and in assisting individuals to work through their problems (36, p. 6).

There are, however, limitations to using only the clinical interview in marriage counseling without the benefit of the more objective guidelines marital prediction tests offer. Green remarks "to a large extent, diagnosis rests on the therapist's special interest--on what he is trying to do about
the marital condition. In essence, we seek to learn what is separate and what is shared in the relationship" (21, p. 163).

In view of the strong reliance many marriage counselors place upon the interview technique, it is especially important to note Burgess' observation that

in every study that has been made, not only in the marriage field but in other areas, when statistical prediction is compared with clinical prognosis it appears that a clinical prediction takes much more time, has never been shown to be superior, and has even been shown to be inferior to prediction from schedules (4, p. 55).

On the question of using the clinical interview with or without predictive tests, Adams logically concludes "in order to be thorough in all areas of marriage, the counselor utilizing marital prediction tests also relies on the personal interview" (1, p. 56). Although Ellis remains skeptical of the value and potential usefulness of marital prediction scales, he cautions counselors employing such tests that

if marriage prediction tests are employed at all in a counseling process, they should be used only for the counselor's information; and his prognosis of a given individual's or couple's marriage, even when partly based on such prediction scale scores, should not be given to the client in terms of the score itself, but should only be given as an integral part of an extended discussion based on the gathering of considerable interview and/or test evidence over and above the giving of such a prediction scale (16, p. 718).

Marital prediction tests, therefore, should be used as guidelines for the counselor in subsequent interviews with clients, aiding them in working toward a healthful resolution of their problems. Marital prediction tests are "most effective
when used as an integral part of a continuing counseling pattern" (28, p. 406).

At this point it is necessary to consider what prediction tests are designed to do. Burgess and Cottrell recognize that it is possible to give symptoms of adjustment a quantitative expression even though we may not be able to measure directly the variables operating in adjustment. . . . we do not measure adjustment directly but must be content with an inferential criterion. Moreover, we are measuring present adjustment only (6, p. 740).

Locke defines prediction as being "always in an actuarial frame of reference," with relation only to probabilities, and uses this one limitation to answer Ellis' comment that "the prediction of marital adjustment is not feasible because it does not predict the adjustment of the individual marriage" (29, p. 311). In reference to the usefulness of marital prediction tests, Coleman specifically emphasizes because of the complexity of factors that determine marital happiness and because the counselor is dealing with two people in interaction rather than a single individual, marriage counselors can predict no more than the probability of success for a particular marriage (11, pp. 407-408).

Thus, by their very nature and design, marriage prediction tests are limited. However, although prediction tests fall short of certainty, they can provide the marriage counselor with predictive information based on more than mere chance and the counselor's intuition.

According to Locke, "a marital adjustment test does not measure the degree of adjustment of an individual marriage
but merely measures the probability that a given marriage will be characterized by a certain degree of adjustment" (29, pp. 65-66). Terman's, Burgess', Cottrell's, and Locke's studies are based on the assumption that counselors "secure information about those adjusted and those maladjusted in marriage and those items which differentiated between the two groups would be predictive factors in marital adjustment" (29, p. 311). In prediction, therefore, emphasis is on the combination of a number of items into a total prediction test; it is designed only to indicate "the probability that a person will succeed or fail" (29, p. 5), and, consequently, is best used to indicate potential future trends in the marital relationship.

Obviously, marital prediction tests have evoked much comment, ranging from complete skepticism to constructive examination. In reviewing Burgess' A Marriage Prediction Schedule (in Buros' Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook), Dearborn begins by stating, "I do not believe that there is any value in attempting to make prediction of success or failure of marriage by a written test, no matter how well it is prepared" (8, p. 685). Fortunately, most of the critics of marital prediction schedules see at least the value of continuing research (8, pp. 680-685); even though they find faults with specific instruments developed to date, these professionals helpfully point out weaknesses which may be
corrected in subsequent research and marital prediction test development. Ellis has been the most exacting critic of marital prediction schedules. His major objections to predicting future marital success or failure through testing are, as Terman evaluates them,

1. . . . the inability to prevent sophisticated respondents from giving dishonest responses if for any reason they feel motivated to do so.

2. At best, they tap only the most conscious and accepted attitudes of the respondents, while they fail to tap unconscious or unfaced feelings of hostility, affection, or ambivalence which may be more germane than the consciously accepted feelings in determining a respondent's marriage adjustment score.

3. . . . questionable reliability and validity or statistical verification of the prognostic value of the items. Validation studies should be such as to derive an estimate of practical value.

4. Validity studies all have used volunteer respondents, particularly weighted with college level and professional individuals, so how clinically applicable are the results to wider segments of the population?

5. Samples employed for validation purposes have consisted of high proportions of happily married couples, using those married for relatively short periods regardless of studies indicating happiness in marriage seems to vary inversely with the length of marriage.

6. Samples used in prediction studies are quite small, frequently atypical and non-random, reducing the faith in reliability and validity studies.
7. ... few of the published scales have used any objective or outside performance criterion on the validation studies which have been done on them.

8. There is trouble comparing those who are ashamed to admit that there is anything seriously wrong with their marriage (lies equal high marital adjustment scores) and those who are not ashamed to do so (truth equals low marital adjustment scores).

9. While the obtained validity coefficients in marital prediction studies have been fairly promising as far as group differentiation has been concerned, they have not been very high in terms of individual prediction (39, pp. 711-717).

It is, in part, the purpose of the present study to suggest correctives for these weaknesses.

Additionally, Burgess mentions a problem encountered especially by non-directive counselors using marriage prediction tests in "... the tendency of predictive schedules ... to lead to a directive relation ... rather than causing the client ... to be thrown back upon himself for his plan for working it out" (4, p. 55). Adams cites Harper's attitude that predictive inventories of marital happiness or success waste time since they screen only those with very high or low scores, leaving a majority of indecisive median scores (1, p. 58). Skidmore and McPhee declare that any kind of instrument which opens discussion about factors of social background and personality which are even possibly relevant to success or failure in marriage is an excellent educational beginning, but not so for specific problems of marital adjustment (36, p. 126).
These criticisms of marriage prediction tests need little, if any, explanation. However, as early as 1932, Kirkpatrick optimistically noted "there seems no good reason why at least rough predictions of marital success should not be made once the preliminary research has been carried on" (27, p. 182). Even Ellis does not deny that practical and effective marriage prediction tests would have great value for marriage counselors (16, p. 710). Since that time marital prediction tests have only gradually become more sophisticated.

The potential uses of marriage prediction tests are many and varied. Terman and Wallin suggest that "the prediction test could be used as a basis for pointing out to the individual what attitudes or behavior patterns unfavorable to marital success have been revealed by the responses given to individual items in the test" (39, p. 504)—a factor especially true for a projective technique such as the Polyfactor test. The attitudes of Terman and Wallin on the use of marriage prediction tests are reflected in their statement "if they reduce by the slightest fraction the enormous gamble marriage is today their employment is justified" (39, p. 504). They conclude that Ellis' criticisms of studies of the prediction of marital success were made largely to emphasize the limitations of their findings and the harm which might result from their misuse in counseling or in popular writing by inadequately trained persons (39, p. 497).

Whether possible misuse of prediction tests prompted Ellis' criticism or not is a matter of conjecture, but this is,
of course, a significant potential risk. Terman and Wallin, however, conclude that marital prediction tests are useful in counseling situations.

In reviewing the positive values of marriage prediction schedules, Burgess notes that

1. Couples testify that filling out a schedule has a therapeutic and educational effect. It makes them realize the factors to be considered in a successful marriage.

2. Time is saved for the counselor and the person counseled by eliminating certain points that then need not be covered in an interview.

3. The schedules may locate problems that might be overlooked if there were only one or two interviews.

4. The schedules seem to reduce, as compared at least to short interviews, the personal and social equation of the interviewer. Each interviewer has a theoretical frame of reference which he is likely to over-stress in his analysis of a case.

5. The prediction that may be made from the schedule tends to put the interviewer on his guard against his intuitive prognosis.

6. The predictive schedule may serve as a desirable screening device, picking out persons or couples whose lower scores indicate their special need of one or more interviews, and setting aside those whose high scores show that they do not need so much interviewing (4, p. 54).

Marriage prediction tests may be used, therefore, as guidelines for individual counseling programs in an effort to use economically and effectively the time of both counselor and clients.

The basic problem involved in marriage prediction schedules lies in "devising an instrument that will give us more reliable and more valid evidence about a subject's marital adjustment than can be obtained in the same time by unsystematic and unstandardized methods of questioning" (39, p. 498).
In addition to predictive schedules, a great majority of marriage tests show a need for improvement in reliability and validity. There is, however, some optimism in this area. The reliability and validity of the marital adjustment instruments employed by Terman, Burgess, and Wallin are reasonably satisfactory, although, of course, there is room for improvement (39, p. 498). According to Frumpkin, the "Kirkpatrick scale discriminates the well-adjusted from the unadjusted spouse with considerable statistical significance" (18, p. 36). Concerned about the length of many marriage prediction schedules, Locke and Wallace developed a shortened version of a marital adjustment and prediction test and found that it clearly differentiated between those individuals well-adjusted in marriage and those who are not, while retaining moderately good prediction validity (30, p. 255).

The results of the reliability and validity studies done on the Polyfactor test are very encouraging. Using the tests of forty-nine married couples, four Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed between counselors' ratings and each of the four main Polyfactor test scales (9). The results of this concurrent validity study are illustrated in Table II. As Table II indicates, only the Difference Score on the Polyfactor test does not measure what it is intended to measure. The Husband's, Wife's, and Couple's
TABLE II
RESULTS OF A CONCURRENT VALIDITY STUDY ON THE POLYFACTOR TEST OF MARITAL DIFFICULTIES USING COUNSELOR'S RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polyfactor Test Scores</th>
<th>r-value</th>
<th>Significance of r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Total Score</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Total Score</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple's Total Score</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Score</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Scores do accurately measure the degree of marital difficulties encountered by married couples taking the test.

In addition to the concurrent validity study, a split-half reliability study, illustrated in Table III, has been done on the Polyfactor test, using the tests of fifty married couples.

TABLE III
RESULTS OF A SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY STUDY ON THE POLYFACTOR TEST OF MARITAL DIFFICULTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polyfactor Test Scores</th>
<th>r-value</th>
<th>Significance of r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Total Score</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Total Score</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple's Total Score</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Score</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
couples seeking marriage counseling. Four Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated between the two halves of the Polyfactor test (12). Since all of the Polyfactor test scores are significant beyond the .01 level, it is concluded that the Polyfactor test measures marital difficulties with considerable consistency.

Some of the limitations of marriage prediction tests may be corrected through an indirect projective method of testing. The questionable prognostic value of marriage tests is related to the use of objective tests as compared to projective tests. Frumpkin supports an indirect approach in measuring attitudes because it tends to be a "shorter, more innocuous, and yet diagnostic instrument of marital adjustment" (18, p. 36). Some of the advantages of the indirect type of scale over the direct scale in analyzing present marital adjustment follow:

1. Although the validity of the indirect scale is not as high as that of most standard direct scales, the reliability has been found to be consistently higher.
2. Derived indirect measures may provide us with information concerning marital adjustment which is relatively impossible for the more direct scale to obtain.
3. Derived indirect measures yield more uniform and more normal distribution of scores on the continuum of marital adjustment, indicating less susceptibility of the indirect measures to examinee manipulation.
4. Direct marriage prediction scales may sharpen already existing differences by pointing them out.
5. Direct scales are easily influenced by the subject's present motivational level (19, pp. 1, 11).

Frumpkin also mentions that "indirect scales are useful in taking into account interaction between the spouses as well as individual marital adjustment for both husband and wife" (18, p. 37).
There is obviously a definite need for developing a technically sound instrument which has a uniform number of responses and a consistent method of scoring responses (18, p. 37). Assuming this to be the most thorough way to study the actual attitudes of the spouses involved, Bernard in 1932 first used the indirect method to assess marital adjustment (17, p. 216). The desire for a means of assessing marriage through the use of projective techniques has become stronger since that time.

Briefly, the basic concept of projective testing methods is that "the subject is forced to organize and interpret the ambiguous stimuli, thereby revealing a good deal about his conflicts, level of aspiration, cognitive patterns, and defense mechanisms" (11, p. 400). By recognizing the attitudes and patterns of behavior for both spouses, the counselor gains a greater insight into their marital situation and the prognosis for improvement.

The Polyfactor test is a projective instrument. This test employs the sentence completion technique, which is very helpful when used in conjunction with interviews and counseling (34, p. 173). The sentence completion testing method is, of course, very versatile in reference to subject matter and is a good technique for determining attitudes in a field as complex as marriage. Because the subject typically does not understand the inferences of the questions or his answers, he may reveal "... latent needs, sentiments, feelings, and
recognize or to express in direct communication" (34, p. 169). Thus, the freedom and flexibility of response allowed through sentence completion tests has great potential in marriage tests, especially if reasonably objective scoring can be devised.

The Polyfactor test also combines a self-rating method with the sentence completion technique. Although self-ratings are subjective, if carefully planned, they result in more objective evaluations than reliance on unorganized impressions. However, the rating scale techniques have limitations, some of which are the following:

1. Raters tend to rate their own sex high on desirable traits and low on undesirable ones.
2. Men are more lenient raters than women.
3. Two ratings by the same rater are no more valid than one.
4. Self-ratings tend to be high on desirable traits and low on undesirable ones.
5. In doing self-ratings, superior people tend to underestimate and inferior people overestimate themselves. Inferior people are less accurate in their self-ratings (22, p. 163).

Like the sentence completion method, a self-rating testing method is fairly easy to construct and is easily prepared to fit the needs of locally identified objectives (3, p. 21).

Burgess and Cottrell have employed the rating scale technique to develop a marriage prediction test. Subjects were instructed to rate their marriage on a five point scale ranging from "very happy" to "very unhappy". Three ratings were obtained for each subject: (1) his own rating, (2) his spouse's rating, and (3) the rating of a good acquaintance
of the couple. The researchers determined that this method produced good reliability and validity in differentiating between good and poor marital adjustment (6, pp. 737-751).

Honesty of reply is a constant problem for all marriage tests. Terman and Wallin suggest

...as a check on subjects who for any reason do not answer the test questions with complete frankness, it would be desirable to explore the possibility of devising a marital happiness test based on projective techniques (39, p. 498).

When using a projective instrument the problem is considerably lessened because the individual's underlying feelings, attitudes, and traits emerge, regardless of whether or not he answers the test items truthfully. In other words, his personality will be projected regardless of his intentions. Response styles, such as tendency to guess, social desirability, self-disclosure, and deviation are more easily identified through projective testing methods. Only Terman suggests that halo effects in answering marriage tests are either small or nonexistent (37, p. 53).

Locke applies the value of projective answers to marriage prediction tests as he de-emphasizes the importance of honest answers.

If one is happy in a situation, will he not look at that situation through rose-colored glasses, and if he is unhappy, will he not be likely to take a "dim view" of the situation? In a prediction study one is searching for symptoms which will indicate the probable future development and outcome of an activity. Consequently, the actual replies may very well be more important indices for prediction than the actual situations which exist.

... The integrity of the subject's responses should be
thought of in terms of whether or not they assist in predicting the probable future behavior of the person in a given activity—in the present case adjustment or maladjustment in marriage (29, pp. 7-8).

Thus, projective techniques have a distinct advantage over objective inventories in providing the opportunity to gather significant information about each individual case, which adds to the predictive value of the instrument.

One of the most difficult problems in developing an improved marriage prediction test is the question of appropriate criterion. Many of the previous studies in this area have used happiness as the criterion for success or failure of marriage. Since the concepts of happiness are subjective, happiness cannot be objectively defined. Although it seems unreliable to attempt to compare the research done based on this criterion (5, p. 37), it is reasonable that happiness be considered an important factor in the success or failure of a marriage.

Burgess', Wallin's, and Terman's studies (39, pp. 502-503) reveal that both prediction tests and marital happiness tests are to a considerable degree indicative of marital failure. Both prediction tests and marital happiness tests, then, are suggestive of relatively long-range success or failure of marriage. In his study designed to predict marital adjustment Locke expanded the criterion to include both happiness and divorce (29, p. 2). The continuum of marital adjustment ranges from complete adjustment on one hand, and complete maladjustment on the other. It is true that significant differences
are more likely to be revealed if the extremes of a continuum are compared, regardless of the criterion.

Divorce is the last step in alienation between marriage partners. The break-up of a marriage, either through separation or divorce, appears to be an acceptable criterion for the success or failure of marriage. By administering a marital adjustment test to a group of married couples and a group of divorced couples, Locke showed that divorce is justified as a criterion of marital adjustment. Compared with the married group, those who were divorced made low scores on marital adjustment tests (29, p. 4). Terman used married, separated, or divorced as criteria in his study on predicting marriage failure from test scores (37). In another study by Terman he found "clearly that the divorced and non-divorced subjects differ significantly both on their aptitude and marital happiness scores" (39, p. 503).

Perhaps the largest difficulty in predicting the success or failure of marriage lies in the fact that very little scientific data is available on the necessary factors for good marital adjustment. According to Adams, "too little research has been done on factors relating to marital success to state with any assurance just what qualities or traits should be included in any instrument purportedly predicting the outcome of marriage" (1, p. 55). Couples differ in the numbers and kinds of marital problems they have, as well as in the intensity of feelings about the difficulties. Reviewing the studies
that have been done in this area, the most frequently mentioned factors in successful marital adjustment are (1) personality characteristics, (2) sex, (3) economic status, (4) sociability, (5) mutual interests, (6) frequency of affection, (7) religion, and (8) in-law relations (33, p. 302; 36, p. 123; 6, p. 740; 29, pp. 266-267). In summary, when factors related to marital adjustment or maladjustment are defined, the content of predictive schedules can be considerably improved.

There are, of course, limitations to using marriage, separation, and divorce as criteria for prediction the success or failure of marriage. Terman voices the most obvious in his statement that marital status is "... a crude measure of marital dissatisfaction. Some persons resort to separation or divorce at the slightest provocation, others for religious or ethical reasons will endure almost any amount of marital unhappiness rather than break-up the home" (39, p. 502). Coleman suggests that "... of the marriages that endure, it is estimated that one out of three continues in the face of deep frustrations and dissatisfaction" (10, p. 616). Marriage, separation, and divorce, however, do provide an outside performance measure by which a marriage prediction instrument may be validated.

It is increasingly recognized that a healthful resolution of a difficult marital situation is the goal of marriage counselors. Just as there are good and bad marriages, there are...
Divorce is not merely the absence of marriage. It is an affirmative relationship, especially where there are children. Like marriage it is a contract between two people. The divorce relationship, properly structured, can often mature the parties to such an extent that the second marriage for both proves successful (35, p. 4).

Thus, it is necessary to determine if a healthful resolution of troubled marriages can be determined through the use of marriage prediction tests.

Disagreement exists among researchers concerning the procedure to be used in collecting data for marriage prediction tests. Is predictive information applicable only to the premarital period or, if it is applicable at one time in a marriage, is it also predictive of a future time in the marriage (29, p. 9)? Having combined engagement adjustment scores, background information scores, and personality scores collected prior to marriage, Burgess and Wallin were able to predict the probability of marital success (7, pp. 324, 330). Burgess and Cottrell, using background information about husbands and wives to predict marital adjustment, were able to discriminate among those who were married, separated, or divorced, those who had contemplated separation or divorce, and those who had not (6, pp. 737, 746). Thus, marital success or failure can be predicted before marriage. Both Burgess and Terman also demonstrated the feasibility of predicting success or failure in marriage on the basis of information available before, but secured after, marriage (29, p. 324).
According to Locke, limiting the prediction of marital success or failure to information available in the premarital period disregards any new behaviors developed by either spouse during the marriage. He assumes that much marital behavior is the direct expression of behavior tendencies developed prior to marriage, but he also assumes that other marital behavior is the reflection of marital experiences. It is assumed that behavior tendencies are modified and developed as a result of communication within the marriage relationship and with others. He then suggests that if prediction for the early marital period is desired, premarital data should be used; if prediction is wanted after several years of marriage, then information collected during the marriage should be used (29, p. 10).

Personality traits of both spouses are relevant in the prediction of marital success or failure. It is not likely that any one single approach can furnish all relevant factors in a situation as complex as marriage. By combining the results of marital prediction tests with the findings of personality tests, greater accuracy in predicting the future marital status of a couple can be achieved. Locke comments "in view of the great attention given to personality traits in marital selection, it is somewhat surprising that they have not been systematically analyzed in research studies of happiness in marriage or in studies of marital maladjustment" (29, p. 171).
Coleman lists the major goals of personality assessment as being "(1) to ascertain personal resources, (2) to reveal typical modes of adjustment, and (3) to diagnose personality difficulties" (11, p. 397). According to Locke, some of the personality characteristics associated with marital adjustment are sociability, adaptability, a sense of responsibility, and affection, and the absence of such traits as being domineering, having a quick temper, and being easily influenced by others (29, pp. 171, 206). According to Burgess, "the factor which we have not adequately identified, either in statistical or in clinical prediction, is the characteristic of adaptability, or a capacity for problem solving (4, p. 55). Burgess and Cottrell report that

in general, happy wives are found to be secure, outgoing, optimistic, cooperative, benevolent, and conservative. Unhappy wives are found to be insecure, hostile, individualistic, assertive, and radical. Happy husbands are found to be emotionally stable, co-operative, benevolent, outgoing, responsibility-assuming and conservative. Unhappy husbands are described as neurotic, emotionally unstable, insecure, domineering, withdrawing, and radical (5, p. 173).

Johnson and Terman list as traits of happily married persons emotional stability, social adaptability, uplifting interests, and conservative tendencies, with men showing more tolerance and sympathy than women. On the other hand, they describe the characteristics of unhappily married persons as neurosis, introversion, intolerance, and volitional inadequacy. They have found that divorced women exhibit more self-reliance, independence, tolerance, initiative, and cognitive intensity
than married women, and that both divorced men and women have more intellectual interests than married persons (25, p. 311). Adams reports that men found to be tranquil, frank, and stable prior to marriage appear happier in marriage than those who were irritable, evasive, and emotional. He continues that women found to be frank, stable, and content before marriage appear to be happier in marriage than those who were evasive, unstable, and discontent (2, pp. 192-193). From these studies it is concluded that certain personality traits are characteristic of those remain married and others of those who divorce. It has been determined that certain scales of the MMPI are useful in differentiating the personality characteristics of married and divorced persons. Kirkpatrick notes that personality patterns are indicated on the MMPI, as well as diagnostic information (27, p. 476). Three MMPI scales are reviewed in the present investigation: Depression (Scale 2), Psychopathic Deviate (Scale 4), and Psychosthenia (Scale 7).

Scale 2 of the MMPI is described by Dahlstrom as a dependable measure of clinical depression, because it is extremely sensitive to the fluctuation of the mood of the testee and temporary changes in his morale. In addition to depression, persons who score high on Scale 2 are characterized as aloof, apathetic, disinterested, indifferent, with generally low morale. They show tendencies to be unexcitable, dull, evasive, and withdrawn, and, consequently, excessively
sensitive and unsociable. Being introverted and functioning at a slow personal tempo, persons scoring high on Scale 2 are indecisive, submissive, and tend to have in varying degrees feelings of uselessness, hopelessness or worthlessness. They exhibit a pessimistic outlook on life, characterized by dejection, discouragement, brooding, and a denial of happiness, i.e. a subjective distress. Frequently, their self-dissatisfaction, self-criticism and tendency to worry leads to an incapacity to perform their work satisfactorily. Those who score low on the MMPI Depression Scale, on the other hand, tend to be cheerful and enthusiastic (15, pp. 55, 57, 173, 296; 26, pp. 20-22). The characteristics of persons scoring high on Scale 2 of the MMPI, when compared to the traits of persons happily married, are counter-indications of personality patterns found in successful marriages.

Both the Depression Scale and the Psychosthenia Scale (Scale 7) on the MMPI indicate anxiety and dependency, which are "components of the group who showed adjustment through docility" (15, p. 376). High scores on Scale 2 and Scale 7 generally indicate persons who are self-deprecating and self-effacing.

Elevations on Scale 7, designed to measure Psychosthenia, indicate obsessive-compulsive behavior. High scores on Scale 7 denote unreasonable fears of things or situations, as well as over reaction to more reasonable stimuli, excessive worry and related degrees of immobilization. Persons with prominent
Scale 7 scores have difficulty concentrating, guilt feelings, and excessive vacillation in making decisions. In addition, they are described as dull, formal, unemotional, immature, quarrelsome, and generally dissatisfied. These persons frequently have excessively high standards of intellectual performance or morality, and sometimes assume an unemotional aloofness from personal conflicts. Tension and self-critical attitudes are maintained through compulsive introspective attitudes and low self-confidence, moodiness, and undue sensitivity. High Scale 7 scores also indicate schizoid tendencies (15, pp. 69-70, 199, 288, 305, 362, 375; 26, pp. 28-29). In summary, prominent Scale 7 elevations indicate inconsistency in behavior, a factor that is not complementary to a successful marriage.

Elevations on Scale 7 and Scale 4, a measure of psychopathy, together are indices of rigidity and the inability to adapt behavioral patterns (15, p. 373). A major feature of the psychopathic personality as measured by Scale 4 is an emotional shallowness in relation to others, particularly in sexual and affectional display. They tend toward an inability to form warm and therapeutically useful personal attachments. Some of the personality traits exhibited by persons with prominent Scale 4 scores are the absence of deep emotional response, inability to profit from experience, and disregard of social mores. The adjectives immature, demanding, egocentric, impulsive, careless, moody and low frustration
tolerance describe individuals with high Scale 4 elevations. Lack of a sense of responsibility and lack of appreciation of social patterns or personal and emotional loyalties are other qualities which account in part for the family difficulties frequently encountered by these persons. Those individuals with high Scale 4 scores also exhibit traits such as sociability, frankness, talkativeness, and adventurousness (20, p. 59; 26, pp. 23-24; 14, p. 481; 15, pp. 60-61).

More study of the correlation of personality characteristics and marital adjustment has been done on Scale 4 of the MMPI than on Scales 2 and 7. Adams reports "our experience has been that an individual with . . . strong psychopathic characteristics is usually unhappy in the bonds of matrimony (and often his spouse even more so)" (1, p. 58). Gilberstadt and Duker note that severe marital conflict is frequent among persons with elevations on Scale 4 because they exhibit a parasitic kind of dependency on their spouses. Few divorce, despite poor marital adjustment, apparently because spouses adopt a "nurturant, succorant, motherly attitude of sympathy and forebearance in response to a high degree of immaturity in these patients" (20, pp. 58-59), as well as strong dependency strivings. Lack of adaptability is the major characteristic of the psychopathic personality that hinders a successful marital relationship (1, p. 58). Lykken defines "the chief characteristic of primary sociopathy as the lack of normal emotional accompaniments of experience," and
his study subsequently "demonstrated the defective emotional reactivity of the primary sociopath" (32, pp. 6-10). Emotional reaction is another important personality attribute related to a successful marriage.

The combinations of personality characteristics of husbands and wives are also important in determining marital adjustment and prediction of marital success or failure. Hunnington includes three basic points in his definition of a personality-interaction approach in studying marital relationships, which are as follows:

1. The interaction of the partners, which consists of the needs of the partners which are expressed in their interactions.
2. The needs of the partners, which are aroused when they are together but are inhibited from expression in interaction.
3. The defenses of the partners, which achieve this inhibition of aroused needs (23, p. 44).

Interaction analysis, stimulated by small group theories, is increasingly being used for an understanding of the many complexities of marriage (33, p. 304). Corsini further comments that

Studies evaluating marital happiness without considering characteristics of both individuals are inadequate, entirely discounting the factor of interaction. The couple is a group, and the happiness of either can hardly be considered without taking into account the other person (13, p. 240).

Mathews and Mikanovick also support the need for interaction analysis in dealing with marital problems remarking,

... empirical trends in our data strongly suggest that the two most important areas of disturbance in
unhappy marriages concern the fulfillment of each other's needs and the kind of interaction which prevails between the spouses if basic needs are not satisfied (33, p. 304).

In addition Kirkpatrick believes that individual scores are important in analyzing marital adjustment but that it is also "desirable to score the relationship of both parties" (19, p. 7). Burgess and Cottrell calculate a joint prediction score for each of their couples (5, pp. 269-289), whereas Terman derives a separate score for husband and wife (38, pp. 358-359). Thus, according to previous research involving marital adjustment, the most thorough testing approach in predicting future marital status is that which combines both individual scores for both spouses and a couple's score, which reflects the interaction in the marriage.

Another way of studying the interaction patterns of a husband and wife has been determined by Hurvitz in a study on the Marital Roles Inventory. He describes this instrument as "... an indirect type of scale based upon the interaction of the marital roles of the spouses and which thus assesses marital adjustment rather than the personality traits associated with marital adjustment" (24, p. 377). Based on a role theory, the assumption of this inventory is that

... spouses whose rank order of role performances and role expectations are similar are adjusted in marriage while spouses whose rank order of role performances and role expectations are different are not adjusted in marriage. The difference between the rank orders a pair of spouses assign to role set is the Index of Strain (24, p. 380).
Although an interaction score is provided, it does not seem feasible to try to separate the personalities of spouses from their respective roles in their marriages.

In summary, an effective means of predicting future marital success or failure must involve, in part, the personalities of the husband and wife involved and the interaction of their personalities within the marriage. The Polyfactor test provides scores for both spouses, a total score for the couple, as well as a graph of both individual's scores in sixteen areas of marital difficulty, illustrating the interaction or lack of interaction in each area. Walker concludes that the testing method used in the Polyfactor test—the self-ratings of finished sentence completion items—is useful in detecting marriage difficulties (40, p. 51). From the review and evaluation of the previous research done in the area of marriage prediction tests, the Polyfactor test can be seen to have several improvements which may correct some of the difficulties frequently encountered in this area of testing.
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CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

Eighty Caucasian individuals, constituting forty couples, were the subjects of this investigation; all of them had terminated marriage counseling prior to the present study. The clients were tested prior to marriage counseling. On entering counseling, 81 per cent of the couples were married, and 11 per cent were separated; although the marital status of 8 per cent of the couples was not available, none had divorced at the time of testing. Twenty couples were married and living together at the conclusion of marriage counseling (Group I). The remaining twenty couples were either separated or divorced and not living together at the end of marriage counseling (Group II). The selection of subjects for Group I and Group II was made on four counselors' reports of the last known marital status for each couple. Table IV shows the qualifications of each of these four counselors and the percentage of subjects who saw each counselor for marriage counseling.
As indicated in Table IV, the professional training of these counselors covers several major specializations in mental health.

All of the couples had voluntarily sought counseling in a neuropsychiatric center, consisting of a small psychiatric hospital, a psychiatric out-patient clinic, and a psychological services center, located in Fort Worth, Texas, a large metropolitan area. The criteria used in selecting couples as subjects for this study were (1) the availability of test information for both husband and wife and (2) the termination of marriage counseling prior to this investigation.

The age range of the subjects was eighteen to fifty years, with a mean age of 31.4 years. The average length of marriage

TABLE IV
QUALIFICATIONS OF COUNSELORS AND THE PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS SEEING EACH FOR MARRIAGE COUNSELING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Professional Education</th>
<th>Years of Counseling Experience</th>
<th>Percentage of Clients Seen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>Medical doctor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>Medical doctor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Completing doctoral degree in counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Counselor</td>
<td>Doctorate in religion and pastoral counseling and full member of AAMC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the present spouse at the time of testing was 9.5 years, with a range from three months to twenty-nine years. The mean number of marriages for the clients equaled 1.2, and there was an average of 2.2 children per couple. The educational backgrounds of the subjects, according to the divisions employed by Horton and Hunt (5, p. 270), are illustrated in Table V.

**TABLE V**

**EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree; Professional</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Non-Graduate</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Non-Graduate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Non-Graduate</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the current projected educational levels for the city were not obtainable, it seems probable from these data available in Table V that these subjects represent a fairly good cross section of the general Fort Worth population.

Using the classifications found in Chinoy (2, p. 152), Table VI shows the occupational status of the subjects, as compared to the 1969 projected occupational levels for the Fort Worth metropolitan population (1, p. 48). As indicated in Table VI, the majority of the subjects from whom data were collected were in the categories of skilled workers and salaried employees. Therefore, it is clear from this data that
TABLE VI

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF THE SUBJECTS AS COMPARED TO
THE 1969 PROJECTED OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS FOR
THE FORT WORTH METROPOLITAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>City Population Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I  Major executives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (independent, 2/3; salaried, 1/3)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Business managers, executing not formulating policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried professionals</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners of businesses valued $35,000-$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Salaried, administrative, and clerical occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiprofessional and technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant supervisors and skilled workers</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>20-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV  Skilled workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty proprietors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V   Semiskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No regular occupation</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Not Available</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the subjects in this investigation represented a good cross section of the Fort Worth population.
Procedure

The data for this investigation, which were obtained from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Polyfactor Graph of Marital Difficulties (See Appendix A) for both spouses of each couple, were collected from the files of the neuropsychiatric center. The standard testing procedure, when both spouses complied, was to give them pencils, two MMPI booklets and answer sheets, and two Polyfactor Tests of Marital Difficulties (See Appendix B). They were then seated in similar but separate testing rooms to avoid one influencing the other.

The initial page of the Polyfactor test consists of personal information about the testee prior to the test instructions, including the client's full name, age, length of marriage, current marital status, number of marriages, and age and sex of children.

Instructions

All items must be completed

Step 1—Finish each sentence that has been started with whatever you wish to say. Do not leave any of the sentence stems incomplete or blank. Leaving any of the sentence stems incomplete or blank invalidates sections of the survey and this makes other sentences which you have completed much less useful.

Step 2—Answer item 86 with a brief paragraph or list.

Step 3—Read what you have written for each sentence, one sentence at a time. As you do this, make a judgement of how much difficulty this sentence represents in your marriage.
You will make this judgement by circling one of the 4 capital letters found in front of each sentence (M, S, L, N). The letters and the amount of difficulty they stand for are as follows:

- M—much difficulty
- S—some difficulty
- L—little difficulty
- N—no difficulty

Again every sentence must receive a judgement. No sentence should be left unjudged, since any sentence without one of the 4 preceding letters circled invalidates an entire section of this survey. Therefore, you must make some judgement for each sentence.

Review

1. Finish each sentence
2. Answer question 86
3. Judge every sentence with one of the 4 letters.

After you have finished this survey check over your answers and see that nothing has been left blank or incomplete (3, p. 3).

Item 86, the testee's enumeration of the best factors in his marriage, was excluded from discussion in this study, due to the subjectiveness of the evaluation involved. Each spouse was told to read the standard MMPI booklet instructions and then asked if he had any questions. There was no time limit for completing either paper and pencil test.

Following completion of both tests by the husband and the wife, the tests were scored. The MMPI was scored, profiled, and interpreted by the standards prescribed by Dahlstrom (4, pp. 3-28, pp. 43-214). The Polyfactor was scored using the standard procedure described by the test authors.

Each "M" (representing much difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored 3 points.
Each "S" (representing some difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored 2 points.
Each "L" (representing little difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored 1 point.
Each "N" (representing no difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored 0 points.
Each sentence left unjudged by the client is scored 1 point.
More than one sentence in a test factor area left unjudged invalidates the score for that area.
More than four sentences left unjudged by the client invalidates the entire test.
Each of the 17 test factor areas are tested for by 5 sentence stems.
To arrive at each area total score the husband's and the wife's score on their respective sentences representing that area are summed.
To arrive at the area difference score the lower score of the husband's and the wife's individual scores on that area is subtracted from the higher.
The husband's and the wife's scores are individually summed to arrive at the husband's total and the wife's total scores and these are then summed to arrive at the test total score.
The sum of the area total scores should equal the test total score and thus provides an arithmetical check on the scoring.
The area difference scores are summed to provide the total difference score (3, p. 5).

It is possible for each marriage partner to obtain a total marital difficulty score for each area of 15 points with 30 as the maximum score for the couple in each area.
The possible maximum score in all areas for the Polyfactor test for an individual is 255 and 510 for the couple.

At this point the area scores of both spouses were plotted on a Polyfactor graph composed of seven columns to form a profile of the marital difficulty for the couple as each spouse perceived it. The first column, titled "Areas of Difficulty," listed sixteen possible problem areas and the numbers of the test sentences, which were designed to measure the difficulty in each factor. In the same column there were
also two validation scales, one designed to assess minimization, or a tendency to de-emphasize or under rate marital problems, and a magnification scale, designed to indicate the tendency for the testee to make the problems seem worse than they may really be. The second column, designated "No Difficulty," contained the number 0. The next three columns were titled (1) "Little Difficulty," figures 1-5; (2) "Some Difficulty," figures 6-10; and (3) "Much Difficulty," figures 11-15. The Area Total Score column followed and provided the sum of both spouse's total points for each area of marital difficulty. The last column, the Difference Score, contained the score obtained as the difference between the scores of the husband and wife in each area. In addition to the three horizontal column totals at the bottom of the graph, (1) Husband's Total Score, (2) Wife's Total Score, and (3) Total Column Score, both the Area Total Score and Difference Score were totaled for all sixteen areas.

In order to determine the relationship of the Polyfactor test to an instrument capable of indicating a general pattern of personality disturbance, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (7, pp. 140-151) were calculated between the MMPI scales measuring Depression (Scale 2), Psychopathy (Scale 4), and Psychosthenia (Scale 7) and the Polyfactor test's Total Column Scores, Husband's Total Scores, and Wife's Total Scores and Difference Scores for both Group I and Group II. Four separate Fisher's t tests (6, pp. 224-225) were computed
between each of the four Polyfactor test scores to determine if there was a significant difference between the Polyfactor test scores of Group I and the Polyfactor test scores of Group II.

The four counselors were asked to rate on a continuum of one to six (See Appendix C) the present emotional healthiness of their clients as related to current marital status. The rating scale consisted of "Mostly," "Fairly," and "Mildly" categories for both the emotionally healthy and emotionally unhealthy. These counselors' ratings were correlated with each of the four Polyfactor test scores for both groups with a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. All of the statistics in this study were calculated by the North Texas State University Computer Center.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed separately for Group I (clients married and living together after marriage counseling) and Group II (persons separated or divorced and not living together following marriage counseling) among the (1) Depression Scale (Scale 2), (2) Psychopathic Deviate Scale (Scale 4) and (3) Psychosthenia Scale (Scale 7) of the MMPI; (4) counselors' ratings of the clients' emotional health as related to marital status; and the (5) Total Column Scores, (6) Husband's Total Scores, (7) Wife's Total Scores, and (8) Difference Scores of the Polyfactor test. The correlation determined if there is a relationship between maladaptive personality factors and the degree of perceived marital difficulty. The results of these Pearson product moment correlation coefficients are illustrated in Table VII for both Group I and Group II.

All of the correlations between the MMPI and the Polyfactor test are very low, and, therefore, non-significant values. This suggests that Scales 2, 4, and 7 of the MMPI do not reveal the same factors as those disclosed by the Polyfactor test. Since none of the correlations between the MMPI Scales 2, 4, and 7 and the Polyfactor test is significant for either
TABLE VII

CORRELATIONS OF THE POLYFACTOR TEST AND COUNSELORS' RATINGS WITH THE MMPI SCALES, 2, 4, AND 7 FOR GROUP I AND GROUP II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>MMPI Scales</th>
<th>Polyfactor Test and Counselors' Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Column Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0620 (NS)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2422 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.0647 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1615 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.1178 (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.2552 (NS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-significant value.

**Clients married and living together after marriage counseling.

***Clients separated or divorced and not living together following marriage counseling.

Group I or Group II, these findings demonstrate the independence of the two tests, an independence which is rather strong, judging from the near zero correlations. Thus, the MMPI scales 2, 4, and 7 are not suitable indicators of marital problems and, likewise, the Polyfactor test is not a suitable measure of personality malfunction. A further interpretation
of these results would tend to refute the idea that marital difficulties are due to personality maladjustment. In other words, the degree of marital difficulty may be more the function of factors inherent in marriage itself, rather than the particular personality traits of each spouse. For practical reasons anyone doing marital diagnosis should give separate tests measuring marital and personality functioning in order to gain a more complete overview and assessment of the total counseling situation. The very low non-significant correlations of the counselors' ratings with Scales 2, 4, and 7 of the MMPI may be interpreted as meaning that they are independent from each other, although the counselors' ratings were possibly more influenced by marital status than personal emotional health. Thus, the hypothesis that there is a relationship between the Polyfactor test and Scales 2, 4, and 7 of the MMPI is not supported.

To determine if any of the four Polyfactor test scores can be used as accurate predictors of marital status after marriage counseling, four Fisher's t-tests, the results of which are illustrated in Table VIII, are calculated between the Total Column Scores, Husband's Total Scores, Wife's Total Scores, and Difference Scores of Group I and Group II. The mean value of the Total Column Score for the clients who remained married following marriage counseling is approximately 266 points out of a possible 510, with a standard deviation of approximately 79 points. This is compared to a
TABLE VIII
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND t-VALUES FOR THE FOUR POLYFACTOR TEST SCORES OF GROUP I AND GROUP II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Polyfactor Test</th>
<th>Polyfactor Test</th>
<th>Polyfactor Test</th>
<th>Polyfactor Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Column Scores</td>
<td>Husband's Total Scores</td>
<td>Wife's Total Scores</td>
<td>Difference Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I* Mean</td>
<td>226.1000</td>
<td>98.0500</td>
<td>128.0500</td>
<td>74.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I S. D.</td>
<td>78.6167</td>
<td>49.2519</td>
<td>50.5614</td>
<td>31.4246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II** Mean</td>
<td>249.6500</td>
<td>116.5500</td>
<td>132.3500</td>
<td>60.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>-1.3425</td>
<td>1.1695</td>
<td>.2926</td>
<td>2.2949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of t</td>
<td>NS***</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Persons married and living together following marriage counseling.
**Persons separated or divorced and not living together following marriage counseling.
***Non-significant value.

mean value of approximately 250 points for the Total Column Scores of Group II, with a standard deviation of approximately 76 points. Although the separated or divorced group's average self-rating of marital difficulty is approximately 27 points higher than the married group's, the t-value of -1.34 for the Total Column Scores of the two groups is not significant. This is interpreted as meaning that the Total Column Score of the Polyfactor test cannot be successfully used to predict the success or failure of marriage, as defined by marital
status following marriage counseling, because it cannot
differentiate between persons in Group I and those in
Group II.

Also included in Table VIII is the mean value of approx-
imately 98 points out of a possible 255 points for the
Husband's Total Scores of Group I, which has a standard
deviation of approximately 49 points. The mean value of the
husband's self-ratings of marital difficulty for Group II is
approximately 116 points, with a standard deviation of about
48 points. With a difference between the means of the
Husband's Total Scores for Group I and Group II of 18 points,
the t-value of 1.16 is not significant. This result suggests
that the Husband's Total Score of the Polyfactor test cannot
be accurately used to predict marital success or failure.

Table VIII also illustrates the mean value of the wives' self-ratings of the degree of marital difficulty for Group I, which is approximately 128 points out of a possible 255 points, with a standard deviation of approximately 50 points. The average value of the Wife's Total Scores for Group II is approximately 132 points, with a standard deviation of about 39 points. There is only a 4 point difference between the mean values of the Wife's Total Scores for Group I and Group II, which results in a non-significant t-value of 0.2926. This lack of significant difference between the two groups of Wife's Total Scores is interpreted as meaning that the Wife's
Total Score of the Polyfactor test cannot be used as an accurate predictor of marital success or failure.

The mean value of the Difference Scores for Group I, which is approximately 74 points, with a standard deviation of about 31 points, is incorporated into Table VIII. The average value of the Difference Scores for Group II is approximately 60 points, with a standard deviation of 20 points. There is a 14 point difference between the average Difference Scores for Group I and Group II. A comparison of the mean values of the Difference Scores of Group I and Group II yields a $t$-value of 2.29, which is significant at the .05 level. This result may be interpreted as meaning that the Difference Score of the Polyfactor test significantly discriminates between the married clients and the separated or divorced clients and, consequently, tends to support the idea that the Difference Score can be used in successfully predicting the outcome of marriages following marriage counseling.

In conclusion, the results of this investigation point out that the Total Column Score, Husband's Total Score, and Wife's Total Score of the Polyfactor test cannot be successfully used to predict marital success or failure. The Difference Score, however, has been shown in this study to be capable of distinguishing between persons who remain married and those who do not following marriage counseling, and, therefore, is capable of successfully predicting marital status following marriage counseling. This suggests that
perhaps the amount of disagreement between spouses, or simply the lack of similar viewpoints concerning problems in marriage, is of more importance than the total amount of perceived marital difficulty. Since the hypothesis that the Polyfactor test can be used as a prediction instrument for marital success or failure is supported, due to the finding with the Difference Score, further research is merited in the area of marital prediction with the Polyfactor Test of Marital Difficulty using a much larger sample and using a criterion other than marital status, i.e. degree of happiness or adjustment in marriage.

The hypothesis that the 2, 4, and 7 Scales of the MMPI would be related to the Polyfactor test is not supported. The independence that is found between the Polyfactor test and the Depression, Psychopathic Deviate, and Psychosthenia Scales of the MMPI clearly points out that the MMPI does not measure the degree of marital difficulty, and the Polyfactor test does not measure personality adjustment. Both tests, therefore, should be included in marriage counseling, since it would be desirable for a counselor to have both assessments—one in personality variables and the other on specific marital adjustment.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this investigation was to determine (1) if the scores of the Polyfactor Test of Marital Difficulties--Total Column Score, Husband's Total Score, Wife's Total Score, and Difference Score--could be successfully used as a predictive instrument for marital success or failure and (2) if there was a relationship between the personality factors measured by the Depression Scale (Scale 2), Psychopathic Deviate Scale (Scale 4), and Psychasthenia Scale (Scale 7) of the MMPI and the four Polyfactor test scores. The Polyfactor tests' and MMPI's of eighty subjects, all of whom had completed marriage counseling prior to this study, were divided into twenty couples who were married and living together after marriage counseling (Group I) and twenty couples who were separated or divorced and not living together after marriage counseling (Group II). Four professional counselors rated on a scale of one to six the emotional health, as related to marital status, of subjects who had been former clients in marriage counseling.

Pearson \( r \) coefficients were calculated separately for Group I and Group II between MMPI Scales 2, 4, and 7 and the counselors' ratings and the four Polyfactor test scores.
Following this, four Fisher's $t$-tests were computed between the four Polyfactor test scores of Group I and Group II. It was concluded that the Total Column Score, Husband's Total Score, and Wife's Total Score of the Polyfactor test cannot be used for prediction of future marital status due to non-significant $t$-tests between the two groups. The Difference Score, however, had a $t$-value of 2.29, which was significant at the .05 level. This was interpreted as meaning that the Difference Score of the Polyfactor test can be successfully used to predict a couple's marital status following marriage counseling.

The hypothesis that Scales 2, 4, and 7 of the MMPI would correlate with the Polyfactor test was not supported. No significant correlations were found between these two measures or between counselors' ratings and the MMPI. These results were interpreted as meaning that the MMPI and the Polyfactor test are independent of each other and do not measure the same factors; consequently, the results indicate a need to use both the MMPI and the Polyfactor test in marriage counseling—the MMPI for personality assessment and the Polyfactor test to measure specific marital adjustment. The lack of relationship between the MMPI Scales 2, 4, and 7 and the Polyfactor test tends to refute the idea that marital difficulties are the result of personality malfunctioning of either or both spouses.
Because of the non-significant correlations between the counselors' ratings of emotional health as related to marital status and Scales 2, 4, and 7 of the MMPI, no conclusions could be drawn concerning the emotional health of subjects, other than the suggestion that either (1) the ratings were possibly made more on the basis of marital status than on emotional health or that (2) the range of one to six for the ratings was too narrow to allow differentiation between Group I and Group II.
### APPENDIX A

**POLYFACTOR GRAPH OF MARITAL DIFFICULTIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENTS' LAST NAME</th>
<th>COUNSELOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUSBAND'S GIVEN NAME</td>
<td>WIFE'S GIVEN NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>NO. OF MARRIAGES</td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGTH OF MARRIAGE</td>
<td>AGE &amp; SEX OF CHILDREN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>RACE:</td>
<td>SCORER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HUSBAND** x----x (Blue)  **WIFE** o-----o (Red)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF DIFFICULTY</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>LITTLE DIFFICULTY</th>
<th>SOME DIFFICULTY</th>
<th>MUCH DIFFICULTY</th>
<th>AT*</th>
<th>DF**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization (0-Scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Marriage (6-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love (11-15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatability (16-20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (21-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse (26-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self (31-35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actualization (36-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (41-45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Difficulty</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Little Difficulty</th>
<th>Some Difficulty</th>
<th>Much Difficulty</th>
<th>AT*</th>
<th>DF**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money (46-50)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (51-55)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment (56-60)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (61-65)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (66-70)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Pressure</td>
<td>(71-75) 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration (76-80)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension (81-85)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT Sc***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT Sca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Scb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Area Total Score.
**Difference Score.
***Husband’s Total Score.
aWife’s Total Score.
bTotal Column Score.
APPENDIX B

THE POLYFACTOR SENTENCE COMPLETION SURVEY
OF MARITAL DIFFICULTIES*

1. Our honeymoon was
2. The place we live in is
3. My spouse's education
4. Our hobbies are
5. Our health
6. Our marriage is
7. A marriage should not be
8. The best thing about marriage is
9. The worst thing about marriage is
10. In marriage
11. Marital love is
12. My spouse loves
13. My love
14. Our love is really
15. Can love
16. I like my spouse to
17. We both share
18. We fight about
19. My spouse wants me
20. Getting along

*Reproduced by permission of the test authors.
APPENDIX B--Continued

M S L N 21. Our sex life
M S L N 22. Sexually I
M S L N 23. Sex with my spouse
M S L N 24. With sex one should
M S L N 25. About sex I wonder
M S L N 26. My spouse is
M S L N 27. My spouse really makes me feel
M S L N 28. My spouse and I
M S L N 29. My spouse treats me
M S L N 30. Why can't my spouse
M S L N 31. To my spouse I
M S L N 32. With my spouse I can
M S L N 33. With my spouse I can't
M S L N 34. I am really
M S L N 35. I wonder if I
M S L N 36. To feel a personal freedom
M S L N 37. In marriage our best
M S L N 38. I contribute
M S L N 39. The rewards of marriage
M S L N 40. Can fulfillment
M S L N 41. Children are
M S L N 42. A child needs
M S L N 43. My spouse feels toward children
M S L N 44. My feelings toward children
M S L N 45. Can children
APPENDIX B--Continued

M S L N 46. Money is
M S L N 47. Our finances are
M S L N 48. Our debts
M S L N 49. Managing our money
M S L N 50. When we have money troubles
M S L N 51. God
M S L N 52. The Church
M S L N 53. To me religion
M S L N 54. To my spouse religion
M S L N 55. In religion I wonder
M S L N 56. I need
M S L N 57. My spouse needs
M S L N 58. The marriage requires
M S L N 59. Our needs are
M S L N 60. We both seem to need
M S L N 61. When my spouse and I talk
M S L N 62. Our communications are
M S L N 63. I feel I can say
M S L N 64. Talking is
M S L N 65. To really communicate
M S L N 66. Others
M S L N 67. Relatives
M S L N 68. Another person
M S L N 69. Some people
APPENDIX B—Continued

MSLN 70. One person
MSLN 71. If it were not for
MSLN 72. My spouse's job
MSLN 73. My job
MSLN 74. Outside the home
MSLN 75. Pressures come from
MSLN 76. I really want
MSLN 77. The reason we can't
MSLN 78. My hopes are
MSLN 79. My persistence
MSLN 80. I don't want
MSLN 81. Divorce
MSLN 82. We will always
MSLN 83. In the future
MSLN 84. I expect we are going to
MSLN 85. Sooner or later
APPENDIX B--Continued

MSLN 86. Please use the rest of this page to write an analysis of what you think are the best factors in your marriage. You may say anything you wish. Finish this question before you judge the sentences you have already completed.
APPENDIX C

COUNSELORS' RATING SHEET

Dr. __________:

Below are clients whom you have previously seen. Please rate on a continuum the emotional health of the individuals below. The basic question involved in the ratings you are about to make is "Do you consider the present marriage, separation or divorce healthy or unhealthy for that individual?"

This rating will be done on a continuum from one to six. The rating numbers stand for:

- 1—mostly unhealthy
- 2—fairly unhealthy
- 3—mildly unhealthy
- 4—mildly healthy
- 5—fairly healthy
- 6—mostly healthy

"Healthy" includes the concepts of increasingly better personal adjustment in the client's home situation, improving self-attitudes, and increased self-actualization with an increased felt sense of personal well-being.

"Unhealthy" includes the concept of feeling defeat in goals significant to the individual in which his home situation is contributing little to decrease these attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Unhealthy</th>
<th>Healthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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