COMPARISON OF THE VERIFICATION SCALES OF A SELF-PATING
SENTENCE COMPLETION METHOD FOR EVALUATING MARITAL
DIFFICULTIES AND THE MMPI VALIDITY SCALES

APPROVED:

[Signatures]

Jack R. Hayes
Major Professor

[Signatures]

Minor Professor

[Signatures]

Director of the Department of Psychology

[Signatures]

Dean of the Graduate School
COMPARISON OF THE VERIFICATION SCALES OF A SELF-RATING SENTENCE COMPLETION METHOD FOR EVALUATING MARITAL DIFFICULTIES AND THE MMPI VALIDITY SCALES

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Dwight Lamon Young, B.A.
Denton, Texas
August, 1970
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Education Levels and Corresponding Percentages of the Sample</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Occupational Levels and Corresponding Percentages of the Sample</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficients for the MMPI Validity Scales and the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and Mag.-Scale</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Mean Score and Standard Deviation for Each of the MMPI Validity Scales and the Polyfactor Verification Scales</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reviewing different methods of evaluating degrees of marital difficulty, there is considerable discussion devoted to the validity and reliability of such measures. Examinee manipulation, examinee antagonism, and differential motivation are examples of the type of variables that could have an effect on both reliability and validity (Rollins, 1961). The attitude with which the client takes a test, his response set, can confound the results and therefore have a considerable effect on the reliability and validity of that test. Skidmore and McPhee (1951) emphasize the importance of knowing if the test really measures what it purports to measure; however, Frumkin (1953) suggests that it is equally important to know that the test is measuring faithfully whatever it is that the test measures. As Sundberg and Tyler (1962) stated, "in evaluating and interpreting tests, it is important to become aware of everything that may affect the results we obtain from their use." Such a philosophy would necessitate clearly identifying a person's way of going about taking a test since knowing his response style would aid in the interpretation of him as a person (Sundberg & Tyler, 1962). A response style which disguises the way the person really sees himself could influence not only construct validity but predictive
validity as well. Since a response style may be a transient set, it could affect the coefficient of stability for a test thereby distorting the reliability of that test. In view of the fact that a study involving response styles on marriage tests may actually be dealing with the test's validity and reliability, the term verification is being used to denote that both properties are at least indirectly being considered. Jackson and Messick (1958) suggest that it is difficult to interpret self-reports as if their face content were true when response style may have considerable effect on the reports. The problems were clarified in Cronbach's discussion of response style.

In any interview of personalities, the psychologist appeals for cooperation and employs his skill as best he can to produce rapport. But rapport is a complex interpersonal relationship, depending on many factors other than the tester's technique. Never may the tester safely assume that he has established the ideal relationship which will cause the subject to want to tell 'the whole truth'. The tester's choice of questions and his subtle modification of the testing situation may cause the subject to shift back and forth from concealing to confessing, but there is little chance that he will come to rest on objectivity (1960, p. 449).

Adams (1950, p. 57) supports Cronbach by saying that "the average subject, whether consciously to protect others' opinions of him or unconsciously to bolster his own estimation of himself, will frequently present an overfavorable picture of himself...." Therefore, there is a considerable need for a method of evaluating marital difficulties which includes some measure of the response style that the client may be
using. As Ellis (1946) suggests, a scale of this type would help reduce the problem of "false positives" and "false negatives" that the counselor must deal with in his attempt to help married couples reach a better adjustment.

Why is there a need for a method of evaluating marital difficulties? Burgess effectively listed the advantages in his paper on the topic.

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 sacred for the counselor and the person counseled by eliminating certain points that then need not to be covered in an interview.
3. The schedule 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 overstress in his analysis of a case.
5. The prediction that may be made for 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 the 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 (1950, p. 54).

Another point to consider is the fact that clinical prediction takes more time than evaluations made from schedules, and no studies have shown the clinical predictions to be superior to evaluations made from schedules. Skidmore and McPhee (1951) have shown the practical use of marriage evaluation schedules. If a marriage test in any way aids in evaluating marital problems, then that test can be useful
to the counselor (Terain & Wallin, 1939). Even, Ellis (1948, p. 2), a strong critic of such tests, admits the "enormous practical value" that a schedule design to explore problems in marriage would have.

There are a number of disadvantages involved in using marriage tests. Termin and Wallin (1949) have studied the validity and reliability of these tests and suggest that the troublesome question can eventually be solved. In the interim, they support the careful use of marriage schedules. This is a reversal of a view that Termin and Wallin reported in an earlier report (1939). Skidmore (1951) further expands the question of validity by suggesting that factors in marriage tests are not fully validated as being important in marital adjustment. After reviewing the literature on marriage tests, Walker (1969) concluded that there was reason for serious concern in regard to the reliability, predictive validity, concurrent validity, and face validity of the existing methods of evaluating marital difficulties. Burgess also listed the following disadvantages:

1. The results of the test of an individual couple are evaluated by comparing them with mass statistical findings of large groups of couples.
2. Statistical prediction does not take into consideration the dynamic factors of the marriage which could be discovered in the clinical interview.
3. For nondirective counselors, results of marriage tests would tend to lead to a directive type of counseling in dealing with a couple following testing (1950, p. 55).

In regard to the second disadvantage Burgess listed above, Sundberg and Tyler (1962) counsel that a client's behavior
in the clinician's presence is often very different from his actions elsewhere. Adams (1950) agrees that to help a client deal more effectively with his marital problems, a knowledge of what the client is like away from the office is necessary providing there is a difference in the client's behavior at the counselor's office and away from it.

Several studies show that an individual can influence the outcome of any schedule if he is motivated to do so (Ellis, 1948; Rollins, 1961; Wesman, 1952). Cronbach (1960) pointed out that "General response styles obscure descriptive information," and that there is a need for a way to detect some of the more common response styles. This would help to combat at least some of the questions of verification so often asked concerning tests of marriage difficulties.

Currently there are no published tests for evaluating marital difficulties that have a scale or scales to measure the degree and direction of any type of response set that might influence the results a counselor would obtain through these scales (Buros, 1965). The need for such a test was the purpose for the inclusion of the verification scales in the Polyfactor Test of Marital Difficulties, referred to as the Polyfactor. The Polyfactor is essentially a sentence-completion projective test combined with a self-rating method of evaluating marriage difficulties which enables the counselor to objectively score the test (Walker, 1969). (See Appendix A.)
The Polyfactor can be scaled to reveal the subject's ratings in sixteen problem areas, and two verification scales. The eighteen scores are rated on the Polyfactor Graph of Marital Difficulties. The graph displays the area scores and the difference scores for the couple. The "little", "some", and "much difficulty" ratings yield column scores for the individual and couple. The Magnification and Minimization scales are scored separately on the graph.

Walker (1969, p. 2) operationally defined self-rating, sentence completion "as a sentence stem which the clients complete and then make a much, some, little, or none rating of the marital difficulties projected in that sentence."

Bonney and Hampleman defined a self-rating scale as the following:

....a special kind of check list in which the items or characteristics checked must be rated quantitatively according to the degree of presence or absence of a trait, the degree of perfection of a skill or the degree of completion of a task (Bonney and Hampleman, 1962, p. 19).

Rating scales have proven to be both practical and reliable, with a relatively high degree of validity (Burgess & Cottrell, 1936; Bonney & Hampleman, 1962). In regard to the sentence completion technique Bonney and Hampleman propose these ideas:

....each subject will project various aspects of himself into his completed sentence. The extent to which his responses actually do reflect his attitudes, fears, or desires depends primarily upon his spontaneity and his willingness to cooperate wholeheartedly with the examiner and the test situation (1962, p. 54).
There are some problems with self rating techniques. The competency and objectivity of the rater needs to be considered in each case (Bonney & Hampleman, 1962). Also, Hahn and MacLean warn against these tendencies:

a. Raters tend to rate own sex high on desirable traits and low on undesirable ones.
b. Men are more lenient raters than women.
c. Two ratings by the same rater are no more valid than one....
d. Self-ratings tend to be high on desirable traits and low on undesirable ones.
e. In doing self-ratings, superior people tend to underestimate, and inferior people overestimate, themselves. Inferior people are less accurate in their self ratings (1950, p. 163).

Over twenty years ago, Terman and Wallin (1949) wrote of the need for such an objectively scored, projective technique as the Polyfactor. The idea that a test was needed that wouldn't appear to be such a direct confrontation to the client is supported by Cronbach (1960).

Even in the face of improved testing techniques that will develop in the coming years, the counselor is still troubled by the same question concerning how dedicated his client was to disclosing as accurately as possible the picture he was capable of presenting. Several authors in the field see the problem of verifying just how concerned the client was with this picture presentation as being quite significant (Ellis, 1948; Terman, 1949; Adams, 1950; Cronbach, 1960; Bonney, 1962). Therefore, Cookerly and Foster (1967) included in the Polyfactor two scales designed to measure the degree and direction of one of the most common response styles.
This is the response style both Cronbach (1960) and Ellis (1948) discussed as being so prominent in testing situations involving personality or relationship schedules such as marriage tests. The proclivity to answer in extremes has been noted repeatedly and it is seen as a significant variable to identify by Adams (1950). The two scales designed to detect this tendency to answer in extremes on the Polyfactor are the Minimization Scale (Min.-Scale) and the Magnification Scale (Mag.-Scale).

The Min.-Scale is designed to indicate to what degree the subject is under-emphasizing or minimizing the problems in his marriage while the Mag.-Scale is intended to show to what degree the subject is over-emphasizing, or magnifying the problems in his marriage.

The Min.-Score is obtained by summing the total number of zeros the subject has rated on the sixteen problem areas, which include questions six through eighty-five on the Polyfactor, each area consisting of five questions. The maximum Min.-Score then is sixteen. The Min.-Score is designed to detect extreme defensiveness on the part of the client when revealing information concerning his marriage or rather his contribution and view of the marriage. The problem areas covered by the Polyfactor are so diverse that it is highly unlikely that a client would ever rate over two or three of the areas as absolutely "no trouble" if the marriage was in such a state that the client was seeking professional help.
Proneness to under-emphasize problem areas is seen as comparable to the L (Lie) Scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). The L scale is based on "some test items so worded that a person who denies having these symptoms is almost certainly not evaluating himself frankly" (Cronbach, 1960, p. 471). The counselor can determine how trustworthy the client's responses are by counting the number of improbable answers that the client chooses on the L scale. The amount of trust the counselor can place in the client's responses is inversely related to the number of "true" answers chosen on the L scale. "Faking good" can sometimes be detected by this scale, but sophisticated subjects can often avoid detection (Cronbach, 1960).

The MMPI K scale is based on a theory similar to that of the Polyfactor Min.-Scale. The K scale is supposed to determine to what degree the client is presenting a "plus-getting" response style showing a defensive denial of symptoms. The key was made to detect an "all is well" facade and therefore reduce the number of misses (Cronbach, 1960). Dicken (1967) recognizes the existence of a detectible acquiescence response style in the MMPI. Glayd and Zimmerman (1967) also give evidence of the detectibility of a favorable response style through the MMPI validity scales.

The Magnification Score (Mag.-Score) consists of the subject's self rating on questions one through five. The maximum rating for the Mag.-Score is fifteen. Cookerly and
Foster (1967) assume that the subject matter embraced by the five questions in the Mag.-Scale section is so widely dispersed that it is unlikely that more than two sentences would be rated highly. The sentence stems in the Mag.-Scale sound as though they may be in the present tense in relation to the marital relationship, but they are usually in the past tense. The "in the past" quality of the sentence stems lessens the likelihood that the areas the sentences cover would be rated as "much difficulty" on the Polyfactor. Hence, a score higher than six on the Mag.-Scale would signify that the client is reacting in the extreme either consciously or unconsciously in an attempt to make his marriage look as bad as possible (Cookerly and Foster, 1967).

The F scale of the MMPI is intended to reveal a response style of extremism as is the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale and is composed of responses given only infrequently. Because rare responses are usually unfavorable self descriptions, a high F score denotes that a subject has attempted to fake a bad record, providing he understood the directions of the test correctly (Cronbach, 1960).

The MMPI K scale also compares with the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale in that it is supposed to reveal a "plus-getting" attitude that a person may exhibit by complete frankness or self-deprecation which would make his response patterns appear abnormal. Both the K scale and the Mag.-Scale are aimed at reducing the number of false positives found in the
testing situation (Cronbach, 1960). Meehle and Hathaway (1946) found that the K scale revealed the "obviously bad" and the "obviously not bad" extremes in certain personalities.

Like the MMPI K scale and the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale, the Kuder interest inventory has a special verification score, which is obtained by counting the subject's responses to certain items rarely chosen. A high score on the Kuder verification scale conveys that the client did not give the questions adequate consideration (Cronbach, 1960).

There is evidence that suggests that the values of the MMPI validity scales for an individual may well reflect a "personological variance", and as such, this response pattern can be studied as a factor of that person's personality (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1960). The supposition that possibly the Polyfactor could be used as a test of marital difficulties perhaps with the added advantage of having scales to determine directional and degree of misleading response styles is tentatively suggested. A favorable comparison between the MMPI validity scales and the Polyfactor verification scales established through a statistically significant positive correlation among the individual scales would lend some support to the supposition suggested above.

Locke and Wallace (1959) postulate that a short test can be as reliable and valid as a long test if the questions used in the short form are carefully selected. This idea, coupled with Termin's (1939) theory that the "halo effect"
of a response style is pervasive in all communications concerning the marital relationship leads support to the assumption that there is a high correlation between the MMPI validity scales and the Polyfactor verification scales. Due to the fact that both tests were given at the same time and, as far as the client was concerned, for the same purpose, there is real reason to believe that the "halo effect" would be present.

In light of the preceding information the following hypotheses were formulated for study.

**Hypothesis 1**

There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the score on the Magnification Scale of the Polyfactor Sentence Completion Survey of Marital Difficulties and the score on the L scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

**Hypothesis 2**

There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the score on the Polyfactor Magnification Scale and the score on the F scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

**Hypothesis 3**

There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the score on the Polyfactor Magnification Scale and the score on the K scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.
Hypothesis 4
There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the score on the Minimization Scale of the Polyfactor Sentence Completion Survey of Marital Difficulties and the score on the L scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Hypothesis 5
There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the score on the Polyfactor Minimization Scale and the score on the L scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Hypothesis 6
There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the score on the Polyfactor Minimization Scale and the score on the K scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Method

Subjects
The subjects were 274 individuals who made up the total population of all those persons who had been administered both a Polyfactor and a MMPI as of March 1, 1970. The subjects had voluntarily sought help from a psychiatric out-patient clinic and a related psychological services center, both of which are
divisions of a privately sponsored neuropsychiatric center and hospital in a southwestern metropolitan city.

The population consisted of 100 males which made up 36% of the sample and 17½ females which made up 64% of the sample. The mean age of the population was 34 years of age. The age range was from 17 years old to 60 years of age. Table 1 presents the level of education analysis for the subjects who participated in the study.

**TABLE 1**

**EDUCATION LEVELS AND CORRESPONDING PERCENTAGES OF THE SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: Nongraduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highschool: Nongraduate</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highschool: Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Nongraduate</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the occupational classifications of the population.
TABLE 2
OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS AND CORRESPONDING PERCENTAGES OF THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Levels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Major Executives; Professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Business managers, executing not formulating policy; Salaried Professionals;</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners of businesses valued $35,000-$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Salaried, administrative, and clerical occupations; Small business owners;</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional and technicians; Plant supervisors and skilled workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Skilled workers; Semi-skilled workers; Clerical and Sales employees; Petty</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Semi-skilled; Unskilled; No regular occupation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Housewife</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Unknown</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information reported by the subjects indicated that 31 or 11.3% of the population were separated and the remaining 243 or 88.7% of the subjects were married and living together. The mean length of the marriages was 10.8 years with a range of 1 week to 36 years. The mean number of marriages, represented by the population, was 1.4 per person with a range of 1 to 6 marriages.
The mean number of children in each household was 2.4 with a range from one child to eleven children. At the time of testing 42.4 percent of the population was seeing a psychologist, with the remaining 57.6 percent seeing a psychiatrist.

**Instruments**

The instruments consisted of the L (Lie), K and F Scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Minimization Scale (Min.-Scale) and Magnification Scale (Mag.-Scale) of the Polyfactor Test of Marital Difficulties (Polyfactor). The Polyfactor Graph of Marital Difficulties and a standard Clinic Information Form were also used in the study along with the MMPI Profile and Case Summary Sheet.

**Procedure**

Each subject was taken to a testing room and given an MMPI booklet and answer sheet. Following the standard instructions for the MMPI, the subjects were given the Polyfactor and asked to fill out the information at the top of the page which consisted of questions concerning the subject's full name, age, length of marriage, current marital status, number of marriages and age and sex of children. Under the information section of the Polyfactor is the standardized instruction section (See Appendix A). No time limit was given for completing the test.
Following the completion of both tests the MMPI was scored in the standard manner and profiled. The scorer was careful to fill in the information section on the MMPI Profile and Case Summary and gave special attention to the occupation and education questions. This information was available to the scorer through the Patient Information Form which every new patient that came to the clinic was required to complete.

The Polyfactor was scored according to standard instructions prescribed by the test authors.

Each "M" (representing much difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored three points.

Each "S" (representing some difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored two points.

Each "L" (representing little difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored one point.

Each "N" (representing no difficulty) which has been circled by the client is scored zero points.

Each sentence left unjudged by the client is scored one 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 seventeen test factor areas are tested for by five sentence stems. To arrive at each factor total score, the sum of the subject's ratings to the five sentence stems corresponding to that factor is found.

The Min.-Score equals the number of zeros rated by the subject on the last sixteen factors of the test (Cookerly and Foster, 1967).
After both tests were scored, the data was transcribed onto a master list of all subjects which allowed a quick review of the information on each subject. This information consisted of the subject's name, sex, age, education level, occupation, marital status, number of marriages, length of marriage, number of children, MMPI L, F and K score, and the Polyfactor Min.-Score and Mag.-Score. The list also included what psychologist or psychiatrist the subject was seeing.

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was computed for the following scales: MMPI L scale and the Polyfactor Min.-Scale; MMPI L scale and the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale; MMPI F scale and the Polyfactor Min.-Scale; MMPI F scale and the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale; MMPI K scale and the Polyfactor Min.-Scale; MMPI K scale and the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale.

Results

Table 3 presents the coefficients for the six correlations listed above. The only correlations that were significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMPI Validity Scales</th>
<th>Min.-Scale</th>
<th>Mag.-Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.2333*</td>
<td>-.0678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.1089</td>
<td>.1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>.1685*</td>
<td>-.0878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05
at the .05 level were between the Polyfactor Min.-Scale scores and the MMPI L and K scale scores. Table 4 presents the mean score and standard deviation of each scale for both the Polyfactor and the MMPI.

**TABLE 4**

MEAN SCORE AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR EACH OF THE MMPI VALIDITY SCALES AND THE POLYFACTOR VERIFICATION SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMPI L</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI F</td>
<td>59.82</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI K</td>
<td>51.49</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyfactor Minimization</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyfactor Magnification</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Hypothesis 1, stating that there would be a statistically significant positive correlation between the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale and the MMPI L Scale was rejected owing to the fact that the correlation did not meet the level of significance specified in the study. The non-significance of the results concerning these two scales may suggest that when subjects overtly lie they tend to do so only in the direction of underestimation rather than overestimation.
Hypothesis 2 had to be rejected since the correlation between the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale and the MMPI F Scale was non-significant. A variable to be considered in the absence of a significant correlation between these two scales is the possibility that the population was abnormally sick. Dahlstrom and Welsh (1965) point out, for example, that a schizophrenic reaction may cause the F scale to be high. The Polyfactor verification scales were not designed to identify reaction formations which might not be related to an extremism response set. Therefore, a condition such as schizophrenia might cause the F scale to be high without a corresponding rise in the Mag.-Scale. In view of the fact that many of the subjects in the study were in-patients at a neuropsychiatric hospital, there might have been enough clients with emotional problems so extreme in nature that their responses confounded the results. This would suggest that the study be repeated with an attempt being made to eliminate high scores that are a result of severe emotional disturbances.

Hypothesis 3, as with 1 and 2, had to be rejected since the correlation between the Polyfactor Mag.-Scale and the MMPI K scale was non-significant. This indicates that possibly a person may underemphasize a problem on the Polyfactor making the Mag.-Scale score low while the same response style could cause the K score to rise. This would have probably produced an inverse relationship had a relationship between the two scales existed.
Hypothesis 4 was accepted since there was a significant correlation between the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and the MMPI L Scale. The Pearson correlation of .23 was significant at the .05 level indicating a definite but small relationship. Ferguson (1966) explains that when the correlation equals .23 the variance of one scale accounts for a little over five percent of the variance of the other scale. The findings denote the possibility that the Min.-Scale, like the L scale, may in fact be detecting some of the clients who attempt to present an unusually good front. Further refinement and investigation of the Min.-Scale does seem warranted by the results.

Hypothesis 5 was rejected owing to the non-significant correlation between the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and the MMPI F Scale. Further evaluation of the presumptions on which the Min.-Scale are based combined with the information concerning the MMPI F scale provided by Dahlstrom and Welsh (1965) offers some explanation of the lack of significant results.

The MMPI F scale is designed to detect a "faking bad" response style, a lack of understanding of the instructions, or, as mentioned earlier, a severe psychological disturbance. The result of any one of these three behavior patterns would yield a high F scale score. A "faking bad" response style would cause the Min.-Scale score to be low. Failure to understand the directions and severe psychological disturbances would probably have no consistent effect on the results.
Therefore, if any relationship existed between the F scale and the Min.-Scale, it would probably be inversely correlated as opposed to the hypothesized relationship.

Hypothesis 6 was accepted, with the results suggesting a slight, limited relationship between the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and the MMPI K Scale. A Pearson correlation of .16 was significant at the .05 level which indicated that the variance of one scale accounted for almost three percent of the variance of the other scale (Ferguson, 1966). The evidence lends some support to the supposition that the Min.-Scale could, with further refinement, detect (1) a client's attempt to place himself in a good light, (2) a client's defensiveness, or (3) his tendency toward guardedness as the MMPI K scale does in fact measure (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1965).

The lack of a significant relation between the MMPI F scale and both the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and the Mag.-Scale may be due to the subjects who took part in the study. As opposed to a possibility suggested earlier concerning the client's psychological health, the findings might indicate that the population may have experienced the testing situation with a normal and cooperative attitude since the F scale tends to be high if the client fails to understand the instructions, is uncooperative, or is schizoid, and hence not likely to get married in the first place. The F scale is also high if the client has a tendency to present himself in a bad light which
is something seldom done on a marriage test. One may present the relationship as extremely bad but rarely will he present himself as being bad when taking a marriage test.

Computations of the data which were not originally considered important to the study show a great similarity between the correlations of the MMPI F and K Scales and the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and Mag.-Scale. Both correlations were statistically significant negative correlations at the .05 level. This may indicate that the Min.-Scale and the Mag.-Scale are measuring opposite tendencies as they were intended to do. The following facts lend some support to the aforementioned supposition: (1) the Min.-Scale was positively correlated with the L and K scales, (2) the Mag.-Scale was negatively correlated with the L and K scales, (3) the Min.-Scale was negatively correlated with the MMPI F scale, and (4) the Mag.-Scale was positively correlated with the F scale.

An important aspect that should be considered in regard to the results of the study is the possibility that an individual might not respond to two different tests with the same response style, at least not to the same degree. Support for this possibility is expressed by Cronbach (1960, p. 372) when he states: "a response style is a habit of momentary set which causes the subject to earn a different score from the one he would earn if the same items were presented in a different form." This could mean the assumption that there would be a response generalization from the MMPI to the Polyfactor might be unfounded, explaining non-existent and low correlations.
Sundberg and Tyler suggest the following consideration concerning the practical application of the data:

The projective hypothesis which states that a person projects into an ambiguous situation his own personal needs and wishes now begins to be seen as constituting only one way of interpreting his responses. Further problems arise when we start raising questions about how safely these responses may be used as a basis for generalizing to his actions in everyday life (1962, p. 142).

Abt and Leopold (1959) state that a test designed to disclose individual variations is necessary for a complete picture of the person even if it means some decrease in reliability and validity.

Ideally, in a testing situation, the client's understanding of the test and his interest in presenting a faithful picture of himself would correspond equally to the examiner's attempt to know him so that the final psychological report would not surprise either of them (Campbell, 1957). However, until such understanding and trust can be reached between client and counselor, further attempts to perfect scales such as the Polyfactor Verification Scales could be considered difficult.

Summary

Response styles and their confounding effects on test results were presented as a major problem in evaluating marital difficulties. The problem was pictured as secondary relative to the other validity and reliability difficulties
complicating the use of marriage tests. A review of the literature revealed no published marriage test that had a scale to detect these deceptive response styles. The term verification was used to denote a variable that affects both validity and reliability. The benefits that a verification scale would offer to a testing situation were discussed.

The Polyfactor Test of Marital Difficulties was introduced as a self-rating, sentence completion method of evaluating marital problems. The test was reported to have the capability of detecting the most common response style, that of answering in extremes by presenting the status of a relationship as being either very good or very bad. The Polyfactor verification scales consist of the Minimization scale (Min.-Scale) and the Magnification scale (Mag.-Scale). The Min.-Scale was described as being able to detect a client's attempt to underemphasize problems while the Mag.-Scale was designed to determine overemphasis of problems. A comparison was made between the Polyfactor verification scales and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) L, F, and K, scales suggesting that they may measure the same response behavior.

Six hypotheses were suggested stating that there would be a statistically significant positive correlation between each of the Polyfactor scales and the three MMPI Validity Scales. The method of study consisted of correlating the scores of each of the Polyfactor scales with each of the
MMPI scales using the Pearson Product-moment correlation. The subjects in the study were either in-patients or out-patients at a privately owned neuropsychiatric hospital and center. There were 274 subjects, making up the entire population of patients who had taken both the Polyfactor and MMPI at the time of the study. The results indicated only two significant correlations.

The hypothesis suggesting a significant relationship between the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and the MMPI L scale was accepted, as was the hypothesis suggesting a significant relationship between the Polyfactor Min.-Scale and the MMPI K scale. Both of these correlations were significant at the .05 level. The meaning of the results were discussed suggesting that the Polyfactor verification scales did partially fulfill their purpose in that the Min.-Scale did seem to detect some attempts at underemphasizing as a response style.

The evidence seems to support the practicality of the refinement of such a verification scale, although at present, the Polyfactor verification scale does not fulfill the need for a test of marital difficulties with scales to detect response styles. It is suggested that a similar study be carried out controlling for the effects of extremely emotionally disturbed personalities on the test results.
APPENDIX A

THE POLYFACTOR SENTENCE COMPLETION SURVEY
OF MARITAL DIFFICULTIES

FULL NAME. Mr., Mrs., _____________________________AGE___
LENGTH OF MARRIAGE. __________ CURRENT MARITAL STATUS____
NO. OF MARRIAGES. ______ AGE & SEX OF CHILDREN. __________
_________________________________ DATE ________________

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 items incomplete or blank. Leaving any of the sentence items 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 judgment of how much difficulty this sentence represents in your marriage.

You will make this judgment 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      L - little difficulty
S - some difficulty      N - no difficulty
APPENDIX A--continued

Again every sentence must receive a judgment. 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 judgments 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.

THE POLYFACTOR SENTENCE COMPLETION SURVEY
OF MARITAL DIFFICULTIES

M S L N 1. Our honeymoon was
M S L N 2. The place we live in is
M S L N 3. My spouse's education
M S L N 4. Our hobbies are
M S L N 5. Our health
M S L N 6. Our marriage is
M S L N 7. A marriage should not be
M S L N 8. The best thing about marriage is
M S L N 9. The worst thing about marriage is
M S L N 10. In marriage
M S L N 11. Marital love is
M S L N 12. My spouse loves
APPENDIX A—continued

M S L N 13. My love
M S L N 14. Our love is really
M S L N 15. Can love
M S L N 16. I like my spouse to
M S L N 17. We both share
M S L N 18. We fight about
M S L N 19. My spouse wants me
M S L N 20. Getting along
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 3½. I am really
M S L N 35. I wonder if I
M S L N 36. To feel a personal freedom
APPENDIX A—continued

37. In marriage our best
38. I contribute
39. The rewards of marriage
40. Can fulfillment
41. Children are
42. A child needs
43. My spouse feels toward children
44. My feelings toward children
45. Can children
46. Money is
47. Our finances are
48. Our debts
49. Managing our money
50. When we have money troubles
51. God
52. The Church
53. To me religion
54. To my spouse religion
55. In religion I wonder
56. I need
57. My spouse needs
58. The marriage requires
59. Our needs are
60. We both seem to need
When my spouse and I talk
Our communications are
I feel I can say
Talking is
To really communicate
Others
 Relatives
Another person
Some people
One person
If it were not for
My spouse's job
My job
Outside the home
Pressures come from
I really want
The reason we can't
My hopes are
My persistence
I don't want
Divorce
We will always
In the future
I expect we are going to
APPENDIX A--continued

MSLN 85. Sooner or later

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.
References


Burgess, E. W., The value and limitations of marriage prediction tests, Marriage and Family Living, 1950, 12 (Spring), 54-55.


Locke, J. J., & Wallace, K. M., Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity, Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21 (8), 251-255.


Talbert, R. H., Cowtown-Metropolis. Fort Worth: Leo Potishman Foundation, Texas Christian University, 1956.


