VALUE SIMILARITY AND DOGMATISM AS RELATED TO MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF COUPLES IN THERAPY

BY

RUTH BRANDT

Bachelor of Science
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
1955

Master of Education
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma
1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1987

VALUE SIMILARITY AND DOGMATISM AS RELATED TO MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF COUPLES IN THERAPY

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the guidance and direction of my chairman, Dr. Al Carlozzi, who has been generous with his time and encouragement. My statistical advisor and committee member, Katye Perry, lent valuable assistance to my formulation and interpretation of the data for this study. I would also like to thank Dr. Brent Snow, Dr. Judith Dobson, and Dr. Ken Kiser for serving as committee members and contribution of time and effort to this endeavor.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Curtis Stucky-Abbott and the staff at HCA Center for Counseling and Psychotherapy for not only assisting in the data collection, but also for moral support and encouragement throughout the writing of this study. Other therapists who also helped in collecting data were Dr. Stewart R. Beasley, Dr. Lucien Rose, Dr. Freda Jones, and Janelle Moore. In particular, I would like to thank my friends, Rev. Karl Kling and Rachel Boggess, for their wonderful encouragement as they helped with scoring the Opinion Survey and uniquely served as my cheering section when I needed it the most.

Thanks are also due Ross Atkinson for his help with the computer analysis and to Lori Cauthen for her secretarial skills in typing this study. I also want to acknowledge the anonymous couples who took the time to complete the questionnaires for the data.

This study is dedicated to my mother; my son, Steve; and my daughter, Debbie; who have always believed I could complete the task and who have given me their love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Society in the 1980s is changing rapidly (Stuart, 1980). Stuart posits that the institution of marriage is in great flux and is characterized by the incidence of a rising divorce rate which is a problem of increasing public and professional concern. The pairing male-female relationship is, perhaps, the most prevalent and enduring dyadic association in human history. While it has shown both stability and persistence over time, the dynamics of the marital relationship has changed profoundly in recent decades (Lupri & Frideres, 1981). A century ago, only one divorce for every 32 marriages was reported, while current figures indicate almost one of two marriages today will end in divorce and the figures for re-marriages are almost as high (United States Bureau of the Census, 1985).

While the rate for divorces has steadily increased over the decades, the marriage rate has remained relatively stable (Stuart, 1980) indicating marriage is as popular today as it ever has been. According the United States Bureau of the Census, there has been a slight increase in the marriage rate per thousand in 1981 (10.6) contrasted with the marriage rate per thousand in 1960 (8.5) indicating a consistent number of Americans are marrying each year. The divorce rate; however, has risen dramatically from 1961 (2.2) to 1981 (5.3). A poll conducted by ABC news (De Boer, 1981) reported that 72% of those interviewed believe the divorce rate will continue to rise. In spite of this rise in the incidence of divorce, Stuart proposes that all but 3% or 4% of the adult population will marry during their lifetime, indicating marriages are here to stay despite rising dissolution rates.

As the impact of the rising divorce rate is felt throughout society, families strive to cope with the adjustments involved in marital instability (Stuart, 1980). The dramatic change in the marital stability of the population has implications for marriage and family educators, researchers, therapists, and counselors (Spanier & Glick, 1981). The continuance of research of the dynamics of marital relationships seems not only appropriate but imperative.

The behavioral and social sciences have long sought to explain the causes of marital instability and the dynamics of marital relationships (Landau, 1984). Despite a multitude of studies, the answers to Levinger's (1965) questions "What makes a marriage stick?" and "What breaks it apart?" remain incomplete, controversial, and confusing. The identification of the foundations of marital happiness is still less than complete and researchers continue to search for underlying components of marital stability (Glenn & Weaver, 1978).

Historically, the study of marriage issues began with social scientists in the early part of the twentieth century, and it was not until the early 1960s when research was spurred by interest in improving marital therapy, that a considerable number of psychologists began to enter the field (Landau, 1984). Notable exceptions were the classic works of Burgess and Cottrell (1939), Hamilton (1929), Locke and Wallace (1959), and Terman (1938). Early theories of marital adjustment concentrated on the mental health of the individual and predictors of marital success or happiness (Landau, 1984), with more recent theories focusing on the dyadic relationship (Spanier, Lewis, & Cole, 1975). Much of the early research focused on demographic variables (Farber, 1957; Goode, 1961), and many factors have been identified as likely to contribute to the stability of a marriage, or to contribute to the cause of divorce. In a review of the literature of the 1960s, Hicks and Platt (1970) cite higher occupational status, income and educational levels of husbands, spouse similarities such as

age, religion, sexual enjoyment, and age at marriage as some of the variables contributing to marital stability.

In their review of the literature of the 1960s, Hicks and Platt (1970) observe a movement from the use of descriptive demographic variables to a search for a more theoretical approach to the study of marital relationships. A theoretical approach is more relevant to professionals who seek to help couples improve the quality of marriage rather than merely identifying characteristics which often cannot be changed. One of the contributions of Burr (1970) in this direction was in differentiating the myriad of terms that have been used to describe marital quality such as: marital success, stability, satisfaction, functionality, adjustment, integration, concensus, role tension, personal development, love and happiness. Burr selected the term marital satisfaction which he defined as "a subjectively experienced reaction" (p. 49) to marriage. Moving from this intrapersonal approach to a more interpersonal approach has been enhanced by the work of more recent researchers (Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1980; Spanier & Lewis, 1980). These researchers have conceptualized their theories as involving the study of families (Olson et al., 1980) and dyadic relationships (Spanier & Lewis, 1980) believing that the measurement and study of the interpersonal unit lends more credence to the information than the study of individuals or a single sex. This theoretical view supports Corsini (1956a) who stated:

> . . . those studies which evaluate marital happiness in terms of the characteristics of one individual without considering the partner appear to be inadequate and represent a naive point of view, entirely discounting the factor of interaction (p. 240).

Olson et al. (1980) have expanded on the conceptualization of cohesiveness as an attribute of marital stability that was first described by Levinger (1965).

Their approach has been defined in the proposal of a circumplex model of family dynamics. Lewis and Spanier (1979) linked marital stability with marital quality based on the work of Locke and Wallace (1959). These authors state that ". . . the quality of most American marriages is the primary determinant of whether a marriage will remain intact" (p. 268). This marital quality is defined as a dynamic process on a continuum from low to high (Spanier & Glick, 1981). Spanier contends marital quality is comprised of several components including cohesiveness, satisfaction, consensus and affectional expression and has developed a measurement of his concept of marital quality, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

Among the variables that have been shown to contribute to marital stability, Cleek and Peerson (1985) reported communication problems as the most frequently reported causes of divorce for both males and females. These findings support the research of Kitson and Sussman (1982) who cited lack of communication as the highest ranking complaint among the divorced.

Two variables that have occurred repeatedly in the literature as having an impact on the dynamics of marital quality and communication style are the importance of similarly held values between spouses and the ability to change or to be flexible (Klagsbrun, 1985; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Martin, 1974; Medling & McCarrey, 1981; Nast, 1978; Stallman, 1978; Stenberg, 1980). Values may tend to fluctuate with life experience and maturation; therefore, the expression of values may change over the course of a marital relationship as the family progresses through various developmental stages of the life cycle (Medling & McCarrey, 1981; Morrow, 1982). An individual does not act independently of values and values impact the way an individual experiences others and reacts to life situations over time (Stuart, 1980).

Research on the concept of values has been stimulated by the work of Rokeach (1973). Values have been identified by Rokeach as modes of conduct that possess a cognitive, affective and behavioral component. He postulates that decisions based on values prompts behavior that chooses one action and avoids another so that there is a consistency between values and behavior. In an appraisal of Rokeach's work, Kitwood and Smithers (1975) confirm that the study of values is crucial to the understanding of human behavior. Nast (1978) supports this, contending that a person's value structure is the ". . . antecedent rationale of interpersonal and intrapersonal behavior". Nast states a value system could be conceived as the core perception of one's reality and is a determinant of behavior in a marriage relationship. In conducting interviews with couples who have been married 15 years or more in an attempt to identify why marriages last, Klagsbrun (1985) categorizes eight attributes of strong marriages. The first three categories describe the sharing of values, the ability to change and ability to live with the unchangeable as components of stable marriages. Change is inevitable over time, as is evidenced by the delineation of the stages of the life cycle (Duvall, 1967), yet spouses may or may not be able to flexibly adjust to changes due to life situations (Lederer & Jackson, 1968). A common key element in what Lederer and Jackson (p. 199) label as a "stable-satisfactory" (p. 133) marriage is the ability to communicate and to negotiate around a common values system. The degree of commitment to a specific value would seem to be an important determinant in predicting the hierarchical placement of that value at any given point over the course of the life cycle (Rokeach, 1979). Thus, not only the hierarchical placement of a value but the ability to negotiate would seem to be components of what Lederer and Jackson term the ability to "give and take without great rigidity or fear" (p. 133). The willingness to change or be open

minded is also the basis of the theoretical approach to therapy advanced by Stuart (1980) as the key to therapeutic success.

Rokeach (1960) has distinguished dogmatism as a form of resistance to change manifested in personal communications. He identified dogmatism as a relatively closed belief/disbelief system which in personal communications refers to an authoritarian and intolerant manner of communicating beliefs and ideas to others. The greater the level of dogmatism, the more likely a person will avoid facts that are incongruent with their personal belief/disbelief system. Rokeach theorized that dogmatism also impacts communication patterns in the following ways: as dogmatism increased a) differences are accentuated and similarities are seen as irrelevant, b) contradictory beliefs are held simultaneously, c) contradictory information is seen as threatening, and d) there is an inverse relationship between the degree of dogmatism and the willingness to compromise. In fact, Vacchiano, Strauss, and Schiffman (1968) described a personality pattern reflective of dogmatism that includes a resistance to change. Other research on dogmatism focuses on the impact of dogmatism on sex attitudes (Kilpatrick & Cauthen, 1968) and on counselor skills training (Carlozzi, Campbell, & Ward, 1982). Vacchiano, Strauss and Hochman (1969) review several areas of dogmatism studies that corroborate the concept of a dogmatic personality and a person's adjustment to life situations and developmental tasks.

In spite of the recognition of the importance of communication styles in marital adjustment and the research on dogmatism as a communication style of belief systems, there is a deficit in the literature linking dogmatism to marital adjustment. Two studies that do not support the correlation of dogmatism to marital adjustment are those of White (1975) and Mlott (1977). White did not find sufficient evidence to conclude a statistical difference between autocratic

and democratic subjects in marital happiness; Mlott found no relationship between dogmatism and marital satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

Values have consistently been shown to influence marital adjustment, and traits such as flexibility and adaptability have been included in the measurement of marital adjustment. No one, however, has correlated the theoretical concepts of dogmatism as an open and closed minded belief system with values. How they might be contributing factors to marital adjustment of couples remains an unanswered question.

It has been observed by Cleek and Pearson (1985) that most of the research in marital adjustment has been focused on a college student population or on a general sample of the population that underrepresents couples experiencing distress in their marriage. For this reason, this investigation will concentrate on the information provided by couples who are seeking help for their marital relationship in order to add to the information regarding this segment of the population.

The specific question involved in this study was: Is there a relationship between value similarity and dogmatism in the prediction of marital adjustment of couples in therapy?

Definition of Terms

Marital Adjustment

Marital adjustment is difficult to define because of the many terms used by various authors such as "marital success" (Hamilton, 1929), "marital cohesiveness" (Levinger, 1965, p. 19; Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1980), and "marital happiness" (Glenn & Weaver, 1978, p. 269). Locke and Wallace (1959, p. 251) use the term marital adjustment as "accommodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time." Spanier, Lewis, and Cole (1975) based the

definition of marriage adjustment on the one used by Locke and Wallace and expanded it in order to include couples who have an ongoing relationship but are not legally married. This concept is labeled dyadic adjustment. Spanier et al. (p. 17) further define dyadic adjustment as ". . . a process of movement along a continuum from good to poor that may change at any given time according to circumstances." The outcome of this process is determined by the degree of: (a) troublesome dyadic differences; (b) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety; (c) dyadic satisfaction; (d) dyadic cohesion; and (e) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic function. For this study, marital adjustment will be defined according to Spanier's conceptualization of a process that can be measured on a continuum of good to poor at any given point in time.

Values

A value is defined as an enduring belief that is central to one's belief system (Rokeach, 1968). Values are, according to Rokeach, abstract ideals that underlie how one responds to life situations. He defines a belief system as ". . . representing the total universe of a person's beliefs about the physical world, the social world, and the self" (p. 123). Rokeach believes this value may be consciously or unconsciously held and is manifested in a person's behavior.

Dogmatism

For the purposes of this study, dogmatism is defined as a relatively closed belief/disbelief system organized around a central set of beliefs (Rokeach, 1960). The cognitive framework of a belief/disbelief system represents the way a person assimilates information for action and communicates beliefs and ideas to others. Rokeach defines dogmatism as a form of resistance to change manifested in personal communications and adjustment to life situations.

Significance of the Study

Research in the area of marriage and family relationships is important

because of the alarming increase in the current rate of dissolution of marriages and the subsequent consequences on families and society (Stuart, 1980). Professionals in the helping professions often encounter problems of marital relationships whether they are working with children or adults individually or as couples and families (Spanier & Glick, 1981). Marriage is a complex phenomenon and the research in this area has been plagued with confusion in definitions, inconsistent results, lack of measurement instruments, and a lack of a broad theoretical approach (Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

It is pertinent to this problem to further develop and delineate the factors that show a relationship to the success and/or failure of marital relationships. In view of the importance of value similarity to marital adjustment and the ability of individuals to flexibly adjust to life situations, it is provident to consider these variables as a construct of congruence that might help predict marital adjustment. The use of couples in therapy will allow measurement of the dyadic relationship as experienced by couples in distress.

It is contended in this study that the openness of a person's value belief/disbelief system will be positively related to the ability of persons in a dyadic relationship to adapt to individual personality or societal changes in a way that promotes the overall quality of the relationship.

Assumptions and Limitations

It is an assumption of this study that all participants will be able to read and understand the directions for responding to the forms and questions and will exercise integrity in their responses.

This study has been limited by the author in a number of ways. First, the participants in this study were from an urban, suburban, and college community located in a midwestern state; therefore, care should be given not to extend the results to other geographical populations. Second, because participation in this

study was on a voluntary basis, the applicability of the results was limited to a volunteer population. It is possible the results would be different if nonvolunteers were included in the sample, however, due to the nature of this investigation, a nonvolunteer population was not feasible. The different locations and types of agencies serving a diversified population that were utilized in this study were an effort to provide a sample that reflects a wide range of socio-economic status, levels of education, various occupations, geographic origin, and age. Demographic data is included in the information reported in this study to substantiate this diversity. Given the circumstances of the nature of the personal information desired in this investigation, arbitrary methods of selection of subjects were not feasible because of ethical considerations regarding the rights of clients to consent to or refuse participation in research. The design of this study allowed an interpretation of the degree of relationships between the variables on a sample selected from realistic counseling settings. Third, the age of the participants was not controlled for and although age was noted, other studies using a different sampling of ages might produce different results.

Fourth, marital adjustment is conceptually a complex process and this study was limited to considering two of many variables that might contribute to a couple's adjustment. Because marital adjustment may vary with external and internal circumstances and is dynamic, the results are indicative of these subjects' current state of being at the time the information is gathered. All of the instruments used for measurement are subjective and self-reports of the subject's own perceptions. An observer might answer the same questions about the subject in a different manner.

Fifth, the limitations of using individual scores on the Value Survey has been noted by Mueller (1984). Because of the ipsative nature of the Survey, real

distances between values are not known. The ordering of one value higher than another necessarily means other values will be ranked lower. This does not imply a lower value is unimportant to the individual (Feather & Peay, 1975). Meuller, however, concludes that the ipsativity of the Value Survey is not as serious a problem as it could be because the two sets of scales have 18 items each. He contends this would be a greater problem in instruments with a smaller number of interrelated scales.

Finally, the correlational design of this investigation limits the interpretation of the results to some degree of relationship between the variables under consideration. Cause-and-effect relationships will not be established. The design of this study allows interpretation of the degree of relationships between the variables on a sample selected from realistic counseling settings.

Research Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that couples' value systems and level of dogmatism will be predictive of marital adjustment. Larger discrepancies in a couple's value similarity and higher degrees of dogmatism will be inversely related to a couple's marital adjustment.

Organization of the Study

Presented in this chapter is an introduction to the topic under investigation. The statement of the problem, definition of terms, significance of the study, assumptions and limitations, and research hypothesis were presented. Chapter II presents a review of the literature, including the definitions, theoretical history and relevant previous research of marital adjustment, dogmatism and the concept of life cycle. The methodology used in conducting the correlational investigation will be discussed in Chapter III. Results are

provided in Chapter IV and an overall summary, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter includes the history, theory, and definitions of the variables considered in this study. The areas are: (a) Conceptualization of the quality of marriage as it has evolved over the past decades with special emphasis on Spanier's measurement of marital adjustment, (b) the theory of values developed by Rokeach especially applied to marriage relationships, (c) the theory of dogmatism developed by Rokeach, and (d) the developmental theory of the life cycle of the family as delineated by Duvall. The usefulness of demographic data as a predictor of marital adjustment will be reviewed also.

Marital Adjustment

The quality of marital relationships, their predictors, causes, stability, and impact have been the target of much attention in the social and behavioral sciences. Problematic to researchers attempting to study marital quality is the complexity of marital relationships, confusion of terms, lack of theoretical bases, and inadequate measures (Landau, 1984). Hicks and Platt (1970) suggest early studies of marital happiness and stability were atheoretical. Concern about marriage issues began with social scientists in the early twentieth century and focused on demographic variables and global measures of happiness (Landau, 1984). Happiness is defined by Hicks and Platt (p. 354) as an "extremely personal and subjective phenomenon" that is difficult to measure and has an almost ephemeral quality because it is difficult to identify the source. Stability is easier to define. It refers to whether the marriage bond is intact or not and the

measurement is an easy categorization into either married, separated, or divorced (Gray-Little, 1983). Divorce and separation define an unstable marriage (Landau, 1984). Although this definition seems acceptable to many authors, Hicks and Platt (1970) suggest after reviewing the literature of the 1960s that there seems to be a dimension of low happiness-high stability that needs to be investigated. Indeed, the extreme of low stability is the dissolution of the marriage; however, many marriages that do not end in dissolution could hardly be designated as happy. Hicks and Platt posit that more empirical research is needed over the life span of marriages to describe changes which take place in marriage relationships.

A successful marriage has been defined on a basis similar to stability: endurance, absence of marital counseling, or reported or judged happiness (Barry, 1970). Marital satisfaction has been the term coined by several researchers to identify the subjective feelings of happiness and pleasure experienced by a spouse when considering all current aspects of marriage (Anderson, Russell, & Schumm, 1983). One of the earliest authors to use the term marital satisfaction was Corsini (1956) who used it to mean a function of interpersonal behaviors that are promoted by the social perceptions of a couple. In a study of 20 couples at the University of Chicago, he found that couples who are similar are more likely to be happy in marriage than couples who are not. He hypothesized that if perceptions could be understood, then the behavior and consequences of that behavior could be predicted. He concluded that similarity between spouses did not necessarily promote understanding of each other.

Levinger (1966) comments that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are always components of human existence but may be so diffuse in their meaning as to be poorly understood. He paraphrases Rousseau's philosophy that ". . . man's dissatisfaction results from an excess of his wants over his abilities" (p. 803). It

is precisely these wants and abilities that present such a complex number of factors to be considered in defining satisfaction. Burr (1979) chose to define marital satisfaction as a ". . . subjective condition in which an individual attains a goal or desire" (p. 49). He suggests that the term is predefined by the criteria by which one chooses to measure it. More recent definitions have evolved from these earlier works and include: "a subjective evaluation of the overall quality of marriage measured by the degree of needs, expectations, and desires that are met" (Bahr, Chappell, & Leight, 1983, p. 795); ". . . subjective satisfaction of the marriage as a whole as well as specific aspects of it that is measured with rating scales" (Gray-Little, 1983, p. 515); and "happiness with the marital relationship so that one desires its continuance" (Landau, 1984, p. 336).

Recent empirical research has focused on the concepts of marital cohesion and adjustment that considers the relationship of spouses rather than individual perceptions. Levinger (1965) was the first to conceptualize the attribute of cohesiveness from an analogy in physics of a physical bond between two nuclei in a molecule and the amount of energy required to break it. He likened marital relationship strength to be a direct function of the social and psychological attraction and barriers inside the marriage as well as being inversely related to influences from alternate relationships such as other family members, other sex partners, opposing religious affiliations, and the wife's independent income producing potential. Levinger conceived marital cohesiveness as a function of barriers as well as bonds. These barriers, such as obligation to children, might be of little consequence if the attraction of the spouses was strong enough. Attractions are defined as such things as esteem for spouse, desire for companionship, sexual enjoyment, home ownership, and others. If the attractions are weak, then the barriers are of greater importance because they form the shell of "empty" (p. 20) marriages that appear to be happy on the outside but in

fact are devoid of positive feelings on the inside. Goode (1961) describes the difference between full shell and empty shell marriages. A full shell marriage would be one in which the attractions and boundaries are both strong and there is a strong emotional interchange. An empty shell is described as:

> . . . The atmosphere is without laughter or fun, and a sullen gloom pervades the household. Members do not discuss their problems or experiences with each other, and communication is kept to a minimum . . . Their rationalization for avoiding a divorce is, . . . 'sacrifice for the children, neighborhood respectability,' and a religious conviction that divorce is morally wrong . . . The hostility in such a home is great, but arguments focus on the small issues, not the large ones. Facing the latter would, of course, lead directly to separation or divorce, but the couple has decided that staying together overrides other values, including each other's happiness and the psychological health of their children (p. 425).

Olson (1970) identified a lack of theoretical base for marital and family therapy and incorporated the concepts of cohesiveness and adaptability into research for a comprehensive measurement of families. He defines cohesiveness as ". . . the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another and the degree of individual autonomy they experience" (Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1980, p. 130). The Circumplex Model of marital and family systems is based on four levels of functioning: rigid (extremely low), structured (low to moderate), flexible (moderate to high), and chaotic (extremely high). The most satisfactory levels of cohesion are found in the middle ranges of structured and flexible with the least satisfactory in the extreme levels.

"Marital adjustment" refers to the overall level to which the individuals have fitted together into a smooth functioning dyadic relationship (Landau, 1984,

p. 336). Cole (1974) defined marital adjustment as a process that reduces differences and interpersonal tensions and increases satisfaction by the enhancement of cohesion and consensus. The concept of marital adjustment as a process is expanded by Spanier (1976) in his definition of dyadic adjustment being movement along a continuum from good to poor. Dyadic adjustment is conceptualized as a dynamic process that includes not only the existence of a continuum, but also the events, circumstances and interactions that constitute movement of a couple back and forth along the continuum. Spanier's definition was a synthesis of previous research that led to the development of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale as a measure of marital quality and stability. A pooling of approximately 300 items from previous instruments using a comprehensive process of procedures was based on a multidimensional approach that defined the outcome of this process by the degree of troublesome dyadic differences, interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety, dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, and consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning (Spanier, 1976).

Spanier based his synthesis of marital adjustment conceptualization on research that dates back to Hamilton (1929) who developed a 13-item instrument based on a sample of 104 couples. Hamilton interviewed individuals on topics that encompassed their general satisfaction of their marriage, their present sexual life, and their childhood experiences of their parents' marriage. Extensions of this instrument were made by Terman (1938), Burgess and Cottrell (1939), and Locke and Wallace (1959). Terman developed a 90-item Index of Marital Happiness that included the concepts of compatibility, personality, and background factors. Burgess and Cottrell (1939) developed the Marital Adjustment Form based on the study of 526 couples using a variety of factors. They identified the emergence of the companionship marriage as the alternative to the traditional view of institutional marriage. Laws (1971) laments the

seeming avoidance of Burgess and Cottrell's theoretical proposals by more recent researchers. Personality development and self-actualization were seen by Laws as the goals of the companionship marriage described by Burgess and Cottrell, and role descriptions of the spouses as symmetrical or interchangeable. Locke and Wallace (1959) use the term marital adjustment to mean ". . . accommodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time" (p. 251). The development of the Short Marital Adjustment Test by Locke and Wallace led to extensive use of this instrument as a research tool. The sample used by Locke and Wallace were white, Protestant, white collar and professional urban non-related spouses. Categories examined by Locke and Wallace included happiness in marriage, integration of the couple, and marital adjustment. This instrument has been criticized for its lack of relevancy in measuring contemporary marriages and for several methodological weaknesses (Laws, 1971; Spanier, 1972).

Research in the concept of marital adjustment has grown out of varied theoretical positions that attempt to describe and explain the underlying factors that contribute to marital quality. Some authors have posited that the lack of empirically tested principles is a serious deficit in the field of marital research (Barry, 1970; Burr, 1979; Olson, 1970). Several theories have been advanced over the past two decades to lend understanding to the dynamics of marital relationships. Homogamy theory (likes choosing likes) postulates that the similarity of individuals increases the likelihood of selection and satisfaction (Cole, 1973). In a test of this theory, Cole used a sample of 265 married couples and found that homogamy enhanced marital adjustment moderately when religion and values were considered, but was not a factor for age or education. Corsini (1956) reviewed the literature previous to that time that dealt with marital happiness prediction from background factors of the individuals or from studies

of personality correlates. In a study of 20 couples, Corsini (1956) found similarity of personality positively correlated with marital happiness. He did postulate, however, that perhaps couples become more similar if their marriage is happy. Barry (1970) approaches the study of marital research from an object relations point of view. He defines the happily married as emotionally stable, considerate of others, yielding, companionable, self-confident, and emotionally dependent. A correlation between an individual's neuroticism and marital happiness is recognized. Barry postulated that conflict theory best lends itself to the object relations view and the void of reliable instruments to measure such concepts.

Exchange and equity theory suggests that relationships are maintained by the provision of rewards on both sides. Studies of the rewards in different relationships and the development of interdependence of spouses constitute the focus of this theory (Argyle & Furnham, 1983). These researchers hypothesize that there are universal sources of satisfaction and difficulty which are common to all relationships and that the closer the relationship, the deeper the commitment to working through the conflict rather than avoidance of it. Argyle and Furnham postulate the source of conflict is a competition for resources and a difference in beliefs. The exchange theory states that when one partner is dissatisfied with the exchange achieved, conflict results. In a study of 52 subjects from lower and working-class employees in Oxford, England, they found that a high level of conflict is normal in a marriage and that apparently the closer the relationship, the more conflict and satisfaction is perceived by the spouses.

The social learning approach examined the predictive power of communication styles by assessing the communication patterns of premarital couples and following up on these same couples after a length of time. A

longitudinal study by Markman (1981) attempted to follow up on couples that remained intact for 5½ years to support a social learning model of marital adjustment. Twenty-six couples were assessed in the first group and nine intact couples participated in the follow-up five years later. Findings of this study were consistent with the social learning model that communication deficits are predictors of marital distress.

Developmental theory has influenced that study of marital adjustment over the life cycle of couples. Studies of the influence of the life cycle as a predictor of marital quality contribute conflicting and controversial results. A curvilinear relationship between family life cycle has been identified and the presence of children, length of marriage, and age at marriage have been used as variables as well as life cycle. Rollins and Cannon (1974) report that stage of the family life cycle accounts for less than 8% of the variance in marital satisfaction and Spanier (1979), Nock, (1981), and Anderson, Russell and Schumm (1983) found similar results. Anderson concludes that the best combination of independent variables for the prediction of marital adjustment has not yet been discovered.

A multitude of factors have been utilized in studies in an attempt to predict marital adjustment. Earlier research concentrated on demographic variables that might contribute to an explanation of the characteristics of a happy or successful marriage relationship. Farber (1957) used an interview technique on 99 white families in Chicago and another city in Illinois and found marital integration tended to vary directly with the husband's value hierarchy, the perceived similarity of spouses, and found differences in the sexes on some variables. Women tended to rank values related to social-emotional aspects of interaction higher than did their husbands. Religion and values were found to be significant predictors as well as the similarity of backgrounds (Cole, 1973). Age at marriage was found to be a significant predictor in some studies (Weed, 1974),

and was not a significant factor in others (Bahr, Chappell, & Leight, 1983; Cole, 1974; Glenn & Weaver, 1978). Kimmel and Van Der Veen (1974) did a factor analysis of the Locke-Wallace using a sample of 149 wives and 157 husbands and found differences for males and females on two factors: sexual congeniality was significant for husbands and agreement and compatibility was significant for wives. The presence of young children was found to be detrimental to marital happiness for wives (Glenn & Weaver, 1978). Couples who showed a cooperative and non-competitive style of marriage were found to have higher marital adjustment scores than those who were competitive (Cohen, 1980). Cohen found egalitarian couples to be the most well adjusted with husband-dominated couples moderately adjusted and wife-dominated couples the least adjusted group. Cohen used a sample of 25 couples in therapy and 25 couples not in therapy to investigate differences in personality needs. Men have been found to be more satisfied with marriage than women (Kitson & Sussman, 1982; Rhyne, 1981). Kitson and Sussman identified lack of communication as the most frequently mentioned marital complaint of males and females who were interviewed with the question "What caused your marriage to break up?"

Reasons given for marital discord and divorce differ today from those reasons given 25 years ago. Goode (1956) cites social class, length of marriage, and geographic origin as chief factors in dissatisfaction while Levinger (1966) cites finances, drinking, and physical abuse in lower class and lack of love, infidelity, and demands for middle classes as chief factors. Cleek and Pearson (1985) confirmed that women tend to make more marital complaints than men and that communication problems were the most frequently indicated cause for dissatisfaction for both sexes. In a factor analytic study of 275 males and 336 females in Wisconsin, Cleek and Pearson identified seven factors as perceived cause of divorce and found that the rank order of these factors differed for

males and for females. Females ranked interpersonal interaction the highest followed by abuse, infidelity, religion, alcohol abuse, in-laws, and independence. Males ranked drug abuse highest followed by various differences, abuse, independence, interpersonal interaction, alcohol abuse, and infidelity. In a review of marriage, Gray-Little (1983) reports the most prevalent finding is that marriages in which the wife is the dominant partner, whether in decision making or some other aspect of control, are more likely to be unhappy than any other type of marriage.

For purposes of this investigation, the definition of marital adjustment will be based on Spanier's (1976) conceptualization that marital adjustment is a process that can be measured on a continuum of good to poor that results in a measurement of a couple's adjustment at a given point in time in their relationship.

In summary, the conceptualization of marital adjustment is a complex phenomenon that has been the subject of research dating back to 1929. The myriad literature in the past two decades indicates there is still much to be gleaned from research in this area. While the focus of the research in the 1960s leaned toward research of demographic variables and the research of the 1970s tended toward a more multidimensional approach, the questions raised regarding the most significant predictors of marital adjustment still remain unanswered. Trends for research in the 1980s seem to be: improved methodology, studies that include men (husbands) in the samples, and the use of couples to study dyadic relationships whether they are married or cohabitants. An awareness of role transitions and a shift toward the development of theory are the challenges of the present (Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

Values and Value Similarity

While the needs of research in marital relationships have been developing,

the study of human values has also developed as an important component of investigating human behavior. "All human interactions are guided by values and philosophies of the parties concerned" (Stuart, 1980, p. 21). There is a universal nature of values found even in diverse cultures by anthropologists (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) as human beings strive to cope with and respond to problems encountered in life and death. These authors have defined values as a conception of the desirable and more specifically as:

> . . . orientations that are complex but definitely patterned (rank ordered) resulting from the . . . interplay of three . . . elements of the evaluative process . . . the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements. (1961, p. 4).

Although Rokeach (1973) believes these elements are essentially a part of values, he argues that desirable is too difficult to define and operationalize; therefore, his definition of a value is ". . . an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct" (p. 5). A value system is defined by Rokeach as ". . . an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-state of existence along a continuum of relative importance" (p. 5). In the preface of his book, The Nature of Human Values, Rokeach gives credit for influencing the development of his philosophical and theoretical concepts of values to Clyde Kluckhohn as well as to A. O. Lovejoy in philosophy, Robin Williams in sociology and M. Brewster Smith in psychology, thus recognizing the contributions of these fields of study to a theory of values.

The study of human values and their influence on human behavior has been of interest to the field of psychological research for at least fifty-five years. In reviewing the history and development of the study of values, Dukes (1955) delineates three areas in which the study of values began: measurement of

values, the origin and development of values in the individual, and the influence of an individual's values on his cognitive functioning.

In the area of measurement, the development of a reliable instrument and the lack of theory has been deplored (Murstein, 1970). One of the first instruments to be developed was A Study of Human Values (Allport & Vernon, 1931). This instrument provides measures of six values they believed depicted generalized traits of personality: aesthetic, economic, political, religious, social and theoretical. Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey revised and Study of Values in 1951 and 1960 which was reported to assess the dominant "interests" of personality. Gordon (1960) also developed an instrument to measure values he identified as: benevolence, conformity, independence, leadership, recognition, and support. He posits that these are important values in personal, social, occupational and marital adjustment. Several other instruments have been developed to measure values but most have been used only once, or infrequently (Kelley, 1974).

In the area of cognitive functioning, Rokeach (1973) extends the cognitive influence of values to include affective and behavioral components as well. The cognitive component tells a person the correct way to act or the right goal to attain. The affective component lets a person feel emotionally for or against a value that is perceived to be important, and the behavioral component leads to action.

Rokeach (1973) identifies several terms that are often used interchangeably with the term value: interest, attitude, norm, motive, and need and distinguishes values from them. He defines a value as consisting of a single belief or standard that transcends objects in contrast to an attitude which refers to several beliefs focused on a specific object. Rokeach views values as determinants of attitudes and interests both of which are manifestations of one's

values. He conceptualizes values as more amenable to change than personality traits, such as motives or needs, which may be more fixed. In contrasting values with social norms, Rokeach posits a social norm is consensual and external, whereas a value is more personal and internal.

Rokeach (1973) defined a terminal value as an "end-state" and an instrumental value as a "means" (p. 7); both are considered to be enduring as well as changeable. He identified two kinds of terminal values: personal and social, or, in other words, intrapersonal and interpersonal. An example of an intrapersonal end-state would be peace of mind while an example of interpersonal value or end-state would be world peace. There are also two kinds of instrumental values, or means: moral and competence. Moral values have an interpersonal focus and when violated might arouse the conscience. An example of a moral value would be behaving honestly. Behaving intelligently is an example of a competence value that is more personal in focus rather than interpersonal. Values refer to a preference of one mode of behavior over another, thus Rokeach sees them as antecedents to action based on a hierarchical arrangement. Values determine how one chooses to respond to goals for living or for modes of behavior; thus, one chooses what is, or what is not, worthy of attainment. Rokeach maintains that values underlie all behavior and the consequences of this behavior are components in almost all phenomena that researchers would want to investigate and understand. It was within this context that he developed the Value Survey as an instrument of measurement of values.

In the area of the origin and development of human values, it is not surprising that values have been a facet of research in the area of marital relationships when consideration is given to their function. Rokeach (1973) states:

> One way to approach the question: what functions do values serve? is to think of values as standards that guide ongoing activities, and of value systems as general plans to resolve conflicts and to make decisions. Another way is to think of values as giving expression to human needs (p. 12).

Values also serve a function of defining and maintaining personal boundaries (Stein, 1985). Stein comments that values are an aspect of an inner-representational world that gives meaning to experience and gives coherence to the expression of the inner self in behaviors. Stein says "values affiliate 'me' with 'us' and disaffiliate 'us' from 'not-me' or 'them'" (p. 36).

One of the influences in the formation of the values in society is the expression of new values by college students (Yankelovich, 1981). Yankelovich identifies three central value dimensions: (a) Moral norms, dealing with sex, authority, religion, and obligations to others; (b) social values, dealing with money, work, family, and marriage; and (c) self-fulfillment dealing with opposition to role obligations to others and to the quest for economic security (Lerner, 1984). With the experience of a rapidly changing world, it is not surprising that persons in a marital relationship are challenged to be aware of the cognitive, affective and behavioral manifestations of values. Nast (1978) comments that, given the interdependency attributed to a marital (or dyadic) relationship, it would seem that a couple would function in a more satisfied way if there was some consensus between them regarding their value system.

For this investigation, the theoretical approach of values and value systems postulated by Rokeach (1973) formed the basis of inquiry using similarity between spouses as a predictor of martial adjustment. Although several studies have utilized values in various combinations there still remains the question of what combinations are the best predictors and how values systems are

manifested in couples who are experiencing distress in their marriages. The definition of values used in this study was based on the definitions used in the Value Survey, 1982 (Appendix B).

Values and Marital Adjustment

One of the earlier studies linking a theory of values to marital adjustment is reported by Murstein (1970) called the Stimulus-Value-Role theory of marital choice. He used a sample of 99 engaged couples and a sample of randomly matched couples to determine what influence role compatibility had in choosing a marital partner. He hypothesized that couples would verbally explore value convergence and be attracted to partners who held similar values. In this way partners would have their own values validated and their self-concept supported. Murstein used a questionnaire consisting of ten values and found confirmation of his hypothesis that marital choice is dependent on value similarity. In a review of marriage research Barry (1970) reports several studies that positively correlated similarity of personality and attitudes with marital satisfaction (Byrne & Blaylock, 1963; Levinger & Breedlove, 1966) and noted findings that indicated couples did not become more similar after 18 years of marriage than they were at the time of engagement (Kelly, 1955).

Kelley (1974), in a correlational study of 161 couples in Georgia, found distinctive values for the low marital adjustment group and high marital adjustment group. Rokeach's Value Survey (1973) was used to rank order values and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale was the instrument used to differentiate high from low marital adjustment. The low marital adjustment group ranked Happiness, Exciting Life, True Friendship and World at Peace among their most important values. Ranking most important by the high-score group were Salvation, Inner Harmony, Sense of Accomplishment, and Family Security. On the instrumental values, the low group differed by a higher ranking

for being Broadminded and Imaginative, contrasted by the high group who stressed being Clean and Loving.

In a study of value convergence (the degree of similarity between spouses) comparing a sample of fifty well-adjusted couples and 24 couples admitted in a mental health center for marriage counseling, Martin (1974) found a positive and significant relationship between value convergence and marital satisfaction. Instruments used for measurement were the Value Survey, the Locke-Wallace Marital Relationship Inventory and a semi-projective sentence completion tested designed by Martin. Well-adjusted couples had more similar terminal and instrumental values than did maladjusted couples. Instrumental values were found to be more strongly associated with marital adjustment than were terminal values.

Support for the hypothesis that values that support a commitment to the marital relationship and the instrumental behaviors which support this commitment contribute to marital adjustment was found by Stallman (1978) in a study of middle to upper class volunteers using the Value Survey and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. He found that wive's assumed similarity of values contributed to marital adjustment while husband's actual similarity of values contributed to marital adjustment. Wives were found to operate on an assumption that values were similar and the implications for counseling couples in distress is to check the reality of the couple's value similarity and their manifested behaviors based on this value system.

Nast (1978) corroborated findings that similarity of values is directly related to marital satisfaction. The sample of 38 couples divided between high marital satisfaction and low marital satisfaction as measured by the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale were found to differ significantly ($p < .001$) with respect to similarity of values. The high marital satisfaction

group had significantly higher similarity of values than the low marital satisfaction group. Unlike Kelley (1975), Nast found no specific values were consistently chosen within the top five of the value rankings for either group.

In a sample of 447 undergraduate students, Kindelan and McCarrey (1979) used a simulated profile of two couples to test the relationship between the proportion of similar attitudes and marital adjustment. The use of simulation limits the results of their study; however, the degree of similarity of values was a significant attribution of marital satisfaction. The subjects in this study relied on how many values were similar, rather than which values were most important.

In order to expand on the previous research of Kindelan and McCarrey (1979) that used simulation design, Medling and McCarrey (1981) used a sample of 172 married couples to compare the relationship of values and marital adjustment over segments of the life cycle. They also focused attention on identifying a set of values that would be indicative of marital adjustment. Medling and McCarrey used the Value Survey and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) to assess their sample. Although they labeled their sample a field sample, they made no attempt to identify couples who were in distress versus couples who were not. They found that value similarity accounted for a very low percentage of the variance in marital adjustment although value similarity did appear to have an impact on marital adjustment in the latter years of marriage, that is, those married 25 years or more. A complex of both terminal and instrumental values were found to serve as predictors of marital adjustment using a statistical analysis of discriminant function. This set of values were identifed as those having to do with reciprocity between spouses of values that were viewed as nourishing to both individuals.

In an investigation of the relationship between marital values and marital satisfaction using 47 couples in the Los Angeles area, Stenberg (1980) found the

higher adjusted couples (measured by the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale) to have a higher number of values that were similar. Stenberg used the Cohen-Stenberg Marital Value Inventory to measure values in this study.

Morrow (1982) used a sample of 100 volunteer couples registered to participate in a Marriage Encounter weekend near San Francisco to investigate the interrelationship between purpose in life, values, and marital adjustment at three stages of the life cycle. Morrow used the Value Survey, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and the Purpose in Life Test. Instrumental values tended to differentiate among subjects at various levels of marital adjustment; however, value convergence or value consensus was not found to be significant for couples reporting high marital adjustment which questions the findings of other researchers except for Kelley (1974) and Stallman (1978). Morrow concluded support for the hypothesis that persons in intimate relationships do not necessarily hold the same values in high esteem. No significant comparisons in the values held by couples in each of the three life cycle stages used were found which Morrow concluded questions Rokeach's theory that values are more likely to change as one experiences different social conditions.

Values and Dogmatism

The effect of value patterns and dogmatism was used by Jacobson (1972) to predict social alienation in a sample of 310 New York University students. Social alienation is defined as the ". . . explicit rejection of traditional American culture" (p. 8). Jacobson found the most influential single predictor for social alienation had less to do with one's values than with the structure of one's belief system - dogmatism. He used the Rokeach Value Survey and Dogmatism Scale as measures of values and dogmatism respectively.

In a study related to the concept of dogmatism, Craddock compared the relationships between authoritarianism, marital power expectations and marital

value systems using a sample of 65 engaged Australian couples. Authoritarianism was measured by the F Scale (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levison, & Sanford, 1950) and values by the Value Survey (1967). Craddock (1977) theorized that the high-authoritarian individual adheres to a viewpoint of dominance and submission in interpersonal relationships but found the literature dealing with authoritarianism and marital expectations scant. Craddock found that high-authoritarian males and females valued task terminal values higher than low-authoritarian males and females. Traditionalist males devalued female instrumental values; traditional females were found to value the female instrumental values contrary to the researcher's expectation. Craddock concluded that in agreement with Barry (1970), marriages should be studied with a view of personality patterns based on an individual's past experiences in relationships.

In summary, Murstein (1976) has noted the importance of the congruence of values to marital adjustment and suggested that research in this area has suffered from the lack of a good instrument to measure values and the lack of a comprehensive theory of values. Rokeach (1973) offers an answer to both of these deficits with the Value Survey and his theory of values which was developed by integrating the contributions of philosophy, sociology, anthropology, and psychology.

Although there has been much interest in the study of values, there is still a deficit of research reported that establishes the relationship between value consensus to the degree of marital adjustment in couples (Medling & McCarrey, 1984). Much of the research that has been done has used individuals rather than couples, most have used students rather than a diversified sample of adults, many have used instruments developed for one study only, and only one study reported the use of couples in therapy. To further the bases of a theoretical

concept for the components of marital adjustment, it is the purpose of this investigation to utilize the Value Survey to test the relationship of values to couples that are experiencing distress and are in therapy in order to extend the bank of research to a field setting.

Dogmatism

Rokeach (1954) defines dogmatism as:

> a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority, which, in turn, provides a framework for patterns of intolerance toward others (p. 192).

Rokeach developed his conceptualization of dogmatism based on the work of Maslow (1943), Fromm (1947), and Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levison, and Sanford (1950). Research on dogmatism began as a study on anti-Semitism during World War II. Researchers analyzed the ideological content and personality components of anti-Semitism and then devised quantitative methods for measuring it (Rokeach, 1960). Adorno et al. (1950) developed the F scale originally as a measure of racism and ethnocentricity and the F scale became known as the racism scale until Adorno et al. published the book The Authoritarian Personality and the scale was found to distinguish certain personality traits as well as right wing authoritarianism.

According to Craddock (1977) the Authoritarian person views interpersonal relationships in terms of dominance and submission with these relationships governed by rules and expectations, rather than flexibility or spontaneity. Authoritarian individuals are identified by a rigid cognitive style and a dislike of individuality because it tends toward disorderliness and change. Other traits that have been identified as constellations of the authoritarian personality include: strict obedience to authority figures, intolerance of opposing opinions,

prejudice, a tendency to have an oversimplified view of the world, a tendency to employ polarized "black-white" cognitive constructs, and a cynical view of human nature (Finkel, 1984).

Rokeach (1960) posits the F scale falls short of being a general theory of authoritarianism and intolerance because of the specificity of content that measures only one end of the authoritarianism continuum. Rokeach theorized that there are manifestations of authoritarianism and intolerance that are not all associated with ethnic prejudice and conservatism. He proposes authoritarianism and intolerance in attitudes and in interpersonal relations can be readily observed among persons along a continuum from left to right and encompassing many different orientations. Rokeach (1956) proposes a construct of dogmatism that involves the convergence of three variables: closed cognitive systems, authoritarianism, and intolerance. He conceived all cognitive systems as being organized into a belief system and a disbelief system that varied along a continuum from open to closed. Rokeach (1960) states that the extent to which a person's system is open or closed is based on:

> . . . the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside . . . (p. 57)

The more open one's belief system the more should evaluating and responding be independent of pressures from the outside and be based on rational and intrinsic merits. The more closed a person's belief system, the more attention is paid to the source of information rather than to inner directedness. The more closed the belief system, the more the world will be seen as threatening and the more a person will evaluate others according to their agreement or disagreement with that person's beliefs. The more open-minded person will value others in a positive way

regardless of their beliefs (Rokeach, 1960). Rokeach suggests that the closed-minded person will be prone to restrict activities in order to avoid contact with people, books and ideas, and social, religious, and political events that would threaten the validity of one's belief system or the "invalidity" of one's disbelief system. In defining closed belief systems, Fromm (1947) states that:

> . . . individuals may become disposed to accept or to form closed systems of thinking and believing in proportion to the degree to which they are made to feel alone, isolated, and helpless in the world . . .

Anxiety for the future, feelings of inadequacy, and self hate result, which the individual expresses as needs for power and status.

Rokeach points out that change is possible for both the closed-minded or open-minded person but for different reasons. The person with a relatively closed system may change, or become fixed, for basically the same reasons as the open-minded person. These reasons may be conformity, other-directedness, identification with authority, ego defense, compartmentalization, isolation, opportunism, and expediency. In contrast, the open-minded person may change or not according to a correct appraisal of reality, from intellectual conviction instead of dogmatic conviction, or from independence rather than submitting to conformity pressures. Rokeach (1960) also points out that ". . . real people . . . have systems that are neither completely open nor completed closed" (p. 66). Open and closed systems are only ideals for the purpose of analysis. Rokeach (1954) further defines dogmatism as "a hypothetical cognitive state which mediates objective reality within the person" (p. 195).

The cognitive structure of dogmatism has been described by Rokeach (1954) as containing several components: (a) There is isolation within and between the belief systems, (b) there is a difference in the strength of the belief-disbelief system, (c) there is a discrepancy in how beliefs are

differentiated and, (d) how the belief is viewed in terms of the past, present, and future. Rokeach postulates that the greater the dogmatism, the greater the isolation factor will contribute to accentuation of differences, presentation of the similarities between beliefs and disbeliefs will be perceived as irrelevant, and contradictions will be denied or will coexist irrationally. As an example of the latter, the following story attributed to Sholom Aleichem is offered by Rokeach (1954, p. 199): "I did not borrow your pot; besides it was broken when you lent it to me; besides I have already returned it to you." The statement is a progression of illogical statements that serves one central purpose, that of protecting the person from perceived threat. Rokeach also posits that the strength of the belief-disbelief system is described as the greater the dogmatism, the greater the rejection of closely related (but disbelieved) ideas and disability to compromise. "Narrowing" is described by Rokeach as an example of how parts of reality may be disregarded. The dogmatic person might be described as one who selectively chooses friends who ascribe to a compatible belief and avoids those who do not. Rokeach describes the time perspective, or view of past, present and future as the greater the dogmatism, the more the present is perceived as unimportant except as a passageway to a future utopia. The present is perceived as unjust and full of suffering (Rokeach, 1954).

The cognitive content of dogmatism includes authoritarianism and intolerance (Rokeach, 1968). As dogmatism increases, authoritarianism is perceived as an increasing admiration for positive authority figures and a fear, hatred, and denunciation of those persons holding opposing beliefs. Intolerance is defined by Rokeach as the opinionated rejection of a belief and of persons who accept that belief, or as opinionated acceptance of a belief and of those who agree with it.

Rokeach (1968) posits a "principle of belief congruence" (p. 83) that asserts:

> . . . we tend to value a given belief in proportion to its degree of congruence with our own belief system and, further, we tend to value people in proportion to the degree to which they exhibit belief . . . congruent with our own (p. 83).

He makes the assumptions that not all beliefs are equally important to the individual, however, the more central the belief, the more resistant that belief is to change. Rokeach identifies beliefs on a continuum from the most central core beliefs to those that are inconsequential. He explains that core beliefs are those that have been learned as a child and that virtually all others believe, then come beliefs that are true for the person even though no one else believes them, other important beliefs, and those that are a matter of taste (Rokeach, 1968).

Although Rokeach intimates that experimentally induced modifications in belief systems have not been found, others have applied the background of his postulates to answer some of the questions he leaves unanswered, such as: What social or personal conditions give rise to dogmatism? How is it manifested in interpersonal relationships? Can it be modified, and if so, how?

Personality correlates of dogmatism have received much attention in the research and are of interest to this study of marital relationships. High dogmatic individuals are found to differ on several scales of the California Personality Inventory and are described as psychologically immature, impulsive, defensive, and stereotyped in their thinking, whereas Low Dogmatics are described as being outgoing, mature, efficient, responsible, and more likely to succeed at learning tasks (Vacchiano, Strauss, & Hochman, 1969). Korn and Giddan (1964) found that the more dogmatic a person is, the less tolerant, flexible, and secure that person is. Vacchiano, Strauss, and Schiffman (1968) used three personality instruments that yielded clusters which seemed to identify the dogmatic personality. Using a sample of 53 male and 29 female college

students, Vacchiano et al. (1968) concluded the dogmatic needs to receive support, encouragement and understanding from others; has an intolerance for understanding the feelings and motives of others; and avoids change. In addition, the dogmatic is doubtful about self-worth, is anxious, lacks confidence and feels inadequate. These traits are accompanied by low ego strength, frustration at changeable conditions, and results in restrained, timid, tense, impatient, and conservative responses. A replication of this study by Bernhardson and Fisher (1970) using a sample of 68 undergraduates questioned the methodology of Vacchiano et al. (1968) and criticized their statistical report.

Among the personality characteristics associated with dogmatism are defense mechanisms used to avoid anxiety and stress. Rokeach (1960, pp. 69-70) states that ". . . the more closed the belief system, the more it represents a tightly woven network against anxiety." Defenses manifested by dogmatics or closed-minded persons include: repression, rationalization, denial, projection, reaction formation and overidentification. The use of intellectualization and sensitization was found by Byrne, Blaylock, and Goldberg (1966) in two independent studies with samples of 76 and 138 students conducted at the Universities of Texas and Illinois. Byrne et al. concluded that among the characteristics of highly dogmatic persons are pessimism and dissatisfaction and that "the dogmatic, sensitizing, personally unhappy individual tends to express negative feelings toward self and others." The influence of social desirability responding on the Dogmatism Scale and Repression-Sensitization Scale used in the Byrne et al. study was investigated by Bernhardson (1967) who found social desirability did not contribute to the results.

A longitudinal study of 514 medical students (Juan, Paiva, Haley, & O'Keefe, 1974) resulted in high dogmatics favoring conformity, recognition and religious values while low dogmatics favored independence, aesthetic and social

values in their freshman year. Four years later Juan discovered the degree of dogmatism decreased significantly from the freshman to the senior year suggesting education may mitigate some dogmatic characteristics.

Smithers (1970) used males at the University of Bradford in a study to corroborate that dogmatism is a defense against anxiety and found dogmatism related to neuroticism; the higher the dogmatism, the higher the degree of neuroticism. Gaensslen, May, and Wolpert (1973) questioned the validity of the connection between anxiety and dogmatism with a sample of 701 persons from lower middle class and upper lower classes. They used seven subtests of the 16PF Personality Questionnaire and could not prove a relationship between anxiety and dogmatism. They concluded that if dogmatism is a successful defense against anxiety, then highly dogmatic persons would not be expected to suffer from anxiety.

The most significant personality traits were found by Anderson (1981) to be trust and emotional stability which are negatively correlated with dogmatism. In a stepwise discriminant analysis Anderson identified six personality factors that differentiated between high and low dogmatism in a sample of 253 male and 302 female high school students and concluded a dogmatic personality pattern is identifiable. Interestingly, Anderson also found dogmatism to be more pervasive in females at this stage of development.

If dogmatism is represented in a generalized personality pattern, then the interpersonal behavior of highly dogmatic persons will show differences from low dogmatic persons (Vacchiano, Strauss, & Hochman, 1969). In their review of dogmatism, Vacchiano et al. report studies that support a positive relationship between dogmatism and interpersonal sensitivity (Byrne et al., 1966), and that degree of dogmatism effects the level of empathy and positive regard for others. Zagona and Zurcher (1965) found high dogmatics in dyadic bargaining situations

less willing to change from a given stance because they viewed compromise as defeat.

The resistance to change has been verified by Vacchiano, Strauss and Schiffman (1968) and they posit that dogmatics are confident in what they believe, accept the tried and true despite contradictions, and generally are traditional in their views. Lee and Ehrlich (1971) found that closed-minded persons would have negative beliefs about self and others, seek status and power, report a sense of martyrdom, and display more self-righteousness. In their sample of 444 students in intrductory sociology classes, dogmatism was found most strongly related to negative beliefs about others and to the need for moral self-righteousness; however, because the correlations were not high (.51 and .50 respectively), they concluded that closed-mindedness is not necessarily accompanied by a negative self-attitude.

The effect of personality correlates of dogmatic counselors in training was investigated by Carlozzi, Campbell, and Ward (1982). Using a sample of 215 master's degree candidates majoring in guidance and counseling at three southwestern universities, Carlozzi et al. hypothesized that dogmatism and externality in locus of control are inversely related to skills involved in effective and facilitative responses to clients in a counseling situation. The results supported the postulates of Rokeach (1960) that highly dogmatic persons exhibit a closed way of thinking, distortions of statements from others, an authoritarian perspective, and an intolerance for the beliefs of those who disagree. In contrast, open-minded persons are less likely to be defensive, are more tolerant in relationships and weigh incoming messages on their own merits. The authors conclude that counselor education should be focused on facilitating a more open-minded perspective on the part of the counselor.

Another consequence of the dogmatic personality that has been investigated is social alienation. In a study of 310 New York University students, Jacobson (1972) compared closed-mindedness and values and found the most influential single predictor for social alienation was the structure of one's belief system, or dogmatism.

Extending the concept of the need for power and the consequences of an authoritarian personality on interpersonal relationships, Danesh (1984) postulated that the outcome will result in feelings of resentment, anger, fear and anxiety in the oppressed partner, and insecurity and aggression on the part of the authoritarian partner. Danesh describes a power orientation of the authoritarian personality as one in which power is hoped to bring security, protect from dangers, and fill wants and desires. The authoritarian never achieves complete power and thus rarely feels secure. The tendency is to demand conformity from spouse and children which puts the others in a position of sacrificing personal growth for the sake of decreasing the fears and insecurities of the dominant, or authoritarian person. Because of dichotomous thinking, Danesh suggests the authoritarian person experiences emotional and conceptual separation and ends up being isolated, alone, and envious. Danesh further postulates that the authoritarian person exhibits emotional and intellectual rigidity and is afraid of emotions that express tenderness, intimacy, compassion and warmth which are perceived as weaknesses. Because the authoritarian seeks to defend against fear and anxiety and attempts to repress these feelings, the authoritarian often shows aggression, competitiveness, and hostility. Danesh proposes that the power orientation in relationships is the opposite of love orientation in which others are related to from an open and vulnerable stance that shows respect, acceptance, trust and service. The ability to cooperate and still maintain uniqueness and diversity, Danesh believes, is a mark of a healthy personality.

Vacchiano et al. (1969) report substantial evidence for a correlation between parent attitudes and the development of dogmatism in children suggesting that closed-minded persons tend to discourage confrontation of their belief-disbelief system and thus encourage the same behavior in their children. The authors cite examples of developmental stages in dogmatism, suggesting that as children progress through school a significant decrease in dogmatism is noted.

The definition of dogmatism used in this investigation followed the theory and postulates of Rokeach (1960) that dogmatism is a relatively closed cognitive system of beliefs and disbeliefs which are subject to certain personality correlates and manifest behaviors that result in a basically intolerant stance toward others. Because Rokeach based much of his theory on the concepts of authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950), the definitions are similar and the terms authoritarian, dogmatic, and closed-minded was used interchangeably in this study. The dogmatic cognitions and behaviors affect relationships at all levels; however, this study primarily was concerned with the influence of dogmatism on the dyadic marital relationship.

Dogmatism and Marital Adjustment

Although there is a great deal of literature delineating dogmatism as a basic cognitive belief system, there has been little application of this theory to the field of marital relationships. White (1975) investigated the relationship of family ideology, dogmatism, and religious attitudes with marital happiness on a sample of 325 married individuals at East Texas State University. He did not find statistical support for differentiating between high dogmatic subjects and low dogmatic subjects in relation to marital happiness. He did find sufficient evidence that there is an interaction between family ideology and dogmatic orientation and that traditional subjects were significantly more dogmatic than

non-traditional subjects. This tendency toward conservative and traditional viewpoints corroborates the work of Levin and Spates (1968) who found 174 Boston University students expressed a more traditional family outlook as dogmatism increased. The traditional family system is defined as a more narrow outlook indicative of a closed behavior system of personality or social structure.

Mlott (1977) investigated the influence of dogmatism, locus of control, and life goals in stable and unstable marriages using a sample of 22 married couples seeking professional help and 22 couples not seeking help. Mlott did not find that individuals in unstable marriages were more dogmatic, more externally controlled, or were dissimilar in life goals. Mlott concludes from his research that when the wife has greater dogmatic attributes the marriage is perceived as more stable.

In contrast, Craddock (1977) investigated the relationship of authoritarianism, marital power expectations and marital value systems among 65 engaged couples in Australia. High authoritarian males expressed a preference for a traditionalist view of marital power while the low authoritarian males and females expressed a personal preference for an equalitarian view. There was no measurement of the marital adjustment of the couples in this study, obviously, since they were engaged or in the Mlott (1977) study other than whether they were in therapy or not. It seems there is a need for further investigation of how dogmatism affects the marital adjustment of couples before any relationships are clearly established.

In summary, the development of the Dogmatism Scale by Rokeach (1960) is based on earlier studies of the authoritarian personality by Adorno et al. (1950). The definition of dogmatism is:

> a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute

> authority which, in turn, provides a framework for patterns of intolerance toward others (Rokeach, 1954, p. 192).

Personality correlates have been found in numerous studies which form a picture of the dogmatic personality. Interpersonal relationships are affected by the dogmatic personality and manifest behaviors which have implications for marital relationships; however, the relationship between dogmatism and marital adjustment has received little attention in the research and it is the purpose of this study to further explore this phenomenon.

Marital Adjustment, Demographics, and Life Cycle

Demographics

A strategy often used in the study of marital adjustment has been to look for clues among social and demographic categories of married couples (Glenn & Supancic, 1984). In reviewing the literature of the 1960s, Hicks and Platt (1970) reported that census data studies found greater marital stability for whites than non-whites; stability increases with the increasing status of the husband's occupation; stability decreases for school drop-outs; and age at marriage contributed to the stability of the marriage. Men who married at age 21 or under and women who married at age 19 or under tended to end an unhappy marriage more than those who married later. Hicks and Platt also reported that persons in higher status occupations, higher levels of education, working wives, and those with less devout religious feeling tended to end unhappy marriages by divorce. The presence of children tended to decrease marital adjustment.

Glenn and Weaver (1978) found the effects of ten variables including age, age at marriage, occupation, education, income, church attendance, wife's employment and children in the home to be weakly correlated with marital happiness. The strongest correlations were found to be the presence of very young children and being middle-aged for females, both of which were negative.

In an analysis similar to Glenn and Weaver, Donohue and Ryder (1982) found similar correlations even though the data they used was from a study done 15 years previously to the Glenn and Weaver study in an attempt to test whether higher divorce rates in more recent years result in skewed data. Donohue and Ryder concluded the increased divorce rate is not an important factor in explaining marital satisfaction on large samples. The argument that higher divorce rates of recent years have resulted in samples with fewer dissatisfied spouses because the divorced are removed from the sample was disputed by Donohue and Ryder in this study.

In a study of the perceived causes of marital breakdown, Burns (1984) found several demographic variables contributing to the divorces or separation of 335 Australian men and women. Socio-economic status, age at marriage, religion, length of marriage and number of children were all identified as reasons given for dissatisfaction. Seven factors were identified in this study that corroborated the findings of others that marital adjustment is complex and contains multiple components. A similar study on an American sample of 275 males and 336 females in Wisconsin also identified seven factors; however, the rank order of these factors differed for males and females (Cleek & Pearson, 1985). These researchers postulate that demographic data such as sex, age, length of marriage, years of education and number of children may be useful to identify groups that share the same characteristics for purposes of comparison.

Life Cycle

Developmental theory applied to the study of marriage and the family attempts to deal with the changes that take place as a result of transitions over time (Morrow, 1982; Olson, Russell, & Sprenkle, 1980). This developmental approach takes into account the dynamics of the process spouses experience as they progress developmentally (Lupri & Frideres, 1981). The use of life cycle as

a description of the structure and function of marital relationship interactions has been utilized in studies of marriage and family for the past thirty years. While Stuart (1980) does not use the term life-cycle, he describes age and stage of the marital relationship as boundary conditions that effect the stability of marriage. Stuart describes boundary conditions as pertaining to the internal and external forces that may exist at any one point in time within a marriage which do not determine the total success of the marriage; nevertheless, they do influence the content and the energy that is expended as a result of their presence. Age at marriage, aging while married, and the length and stages of marriage are all time-related factors that have a bearing on marital adjustment according to Stuart.

Although there is no consistent definition of the criteria for delineating the stages of development, much of the research has utilized some combination or modification of the stages outlined by Duvall (1967). Duvall defined the family life cycle as a sequence that is experienced universally and that is composed of periods of dynamic action interspersed with periods of relative calm. Duvall pictures this cycle as consisting of eight stages defined by using the length of time married and the age of the oldest child. Stage I consists of the beginning family married 0-5 years without children and progresses through stage VIII which consists of aging families delaing with retirement and death of the first spouse.

The developmental tasks attributed to each stage of the life cycle are defined as growth responsibilities by Duvall. Pertinent to the variables that will be investigated in this study are the ways in which values and the openness or closedness of one's belief system is impacted by the presence of children, aging, and the internal and external dynamics present at each stage. In the early stages of a marriage the system of values might be highly personalized and focused

more on the establishment of dyadic values (Medling & McCarrey, 1981). These researchers suggest that the middle years when children are more likely to be present in the home, a couple may be engaged in the reality of earning a living and establishing a career and values may be taken for granted. The time of parenthood may also be the time of greatest tension and conflict that will impact the couple's relationship (Olson, Russell & Sprenkle, 1980). In the latter stages of the life cycle a couple's priorities shift away from children and back to the dyadic relationship. Medling and McCarrey suggest that this shift also involves increased individual introspection; therefore, values and one's belief system becomes more prominant as the focus of the individual narrows and the couple experience maturation and retirement.

There has been some criticism of the criteria for each of the eight stages proposed by Duvall because the life events that mark the transitions in this scheme are traditional and they may not be as relevant as they were twenty years ago (Glick, 1977; Nock, 1981). For instance, some spouses will not fit into stages using the age of children because they are childless or have postponed beginning a family for longer than the five years defining Duvall's first (childless) stage. In spite of this criticism, her scheme is often taken as the standard reference in research studies (Nock, 1981). Different stratification methods such as age and years married have been proposed, yet none have been found to be clearly superior (Anderson, Russell & Schumm, 1983). For purposes of this study, information about the length of marriage, whether children are present in the home, and the age of the participants is reported, thus contributing to the picture of the couples who participated in this research.

Prior to the use of life cycle, marital adjustment was assumed to vary over time with decreasing satisfaction (Burr, 1979; Hicks & Platt, 1979). In reporting the results of twelve studies prior to 1970, Rollins and Feldman (1970) found

consistency in these studies showing a decrease of marital satisfaction over the first ten years of marriage for wives but not for husbands. These studies yield inconsistent data; however, because of the differences in the definition of marital satisfaction, the instrumentation used to measure variables and a wide variety of sampling that included use of wives only, individuals, couples, and one (Rollins & Feldman, 1970) that excluded couples that had been married more than five years without children because they were considered atypical. Blood and Wolfe (1960) found gradual decreases in satisfaction until children were launched, followed by a slight rise until retirement using a sample of 900 wives. A similar U-shaped, or curvilinear, pattern is reported by Burr (1970), Rollins and Feldman (1970) and Pineo (1961).

Studies have also indicated there are differences between wives and husbands in the perception of marital adjustment over the life cycle. Rollins and Feldman (1970) reported wives showed a decrease in marital satisfaction during the childrearing stages with an increase after the children were launched through the retirement stage. Husbands were less affected by the life cycle stages until the anticipation of retirement. An explanation for this difference between husbands and wives is offered by Barry (1970). Barry suggests that the first years of marriage are more difficult for women as they make transitions from career to motherhood than for husbands who do not have the same connotations and symbolic images of parenting. Burr (1979) used a sample of 116 intact couples and analyzed the data separately for husbands and wives. He found the school-age stage of the life cycle the most difficult with a tendency toward a gradual increase in satisfaction following this stage.

The curvilinear trend of satisfaction for both husbands and wives was corroborated by Lupri and Frideres (1981) in a sample of 194 wives and 168 husbands in Alberta, Canada, who found gender differences in various stages of

the life cycle along with a general U-shaped trend that showed a decrease in satisfaction in the early stages of the life cycle, a leveling off at midlife, and an increase in the later stages. In addition to the presence of children, these researchers used the wife's employment status as a variable and found an important and positive effect on the marital satisfaction of both husbands and wives. Employed wives were slightly more likely to be satisfied with their marriages and husbands showed an even higher degree of satisfaction if their wives were employed.

Using a sample of 196 wives in a midwestern city, Anderson, Russell, and Schumm (1982) investigated perceived marital quality and family life cycles using a combination of total number of children, length of marriage, and a modification of the eight stages of the life cycle elaborated by Duvall (1967). These researchers collapsed some of Duvall's traditional eight stages into five stages, with Stage I designated by beginning families with no children, followed by childbearing and pre-school stage, school-age, launching, and launched stages. Anderson, Russell, and Schumm (1983) found the life-cycle variable accounted for 8.4 percent of the variability in marital satisfaction and concluded that other factors must play a central role in determining marital satisfaction. This percentage of variability is consistent with other investigations of family life cycle as a predictor of marital adjustment (Nock, 1979; Spanier, Sauer & Lazelere, 1979).

Criticisms of the use of the family life cycle as a variable in investigations of marital adjustment have focused mainly on measurement issues discussed previously and on methodological issues. Cross sectional designs have been criticized by several because they may result in a deficit of information about the influence of changes due to maturation, cultural values, or socioeconomic status (Anderson, Russell & Schumm, 1983; Lupri & Frideres, 1981; Spanier,

Lewis & Cole, 1975). On the other hand Lupri and Frideres (1981) question whether longitudinal studies may produce fallacy by ignoring age and cohort differences. Cohort differences are defined by Anderson et al. as the consequence of divorced couples being eliminated from later stages of the life cycle. Selective survival has been mentioned by Lupri and Frideres as another feature that may tend to distort marital satisfaction studies because divorced and separated individuals or couples are no longer considered in the samples; thus, a strong normative component is found in samples of married couples.

In summary, Cleek and Pearson (1985) make the observation that although demographic data adds to the knowledge regarding causes of dissatisfaction in marriages, demographics do not provide personal reasons for the dissatisfaction. The results of demographic studies have resulted in a complex picture of which ones contribute to marital adjustment and how. The purpose of this study was to obtain demographic data for the purpose of describing the subjects participating in the investigation and to observe any patterns that may emerge from this information.

Summary

Although there has been a considerable amount of research on marital adjustment in the past, questions raised regarding the most significant predictors remain unanswered. There has been much interest in the study of values, but little has been done to establish a relationship between value consensus and marital adjustment in couples. Most of the research has been done using individuals rather than couples in a realistic field setting. The relationship of a person's open or closed belief system has been studied in interpersonal relationships, but little attention has been directed toward the possible relation of dogmatism to marital adjustment of couples. Additional research is warranted to discover if value similarity and dogmatism are reliable predictors

of the marital adjustment of couples. The use of couples in therapy extends the findings to a realistic setting with information useful to the counseling profession.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter contains the presentation and description of the methods and procedures utilized in this study. The procedures for random selection of subjects is detailed, as well as a demographic description of the subjects. Instruments used for the study are described and procedures used for collecting the data are documented. The chapter concludes with descriptions of the research design and the statistical analysis of the data.

Subjects

The 60 couples that comprised the sample for this investigation were randomly selected from a clinical population of 80 couples who were receiving therapy for marital distress. A total of 160 packets were distributed to husbands and wives by their therapists. Seventeen therapists participated in the data gathering process.

The subjects in this study were tabulated according to demographic variables of: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) length of years in current marriage, (d) whether they were previously divorced, (e) number of years of education completed, (f) whether they were employed, (g) number of children, and (h) whether there were children living in the home. There were 60 males and 60 females who comprised the sample of 60 couples.

The mean age of males in this sample was 39.2 years. The ages of males ranged from 23 to 67 years with a median of 38 years. The mean age of females was 37.6 years. Females ranged in age from 22 to 67 years with a median of 36

years. Couples had been married an average of 14.6 years. The range of years married was from one to 42 years with a median of 14 years.

The mean educational level of the male subjects was 15.76 years. For females, the mean educational level was 15.22 years. The educational level ranged from 10 to 19 years for males and from 12 to 20 years for females. The median number of years of education for both males and females was 16 years. Eighteen percent of males and 21.7 percent of the females had been previously divorced. None of the subjects reported they had been widowed.

Children still living in the home were reported in 66.7 percent of the cases. The number of children living in the home ranged from 1 to 6 children with the mean being 2.2 children. Seventy-five percent of the males were employed, while 66.7 percent of the females were employed.

The use of couples rather than individuals to obtain assessment of marital adjustment has been recommended by Olson, Russell and Sprenkle (1980) and Spanier (1976) because the research is focused on the perceptions and comparisons of the dyadic relationship. Olson (1970) has also criticized the overuse of college freshmen and sophomores in empirical research; therefore, the population for this study were couples from actual clinical settings. Five agencies were utilized as sources for the clinical population in order to increase the diversity of the population including a university marriage and family clinic, a hospital outpatient clinic, and a licensed psychologist's private practice.

The marriage and family clinic utilized in this study is located on the campus of a large midwestern state university and offers services to students and faculty as well as to persons in the surrounding area. The hospital outpatient clinic which is located in a metropolitan area of the same state has six branch offices servicing four additional cities that are contiguous to this hub. The licensed psychologist's private practice that was utilized in this study is located

in an affluent suburban community with a population of approximately 35,000. In addition to these agencies, four other qualified therapists involved in private practice in a metropolitan area gathered data from their clients.

Of the 80 couples who agreed to participate in this study, 68 couples completed and returned packets. Because subjects were allowed to take the packets home to complete, 12 couples were dropped from the population because they failed to return complete packets. Some of these couples dropped out of therapy and no follow-up was attempted to retrieve the data. Three couples moved away without returning data. It was deemed appropriate to respect the rights of these clients not to participate. A random number table was utilized to randomly select a sample of 60 couples from the 68 couples' packets that were returned and these were used in the analysis of this study.

A multiple regression power table was utilized in setting the criteria for the sample size of this study. According to Cohen (1977), for a correlational investigation with two independent variables, a medium effect size of .13, alpha .05, and an expected correlation square (R^2) of approximately .15, a sample of 60 subjects will yield estimated power of .82 using multiple regression analysis.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in this study: The Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960), The Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976). Permission for the use of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) has been granted by Spanier (Appendix C). These instruments were selected to provide measurements of the independent variables of dogmatism and values and the dependent variable of marital adjustment.

Dogmatism Scale

Form E of The Dogmatism Scale (Appendix A and labeled Opinion Survey to prevent prejudicial responses) was used to assess the open or closed-minded

belief system of married couples. This scale is a paper and pencil questionnaire designed to measure the relative openness or closedness of a person's belief system according to the function, content, and structure of Rokeach's theory (1960). Erlich and Lee (1969) support the paradigm of Rokeach that closed-minded persons are less able than open-minded persons to learn new beliefs and to change old beliefs. Form E is the fifth revision of the Dogmatism Scale. Each revision has been for the purpose of increasing the reliability and improving the item content (Pedhazur, 1971). The Dogmatism Scale has been widely used to explain and predict dogmatism in a variety of settings with diverse groups (Anderson, 1981; Byrne, Blaylock, & Goldberg, 1966; Carlozzi, Campbell, & Ward, 1982; Erlich, 1961; Gaensslen, May, & Wolpert, 1973; Jacobson, 1972; Kilpatrick, Cauthen, Sandman, & Quattlebaum, 1968; Mlott, 1977; Parrot, 1971; Pedhazur, 1971; Rokeach, 1960; Vacchiano, Strauss & Schiffman, 1968; Wahrman, 1980).

The Dogmatism Scale has been used as a research tool in many investigations applied to various situations (Vacchiano, Strauss, & Hochman, 1969). The reliability and validity of the scale has been reported by several researchers (Ehrlich, 1961; Korn & Giddan, 1964; Zagona & Zurcher, 1965). One of the first investigations using the Dogmatism Scale was a test of the hypothesis that closed-minded persons resist changing beliefs and, therefore, learning would be inversely related to dogmatism (Ehrlich, 1961). Ehrlich reports a five-year follow-up study on an original sample of 100 students enrolled in sociology classes. He reports a confirmation of the validity of Rokeach's theory and verifies that open-minded persons are more able to learn new beliefs and change old beliefs.

Factor analysis of the Dogmatism Scale has yielded inconsistent results although five factors appear consistently, Belief in one truth, Belief in a cause,

Virtuous self-denial, Self-proselytization, and Isolation-alienation (Parrot, 1971; Pedhazur, 1971; Steininger, 1973; Vacchiano et al., 1969). Sex differences have been reported by those who have analyzed the data using male and female subjects. In reporting norms for the Dogmatism Scale, Alter and White (1966) found males show consistently higher dogmatism scores than females and that this difference may be attributable to subcultural differences. Vacchiano et al. found the same factors for both sexes but many items differed for males and females. Pedhazur, in a study of 309 males and 526 females who were teachers and graduate students in New York concluded male and female differences warranted treating them separately. Steininger (1973) found in a content analysis of items on the Dogmatism Scale that only three of the factors showed items that were statistically different for males and females and concluded these could have occurred by chance; therefore, concluded the same factors are measured in both sexes.

Sex differences were also found by Kilpatrick et al. (1968) in a sample of 192 male and 188 female university students. High dogmatic males had a more conservative sex attitude than low dogmatic males; however, the same was not found for females. Sexually conservative males seem to be more closed-minded and less open to new information and ideas than their sexually liberal peers and showed less tolerance for attitudes differing from their own.

Form E of the Dogmatism Scale contains 40 items that differentiate significantly between levels of dogmatism using a Likert scale with six possible responses: (+1) I agree a little, (+2) I agree on the whole, (+3) I agree very much, (-1) I disagree a little, (-2) I disagree on the whole, and (-3) I disagree very much. To reduce central tendency, the (0) score was excluded. A constant score of 4 was added to each response, converting the scale to scores of 1 to 7 (Rokeach, 1960). Thus, the range of possible scores for each individual was from

40 to 280. For purposes of this study, three scores were obtained: husband's dogmatism, wife's dogmatism, and a total couple score computed by adding the husband's score to the wife's score. The total score for each couple was used in the statistical analysis to determine the relationship between the amount of dogmatism measured in a couple and their marital adjustment. A higher score indicated a high degree of dogmatism, lower scores the converse.

Mlott (1977, p. 143) states:

> . . . the higher an individual scores on this measure, the greater are his inferred attributes of conservatism, conventionalism, superstition, intolerance of ambiguity, and feelings of threat and insecurity. It is also likely that the high dogmatic individual will have a sense of moral self-righteousness, evidence a high level of anxiety, a need for status and power, . . . be intolerant of people, and have a strong negative attitude about self and others.

Reliability of the Dogmatism Scale. Rokeach (1960) reports test-retest reliability coefficients for the scale ranging from .68 to .93 with a median of .74 spanning one to six month intervals. This rho coefficient is supported by Erlich (1961) who reports split-half reliability was .88 for a sample of 100 students in a test-retest with a 5-6 month time span and he confirms Rokeach's theoretical formulations on the nature of the dogmatic cognitive structure. Also lending support to the reliability of the Dogmatism Scale is a test-retest study of 517 University of Arizona freshmen and sophomore students conducted by Zagona and Zurcher (1965) who found the Pearson r for the entire sample to be .70. Response set bias has been discounted by Wolfer (1967) when subjects' scores were not reduced on a second administration of the Dogmatism Scale after the subjects were informed of the purpose of the test.

Validity of the Dogmatism Scale. Construct validity is reported by Korn and Giddan (1964) who compared Dogmatism scores to several scales of the California Personality Inventory (CPI) using close to the entire freshman class at Stanford University (816 males and 396 females). The three CPI scales used for comparison, Well-being, Tolerance, and Flexibility, were deemed to be theoretically related to dogmatism by Korn and Giddan. Factor analysis of the Dogmatism Scale has been reported by Vacchiano et al. (1969), Parrot (1971), Pedhazur (1971), and Steininger (1973). For example, five factors of the Dogmatism Scale were found by Pedhazur using 309 male and 526 female teachers and graduate students. The factors identified were: (a) Belief in one truth, (b) Isolation-alienation, (c) Belief in one cause, (d) Self proselytization, and (e) Virtuous self denial for males and Narrowing and intolerance for females. Content analysis of the Dogmatism Scale using 98 male and 79 female students found inconsistent patterns in sex differences (Steininger, 1973). Steininger concluded the Dogmatism Scale had the same meanings for male and female college students and measured the same factors for both males and females.

Value Survey

The Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973) was used as a measure of the similarity of husband's and wife's value belief system (Appendix B). The Value Survey consists of two lists of 18 values each, one list measuring terminal values while the other list measures instrumental values. Rokeach describes values as choices of importance concerning states of existence with terminal values measuring ends, or ideal goals, and instrumental values measuring means, or modes of behavior (Rokeach, 1973).

Several forms of the Value Survey have been developed since 1967. Form G (1982) was used in this study. This form was published in 1982 and supercedes Form D which was published in 1967. Changes in the new edition

consist of changing the terminal value Happiness to Health and replacing the instrumental value Cheerfulness with Loyal. Form G consists of two lists: 18 terminal values and 18 instrumental values which respondents are instructed to rank order from 1 to 18 using gummed labels which can be moved from space to space. Each label contains a short definition of that value. The instructions for subjects are to make a choice based on ". . . the order of importance to YOU, as a guiding principle in YOUR life" (Value Survey, 1982, p. 2). The test is brief and takes approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The ordinal rankings of each list were transformed to interval data using a procedure similar to Medling and McCarrey (1981). The rankings for terminal values for each person were numbered from 1 to 18 with a score of 1 given to the value with the highest ranking and a score of 18 given to the value with the lowest ranking. Instrumental values for each person were also numbered from 1 to 18. The degree of similarity of terminal values for each couple was determined by taking the absolute difference of each terminal value ranking (numbered 1-18) between spouses and summing the difference scores for terminal values. Instrumental values were scored in a like manner. The difference scores for terminal values and instrumental values were summed yielding a total difference values score for each couple. A score of 0 will represent perfect congruence of the rank ordered values between spouses. As scores increase, the dissimilarity of values will be larger.

Reliability of the Value Survey. Median test-retest reliabilities for terminal values range from .62 to .80; for instrumental values the range is from .53 to .72 (Rokeach, 1973). Test-retest reliability of the Value Survey has been confirmed by Feather (1975) on a sample of 27 male and 50 female students. Feather found a median reliability of .74 for the terminal value system and .70 for the instrumental value system which is generally consistent with those

reported by Rokeach. One reason offered for the consistently higher reliability of the terminal values is the belief they are more stable due to being learned earlier in one's life (Rokeach, 1973). Feather suggests there is sufficient stability in student's responses to justify the use of the Value Survey in a variety of research contexts. Normative data on college and adult samples are available and include median scores for the 36 values by age, sex, income, educational level, occupation, race, college major, and political orientation (Rokeach, 1973).

Validity of the Value Survey. Several studies are reported by Rokeach (1973) that support the construct validity of the Value Survey. Rokeach conducted three types of studies: (a) Differentiation of groups varying in demographic and cultural variables, (b) studies that confirm relationships between specific subsets of values and attitudes toward political and religious issues, and (c) studies that show values are significantly related to specific and general behaviors. Studies using the Value Survey to predict marital adjustment have found support for spouse's similarity of values and marital adjustment (Kindelan & McCarrey, 1979; Martin, 1974; Nast, 1978; Stallman, 1978).

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) was used to measure marital adjustment as the dependent variable in this study. The Dyadic Adjustment Scales (DAS) was developed by pooling all items that had previously been used in assessing marital adjustment including items from the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959). Previously, the Locke-Wallace had been the most widely used instrument in this area.

Spanier developed this measure to conceptually distinguish dyadic adjustment from other concepts such as marital happiness, success, integration, satisfaction, etc. He wanted an instrument that would operationalize his view of maladjustment, to include all criteria important to adjustment, and one that

would be applicable to a study of all marriages. A pool of 300 items was submitted to a panel of three judges for the purpose of validating the content of the relevancy of the items to relationships and marital adjustment as conceptualized and defined by Spanier. Using the responses from a sample of 218 white, married persons and 400 divorced persons in Pennsylvania, the results were factor analyzed and resulted in a 32-item scale which yields an overall measure of marital adjustment. Factors in the scale include: dyadic satisfaction, cohesion, consensus, and affectional expression. Spanier includes a single item that also allegedly indicates the marital commitment of spouses.

The DAS is a questionnaire that takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. The scores are derived from a Likert scale with values ranging from 0 (Always disagree) to 5 (Always agree). A theoretical range of total summed scores is from 1-151 for each spouse with higher scores indicating a higher level of adjustment. For this study, husband's and wife's total scores will be summed to yield one combined score of marital adjustment for each couple.

Reliability of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Reliability was established for each factored subscale and for the total score using Cronbach's Coefficient (Spanier, 1976). Alpha was found to be .96 for the total scale and ranged from .73 to .94 on the four subscales in Spanier's study of 218 married persons located in four corporations in Centre County, Pennsylvania. He especially desired to avoid the university community with this sample, avoiding also any response sets which might be present in subjects that were sophisticated test takers. Sharpley and Cross (1982) report a replication of Spanier's reliability coefficient of .96 in a study of 95 unrelated married persons (58 females and 37 males). Mean scores on the DAS for the Sharpley and Cross sample was 108.5 which was close to the mean score reported by Spanier which was 101.5.

Validity of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Content validity of the DAS was evaluated by three judges as to the relevancy of the items, consistency to the definition of adjustment, and careful fixed choice wording. Criterion validity was established by comparing the difference between the divorced sample and the married sample (Spanier, 1976). Spanier reports the total mean scores for these two groups differed significantly ($p < .001$). Construct validity was established by correlating the items on the DAS with the Locke-Wallace Marriage Adjustment Scale. The correlation was .86 for the married sample and .88 for the divorced sample. Further evidence was found for the construct of marital adjustment by factor analysis of the 32-item scale which resulted in the four factors of marital adjustment, dyadic satisfaction, cohesion, consensus, and affectional expression.

Background Information: Demographics/Life Cycle

In addition to these three instruments, a personal information sheet was utilized in this study that was labeled Background Information (Appendix F). The purpose of this instrument was to gather information of the age, date of current marriage, previous marriages, number and ages of children, educational level and whether husband and/or wife were employed in order to help the reader better determine the extent of the generalizability of the results.

Procedure

The data gathering for this study was begun in the fall of 1986 and completed in April, 1987. The 17 therapists were furnished written instructions to insure consistency in the data gathering process (Appendix G). A suggested dialogue for use by the therapist in asking clients to participate in the study is included (Appendix H). Information on this sheet included the right of the client to refuse participation, purpose of the research study, assurance of confidentiality and what would be expected of each participant. Those clients

who consented to participate were asked to sign an Informed Consent Form (Appendix I). To assure the client's anonymity, the therapist was asked to keep this form in a private file. If the client desired a summary of the results of the study, they detached the bottom half of this form and mailed it to the author.

To further assure the anonymity of the client, the packets containing the instruments were identified with a number; no names were used. Information and test scores were kept confidential and only group scores and means were reported in the analysis.

Each subject agreeing to participate in the study was furnished a packet containing instructions (Appendix J), and the instruments in a numbered manila envelope. Approximately 35 minutes were needed to complete the forms. Each subject was asked to complete the forms independently and honestly. Subjects returned completed packets to their therapist who subsequently returned the instruments to the researcher.

Research Design

This study consisted of a correlational investigation of the relationship of a couple's similarity of values and level of dogmatism to their marital adjustment. Husband and wife combined scores were used to assess the perception of marital adjustment. The use of couples' scores has been proposed to be superior to the use of individual scores because they better reflect the current state of the marital relationship (Spanier, 1976). The use of the combined score of both spouses assesses the perception of the adjustment of the relationship as a functioning group (Medling & McCarrey, 1981).

Standard multiple regression was used to analyze the information from the completed instruments. Results of this study can be used to determine the predictive ability of dogmatism and value similarity of couples in therapy on their marital adjustment.

Statistical Analysis

Standard multiple regression was used to analyze the data to determine the ability of value similarity and dogmatism to predict marital adjustment. The criterion will be marital adjustment as measured by the summed scores of a husband and wife on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). The DAS provides a theoretical range of scores from 0-151 for each subject. The predictors of marital adjustment will be husband's and wife's summed score on dogmatism (Dogmatism Scale, Rokeach, 1960) and a difference score on values using the Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973). The Dogmatism Scale yields a range of possible scores from 1 to 240 and the Value Survey yields possible scores of 0 to 342 with a score of 0 indicating perfect congruence between wife's values and husband's values.

Summary

The sample for this study was randomly selected from a population of 80 couples engaged in therapy. Five counseling agencies and four therapists in private practice located in three cities in the midwest furnished the population from which the sample of 60 couples was randomly selected. Three instruments were administered to each subject: the Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), the Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) which is labeled Opinion Survey, and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976). The instruments are measures of the dependent variables values and dogmatism and the independent variable marital adjustment. In addition to the instruments, a demographic questionnaire was included in the data collection. Standard multiple regression was used to analyze the data to determine whether dogmatism and/or values are predictors of marital adjustment.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Standard multiple regression was used to analyze the relationship between the dependent variable marital adjustment and the independent predictor variables of value similarity and dogmatism. The entire sample of 60 couples was used for the multiple regression equation. Two tailed tests were used in the analyses with an alpha level set at .05.

Marital Adjustment and Its Predictor Variables

Hypotheses: Mean marital adjustment scores of couples in therapy will be negatively correlated with dogmatism and value difference scores.

A standard multiple regression analysis examining the relationship of couples' dogmatism and values scores to marital adjustment was run for the total sample. The continuous independent variable of dogmatism was a combined score of the husband and wife. The continuous independent variable of value similarity was a measure of the husband's values and the wife's values which were given a difference score for each couple. The continuous dependent variable was marital adjustment scores of the husband and of the wife which were summed to yield a marital adjustment score for each couple.

Assumptions of multiple regression were checked by the use of a histogram and scatterplot. The shape of the scatterplot of the standardized residuals (the dependent variable) indicated normality of distribution, linearity and homoscedasticity were not violated. Residuals and outliers were within the minimum/maximum range of $\pm$ 3.

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of the data. Table 2 provides the results of the regression analysis. The minimum criteria for the variables entered into the regression equation was the probability of F at the .05 level is equal to zero. Table 2 displays the raw score regression coefficients (B), the standardized regression coefficients (BETA), the multiple R, R squared and adjusted R.

Table 1

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations

For Dogmatism, Values and Marital Adjustment

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Couple's Dogmatism	273.72	50.39
Couple's Values (Total)	163.68	34.27
Couple's Marital Adjustment	198.45	33.43
Couple's Terminal Values	75.77	20.31
Couple's Instrumental Values	87.91	19.65
Husband's Dogmatism	138.68	30.75
Wife's Dogmatism	136.70	30.98
Husband's Marital Adjustment	100.15	16.23
Wife's Marital Adjustment	98.26	20.15

N = 60

Table 2

Standard Multiple Regression of Couple's Dogmatism and Couple's Values

Multiple R	.535
Multiple R^2	.287
Adjusted Multiple R^2	.262
F (2,57)	11.454*

	B	BETA	R	R^2	R^2 Adj.	F
Couple's Values	-.467	-.479	-.516	-.266	-.216	-17.230**
Couple's Dogmatism	-.099	-.149	-.266	-.071	-.021	-1.669

N = 60; *p < .01; **p < .025

Examination of Table 2 indicates that the prediction formula was significant (F (2,57) = 11.454, p < .05). A SYSTAT stepwise regression was run to determine the unique contribution of dogmatism and couple's values to the equation. Couple's values (adjusted R^2 = -.216) significantly contributed to the equation, while couple's dogmatism (adjusted R^2 = -.071) did not. Together, the independent variables of value similarity and dogmatism accounted for 26% (adjusted multiple R^2) of the variability in marital adjustment. Thus, the lower the difference scores in values (meaning greater value similarity), the greater the marital adjustment. Couple's values thus had a significant inverse relationship (BETA = -.479) to marital adjustment. Couple's dogmatism (adjusted R^2 = -.021) was not a significant contributor to the regression equation.

A Pearson correlation matrix was utilized to analyze the contribution of husbands' and wives' dogmatism to the marital adjustment of husbands and wives. Table 3 presents this correlation matrix.

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Matrix for Spouse's Dogmatism and Marital Adjustment

	Wife Dogmatism	Husband Dogmatism	Wife Marital Adjustment	Husband Marital Adjustment
Wife Dogmatism	1.000			
Husband Dogmatism	.374	1.000		
Wife Marital Adjustment	.140	.234	1.000	
Husband Marital Adjustment	.234	.259	.683	1.000

Tabled value Pearson R (2 tailed) $p < .05 = .268$

This table indicates that while dogmatism does not contribute significantly to marital adjustment, husbands' dogmatism is more related to the husbands' marital adjustment (.26) than is the wives' dogmatism to the wives' marital adjustment (.14). However, these contributions are both relatively low.

For further information, Table 4 presents a correlation matrix for husbands' and wives' marital adjustment with terminal and instrumental value differences. While all value differences are negatively correlated with marital

adjustment, there is a higher inverse relationship in husbands' terminal values to husbands' marital adjustment ($r=.57$, $p < .05$). Wives' terminal values are inversely correlated to wives' marital adjustment, but to a somewhat lesser degree ($r=.45$, $p < .05$). Instrumental values were inversely correlated to both husbands' and wives' marital adjustment, but these correlations were smaller than the correlation of terminal values.

Table 4

Pearson Correlation Matrix for Spouse's Marital Adjustment and Terminal And Instrumental Value Differences

	Terminal Values	Husband Marital Adjustment	Instrumental Values	Wife Marital Adjustment
Terminal Values	1.000			
Husband Marital Adjustment	-.566	1.000		
Instrumental Values	.471	-.321	1.000	
Wife Marital Adjustment	-.445	.683	-.303	1.000

N = 60; Tabled value Pearson R (2 tailed) $p < .05 = .268$

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between dogmatism and values to the marital adjustment of couples in therapy. Standard

multiple regression analysis was significant for an inverse relationship between value differences, dogmatism, and marital adjustment. Couples' value difference scores contributed significantly to the regression equation, while dogmatism did not.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between value similarity and dogmatism to the marital adjustment of couples in therapy. A total of 60 couples were randomly selected from the clinical populations of five agencies and four psychological private practices in the midwest. Seventeen therapists distributed packets of instruments to clients consenting to participate. The completed packets were returned to the therapists and subsequently gathered by the researcher. The packets were identified by numbers only, thus protecting the anonymity of the clients. Dogmatism was measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. Values were measured by Rokeach's Value Survey and marital adjustment was assessed by the Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

The hypothesis for this study stated that mean marital adjustment scores of couples in therapy will be negatively correlated with dogmatism and value difference scores. Following statistical analysis, the hypothesis was accepted.

The data was analyzed by a standard multiple regression analysis in order to determine the predictability of marital adjustment using the independent variables of dogmatism and values. The regression equation was significant for the hypothesis that mean marital adjustment scores of couples in therapy are inversely related to the value differences and dogmatism of couples. Values significantly contributed to the dependent variable of marital adjustment (22%), but the contribution of dogmatism was minimal (7%).

Further analysis of the data using a Pearson correlation matrix yielded the information that terminal values, which are end states, were more highly correlated with marital adjustment than were instrumental values, which are modes of conduct. Furthermore, husbands' terminal values were more highly correlated with the marital adjustment of husbands than wives' terminal values with the marital adjustment of wives.

Conclusions

Conclusions may be drawn based on the results of this study and other previous research that supports or differs from these results. The significance of the negative correlation between value differences and marital adjustment means that the more similar a couple's value system, the higher their marital adjustment. This supports the findings of Nast (1978) who stated that a couple would function in a more satisfactory way if there was a congruence in their value systems. While not using the same combination of instruments of measurement of values and/or marital adjustment and using varying statistical procedures, the significance of value similarity to marital adjustment reported by Kelley (1974), Martin (1974), and Stenberg (1980) was supported by this study. The Value Survey and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale were used by Stallman (1978) and Medling and McCarrey (1981) with varying results. Stallman contrasted assumed and actual similarity of values finding wives' assumptions and husbands' actual similarity of values to be significant. Medling and McCarrey found value similarity contributes a very low percentage of the variability of marital adjustment although the impact was greater in couples married 25 years or more.

In contrast to many studies of values and marital adjustment which focused primarily on the identification of specific terminal or instrumental values as predictors of marital adjustment, this study relied on the similarity of the couple's value system overall. A significant correlation found in this study

between couples' terminal values and marital adjustment contrasts with the findings of Martin (1974) who found instrumental values more predictive of marital adjustment. As instrumental values represent modes of behavior and terminal values represent end states of existence, this study suggests a relationship between the couple's ultimate aims or goals and their marital adjustment. Based upon these results, agreement between spouses on how to achieve these ultimate aims on a practical, instrumental level, appears to be less predictive of their marital adjustment.

This study also supports those researchers who did not find dogmatism to be a significant predictor of marital adjustment. While he did not use couples for his study, White (1975) did not find statistical support for differentiating between high dogmatic subjects and low dogmatic subjects in relation to marital adjustment. Mlott (1977) also did not find dogmatism a significant predictor of marital adjustment when contrasting couples in therapy with couples not in therapy.

Several male and female subjects strongly objected to statements in the Opinion Survey such as "Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature" and "While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare." It is possible that the presence of sexist language in the Opinion Survey prejudices some people negatively toward this instrument. The effect of this negative reaction was not reported by participants; however, the elimination of sexist language would eliminate any negative effect this might produce in responses to the Survey.

In this study, spouses' scores were summed to yield a score for each couple. Some information is lost when this is done because there may be a large discrepancy between the level of dogmatism of the spouses. For instance, one spouse might have a high level of dogmatism and the other spouse might have a

low level of dogmatism. Combining the scores loses information about gender differences and discrepancies that might affect marital adjustment. Questions that might be asked include: "Do couples who have large differences in the level of dogmatism report higher or lower levels of marital adjustment?"; "Does it make a difference whether the husband or the wife is the more open or closed minded?"; and "Do couples having similar levels of dogmatism report higher or lower levels of marital adjustment?"

The effect of the economic crisis currently being experienced in the geographical location of this study may have impacted the 25% of the males who were unemployed. Unemployment of husbands and the employment status of wives was not a focus of statistical comparison in this study; however, financial difficulties would certainly seem to have some influence on marital adjustment as well as perhaps on a couple's current value system.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations were generated from this study.

1. Because so few studies have utilized couples in therapy, future studies may need to replicate the use of clinical populations in order to study the field that is pertinent to counselors and therapists.

2. A comparison of a clinical population of couples with a non-clinical population of couples would allow any similarities or differences between the two groups to be analyzed.

3. A measure of dogmatism could be developed that is free of sexist language and reflects more current belief systems.

4. In the future, a study of dogmatism and marital adjustment could utilize difference scores for couples, rather than summed scores, to establish whether discrepancies between spouses affects marital adjustment.

5. Treatment studies on the effect of value similarity and marital adjustment could establish whether reducing differences in values between spouses produces higher marital adjustment. Various modes of treatment could be compared to establish effectiveness.

6. Further research is need to account for variables that contribute significantly to marital adjustment. This study identified 26% of the variance in marital adjustment is contributed by the relationship of value similarity, but this leaves a great deal of room for other factors to be identified as having a relationship to marital adjustment. This would seem to support Anderson (1983) who concludes that the best combination of predictors of marital adjustment has not yet been discovered. The answer to the questions Levinger (1965) poses, "What makes a marriage stick?" and "What breaks it apart?" (p. 19), remain incompletely answered.

Recommendations for Counseling Practice

1. Values are subject to change and counselors may need to encourage spouses to evaluate their value systems periodically. As life events and life cycle circumstances change, couples might need to reassess their value systems both in terms of terminal values (end states) and instrumental values (modes of conduct).

2. Couples may need to be encouraged to consider whether their instrumental values contribute to the end goals they identify. Differences and/or similarities in personality patterns and history may need to be explored to identify changes that could be made to promote greater congruence between the identified end goals of spouses and their modes of conduct to achieve these value goals.

3. Values are amenable to change as opposed to demographic criteria such as age, socioeconomic status, and length of marriage. Therefore,

identifying a couple's value similarity early in the counseling process could enable the negotiation of compromise and enhance understanding and acceptance of differences between spouses.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. S., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levison, D. J., & Sanford, R. M. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.

Allport, G. W., & Vernon, P. E. (1931). A study of values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1951). Study of values. (rev. ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). A study of values. (rev. ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Alter, R. D., & White, J. (1966). Some norms for the dogmatism scale. Psychological Reports, 19, 967-969.

Anderson, M. A. (1981). The dogmatic personality: A discriminant analysis of personality factors related to dogmatism in high school students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 739B.

Anderson, S. A., Russell, C. S., & Schumm, W. R. (1983). Perceived marital quality and family life-cycle categories: A further analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 127-139.

Argyle, M., & Furnham, R. (1983). Sources of satisfaction and conflict in long-term relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 481-493.

Bahr, S. J., Chappell, C. B., & Leight, G. K. (1983). Age at marriage, role enactment, role consensus, and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 795-803.

Barry, W. A. (1970). Marriage research and conflict: An integrative review. Psychological Buletin, 73, 41-54.

Bernhardson, C. S. (1967). Dogmatism, defense mechanisms, and social desirability responding. Psychological Reports, 20, 511-513.

Bernhardson, C. S., & Fisher, R. J. (1970). Personality correlates of dogmatism: Methodological problems. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 449.

Blood, R., & Wolf, D. (1960). Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Burgess, E. W., & Cottrell, L., Jr. (1939). Predicting success or failure in marriage. New York: Prentice Hall.

Burgess, E., & Locke, H. (1960). The family. New York: American Book.

Burr, W. (1970). Satisfaction with various aspects of marriage over the life-cycle: A random middle class sample. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 29-37.

Burns, A. (1984). Perceived causes of marriage breakdown and conditions of life. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46(3), 551-562.

Byrne, D., & Blaylock, B. (1963). Similarity and assumed similarity of attitudes between husbands and wives. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 636-640.

Byrne, D., Blaylock, B., & Goldberg, J. (1966). Dogmatism and defense mechanisms. Psychological Reports, 18, 739-742.

Carlozzi, A. F., Campbell, N. J., & Ward, G. R. (1982). Dogmatism and externality in locus of control as related to counselor trainee skill in facilitative responding. Counselor Education and Supervision, 21, 227-236.

Cleek, N. G., & Pearson, T. Q. (1985). Perceived causes of divorce: An analysis of interrelationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 74, 179-183.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis in behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, M. S. (1980). Personality needs as related to marital adjustment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3882B.

Cole, C. L. (1974). Values and marital adjustment: A test of homogamy theory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 6769-6770A.

Corsini, R. J. (1956a). Multiple predictors of marital happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 18, 240-242.

Corsini, R. J. (1956b). Understanding and similarity in marriage. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52, 327-332.

Craddock, A. E. (1977). Relationships between authoritarianism, marital power expectations andmarital value systems. Australian Journal of Psychology, 29(3), 211-221.

Danesh, H. B. (1984, October). Uses and abuses of power in interpersonal relationships. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on Authoritarianism and Dogmatism, Potsdam, New York.

De Boer, C. (1981). The polls: Marriage - a decaying institution? Public Opinion Quarterly, 45, 265-275.

Donohue, K. C., & Ryder, R. G. (1982). A methodological note on marital satisfaction and social variables. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 737-747.

Dukes, W. (1955). Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 24-50.

Duvall, E. M. (1967). Family development. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Ehrlich, H. J. (1961). Dogmatism and learning: A five-year follow-up. Psychological Reports, 9, 283-286.

Ehrlich, H. J., & Lee, D. (1969). Dogmatism, learning and resistance to change: A review and a new paradigm. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 249-260.

Farber, B. (1957). An index of marital integration. Sociometry, 20, 117-134.

Feather, N. J. (1971). Test-retest reliability of individual values and value systems. Australian Psychologist, 6(3), 181-188.

Feather, N. J., & Peay, E. R. (1975). The structure of terminal and instrumental values: Dimensions and clusters. Australian Journal of Psychology, 27(2), 151-164.

Finkel, N. J. (1984). Rigidity. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Psychology, 2, (244-245). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Frank, R. (1974). Value similarity, role expectation and cognitive style as factors in marital adjustment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 5694-5695B.

Fromm, E. (1947). Man for himself. New York: Rinehart.

Gaensslen, H., May, F., & Wolpert, F. (1973). Relation between dogmatism and anxiety. Psychological Reports, 33, 955-958.

Glenn, N. D., & Supancic, M. (1984). Social and demographic correlates of divorce and separation in the United States: An update and reconsideration. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46(3), 563-576.

Glenn, N. D., & Weaver, C. M. (1978). A multivariate, multisurvey study of marital happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 269-280.

Glick, P. C. (1977). Updating the life cycle of the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 5-13.

Goode, W. J. (1956). After divorce. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Goode, W. J. (1961). Family disorganization in contemporary social problems. New York: Harcourt & Brace.

Gordon, L. V. (1960). Survey of interpersonal values. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Gottman, J. M. (1979). Marital interactions: Experimental investigations. New York: Academic Press.

Gray-Little, B. (1983). Power and satisfaction in marriage: A review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 93(3), 513-538.

Hamilton, G. (1929). A research in marriage. New York: Boni.

Hicks, M. W., & Platt, N. (1970). Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the 60's. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 553-574.

Jacobson, B. S. (1972). Value patterns, dogmatism, and social alienation. New York: New York University.

Juan, I. R., Paiva, R. E. A., Haley, H. B., & O'Keefe, R. D. (1974). High and low levels of dogmatism in relation to personality characteristics of medical students: A follow-up study. Psychological Reports, 34, 303-315.

Kelley, M. J. (1974). Values and value systems in marriage as related to marital success and selected demographic variables. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 8044A.

Kelly, E. L. (1955). Consistency of the adult personality. American Psychologist, 10, 659-681.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Cauthen, N. R., Sandman, C. A., & Quattlebaum, L. F. (1968). Dogmatism and personal sexual attitudes. Psychological Reports, 23, 1105-1106.

Kimmel, D., & Van Der Veen, F. (1974). Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's marital adjustment test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 57-63.

Kindelan, K. N., & McCarrey, M. W. (1979). Spouses' value systems: Similarity, type and attributed marital adjustment. Psychological Reports, 44(3, pt. 2), 1295-1302.

Kitson, G. C., & Sussman, N. B. (1982). Marital complaints, demographic characteristics, and symptoms of mental distress in divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 87-101.

Kitwood, R., & Smithers, A. (1975). Measurement of human values: An appraisal of the work of Milton Rokeach. Educational Research, 17(3), 175-179.

Klagsbrun, F. (1985). Married people: Staying together in the age of divorce. New York: Bantam Books.

Kluckhohn, R. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Korn, H., & Gidden, M. (1964). Scoring methods and construct validity of the dogmatism scale. Education and Psychological Measurement, 24, 867-874.

Landau, C. (1984). Marital adjustment. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Laws, J. L. (1971). A feminist review of the marital adjustment literature: The rape of the Locke. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 483-516.

Lee, D. E., & Erlich, H. J. (1971). Beliefs about self and others: A test of the dogmatism theory. Psychological Reports, 28, 919-922.

Lederer, W.J., & Jackson, P. D. (1968). Mirages of marriage. New York: W. W. Norton.

Lerner, A. (1984). Political values. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Psychology (pp. 61-62). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Levin, J., & Spates, J. L. (1968). Closed systems of behavior and traditional family ideology. Psychological Reports, 23, 978.

Levinger, G. (1965). Marital cohesiveness and dissolution: An integration review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, 19-38.

Levinger, G. (1966). Sources ofmarital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36, 803-807.

Levinger, G., & Breedlove, J. (1966). Interpersonal attraction and agreement: A study of marriage partners. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 367-372.

Lewis, R. A., & Spanier, G. B. (1979). The measurement of marital quality. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 5, 288.

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

Lupri, E., & Frideres, J. (1981). The quality of marriage and the passage of time. Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle. The Canadian Journal of Sociology, 6, 283.

Markman, M. J. (1981). Prediction of marital distress: A five-year follow-up. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 760.

Martin, J. D. (1974). Value convergence as it relates to marrital adjustment of twenty-five well-adjusted and twenty-five maladjusted couples in southeast Massachusetts. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 3560B.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). The authoritarian character structure. Journal of Social Psychology, 18, 401-411.

Medling, J. M., & McCarrey, M. (1981). Marital adjustment over segments of the family life cycle: The issue of spouse's value similarity. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 195-203.

Mlott, S. R. (1977). Dogmatism, locus of control, and life goals in stable and unstable marriages. Journal of Clinical Psychology,33(1), 142-146.

Morrow, T. O. (1982). The interrelationship between husband's and wive's purpose in life, ranking of values, and marital adjustment at three stages of the family life cycle. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 733-734A.

Mueller, D. J. (1984). In Test Critiques, 1, 549-554. Test Corporation of America, Kansas City, MO: Westport Publishers, Inc.

Murstein, B. I. (1970). Stimulus-value-role: A theory of marital choice. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 465-481.

Nast, E. C. (1978). The relationship between value systems and marital satisfaction.

Nock, S. L. (1981). Family life-cycle transitions: Longitudinal effects on family members. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 703-714.

Olson, D. H. (1970). Marital and family therapy: Integrative review and critique. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 501-538.

Olson, D. H. (1977). Insiders' and outsiders' view of relationships: Research strategies. In G. Levinger and Raush (Eds.), Close Relationships. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Olson, D. H., Russell, C. S., & Sprenkle, D. H. (1980). Circumplex model of marital and family systems II: Empirical studies and clinical intervention. Advances in Family Intervention, Assessment and Theory, 1, 129-179.

Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D., & Russell, C. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems I: Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types and clinical applications. Family Process, 14, 1-35.

Parrott, G. (1971). Dogmatism and rigidity: A factor analysis. Psychologial Reports, 29, 135-140.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1971). Factor structure of the dogmatism scale. Psychological Reports, 28, 735-740.

Pineo, P. (1961). Disenchantment in the later years of marriage. Marriage and Family Living, 23, 3-11.

Rokeach, M. (1954). The nature and meaning of dogmatism. Psychological Review, 61, 194-204.

Rokeach, M. (1956). Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. Psychological Monograph, 70, No. 18 (Whole No. 425).

Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes, and values. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1979). Understanding human values. New York: Free Press.

Rhyne, D. (1981). Bases of marital satisfaction among men and women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 941-954.

Rollins, B., & Cannon, K. (1974). Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle: A reevaluation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 271-282.

Rollins, B., & Feldman, H. (1970). Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 20-27.

Sharpely, C. F. & Cross, D. G. (1982). A psychometric evaluation of the Spanier dyadic adjustment scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 739-741.

Smithers, A. (1970). Personality patterns and levels of dogmatism. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9, 183-184.

Spanier, G. B. (1972). Further evidence on methodological weaknesses in the Locke-Wallace marital adjustment scale and other measures of adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 403-404.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: new scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 15-28.

Spanier, G. B. (1979). The measurement of marital quality. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 5, 288-300.

Spanier, G. B., & Glick, P. C. (1981). Marital instability in the United States: Some correlates and changes. Family Relations, 31, 329-338.

Spanier, G. B., & Lewis, R. A. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, __, 825-839.

Spanier, G. B., Lewis, R., & Cole, C. (1975). Marital adjustment over the family life cycle: The issue of curvilinearity. Journal of Marriage and the, Family, 37, 262-275.

Spanier, G., Sauer, W., & Larzelere, R. (1979). An empirical evaluation of the family life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 27-38.

Spanier, G., Sauer, W., & Larzelere, R. (1979). Gnawing away again: A reply and comment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 692-693.

Sprenkle, D., & Olson, D. H. (1978). Circumplex model of marital systems IV: Empirical study of clinic and non-clinic couples. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 4, 59-74.

Stallman, L. S. (1978). Personal values, family values and control values: The interpersonal perception of these valuesand marital adjustment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5528B.

Stein, H. F. (1985). Therapist and family values in a cultural context. Counseling and Values, 30, 35-46.

Steininger, N. (1973). Sex differences in open-ended responses to the dogmatism scale items. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 36, 916-918.

Stenberg, B. E. (1980). An investigation of the relationship between marital values and marital satisfaction. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1490B.

Stuart, R. B. (1980). Helping couples change: A social learning approach to marital therapy. New York: Guilford Press.

Terman, L. (1938). Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

U. S. Bureau of the Census (1985). Statistical Abstract of the United States (105th Ed.). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Commerce.

Vacchiano, R. B., Strauss, P.S., & Hochman, L. (1969). The open andclosed mind: A review of dogmatism. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 261-273.

Vacchiano, R. B., Strauss, P. S., & Schiffman, D. C. (1968). Personality correlates of dogmatism. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 83-85.

Value Survey (1967). Halgren Tests, 873 Persimmon Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94087.

Value Survey (1982). Halgren Tests, NW 1145 Clifford, Pullman, WA 99163.

Wahrman, I. S. (1980). A study of the relationship of dogmatism, religious group membership, and moral judgment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4750B.

Weed, J. A. (1974). Age at marriage as a factor in state divorce rate differentials. Demography, 11(3), 361-375.

White, P. W. (1975). The relationship of family ideology, dogmatism, and religious attitudes, with marital happiness in university couples. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 5065A.

Wolfer, J. A. (1967). Changes of dogmatism scores of high and low dogmatics as a function of instructions. Psychological Reports, 20, 947-950.

Yanklovich, D. (1981). New rules: Searching for self fulfillment in a world turned upside down. New York: Random House.

Zagona, S. V., & Zurcher, L. A. (1965). Notes on the reliability and validity of the dogmatism scale. Psychological Reports, 16, 1234-1236.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

OPINION SURVEY

OPINION SURVEY

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

Write the number that best describes how you feel about each item.

+3	+2	+1	-1	-2	-3
I agree very much	I agree on the whole	I agree a little	I disagree a little	I disagree on the whole	I disagree very much

_____ 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
_____ 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
_____ 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
_____ 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
_____ 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
_____ 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
_____ 7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
_____ 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
_____ 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
_____ 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
_____ 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
_____ 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
_____ 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what others are saying.
_____ 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
_____ 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
_____ 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

_____ 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
_____ 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
_____ 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
_____ 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
_____ 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
_____ 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
_____ 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
_____ 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
_____ 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
_____ 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
_____ 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
_____ 28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
_____ 29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
_____ 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
_____ 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
_____ 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
_____ 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
_____ 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
_____ 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
_____ 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
_____ 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
_____ 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."
_____ 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
_____ 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX B

VALUE SURVEY

FORM G

VALUE SURVEY

BIRTH DATE_____ SEX: MALE_____ FEMALE_____

CITY and STATE OF BIRTH_____

NAME (FILL IN ONLY IF REQUESTED)_____

HALGREN TESTS
873 PERSIMMON AVE.
SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94087
(408) 738-1342

INSTRUCTIONS

On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Each value is printed on a gummed label which can be easily peeled off and pasted in the boxes on the left-hand side of the page.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 1 on the left.

Then pick out the value which is second most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 2. Then do the same for each of the remaining values. The value which is least important goes in Box 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The labels peel off easily and can be moved from place to place. The end result should truly show how you really feel.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

A COMFORTABLE LIFE
(a prosperous life)

AN EXCITING LIFE
(a stimulating, active life)

A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
(lasting contribution)

A WORLD AT PEACE
(free of war and conflict)

A WORLD OF BEAUTY
(beauty of nature and the arts)

EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)

FAMILY SECURITY
(taking care of loved ones)

FREEDOM
(independence, free choice)

HEALTH
(physical and mental well-being)

INNER HARMONY
(freedom from inner conflict)

MATURE LOVE
(sexual and spiritual intimacy)

NATIONAL SECURITY
(protection from attack)

PLEASURE
(an enjoyable, leisurely life)

SALVATION
(saved, eternal life)

SELF-RESPECT
(self-esteem)

SOCIAL RECOGNITION
(respect, admiration)

TRUE FRIENDSHIP
(close companionship)

WISDOM
(a mature understanding of life)

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED, GO TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Below is another list of 18 values. Arrange them in order of importance, the same as before.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

AMBITIOUS
(hard-working, aspiring)

BROADMINDED
(open-minded)

CAPABLE
(competent, effective)

CLEAN
(neat, tidy)

COURAGEOUS
(standing up for your beliefs)

FORGIVING
(willing to pardon others)

HELPFUL (working
for the welfare of others)

HONEST
(sincere, truthful)

IMAGINATIVE
(daring, creative)

INDEPENDENT
(self-reliant, self-sufficient)

INTELLECTUAL
(intelligent, reflective)

LOGICAL
(consistent, rational)

LOVING
(affectionate, tender)

LOYAL
(faithful to one's friends, group)

OBEDIENT
(dutiful, respectful)

POLITE
(courteous, well-mannered)

RESPONSIBLE
(dependable, reliable)

SELF-CONTROLLED
(restrained, self-disciplined)

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR USE OF DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

408 Steve Douglas
Edmond, OK 73034
February 9, 1986

G. B. Spanier
Department of Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dear Dr. Spanier:

In reviewing the research literature on measurements of marital adjustment and in consulting with my dissertation advisor and other professors at Oklahoma State University, I have decided to ask your permission to use the Dyadid Adjustment Scale. My research topic is the investigation of the influence of dogmatism and values over the life cycle of married couples as measured by the dependent variable of marital adjustment.

It is my understanding there is no commercial copy of this instrument and that, with your permission, the DAS may be reproduced as it appears in your article (1976) in the Journal of Marriage and the Family. If you have any questions as to how the DAS will be used or reported, please do not hesitate to inquire or to call collect (405-341-4206).

Thank you for your consideration of this request for permission to use your instrument.

Sincerely,

Ruth Ann Brandt

Ruth Ann Brandt

Permission Granted

G. B. Spanier 2/25/86

APPENDIX D

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

(Developed by G. B. Spanier, 1980)

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

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1. Handling family finances						
2. Matters of recreation						
3. Religious matters						
4. Demonstrations of affection						
5. Friends						
6. Sex relations						
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)						
8. Philosophy of life						
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws						
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important						
11. Amount of time spent together						
12. Making major decisions						
13. Household tasks						
14. Leisure time interests and activities						
15. Career decisions						

	All the time	Most of the time	More often than not	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?						

	All the time	Most of the time	More often than not	Occa-sionally	Rarely	Never
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?						
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?						
19. Do you confide in your mate?						
20. Do you ever regret that you married? (or lived together)						
21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?						
22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"						

	Every Day	Almost Every Day	Occa-sionally	Rarely	Never
23. Do you kiss your mate?					

	All of them	Most of them	Some of them	Very few of them	None of them
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?					

	Never	Less than once a month	Once or twice a month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas						
26. Laugh together						
27. Calmly discuss something						
28. Work together on a project						

There are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Check yes or no)

	Yes	No	
29.	_____	_____	Being too tired for sex.
30.	_____	_____	Not showing love.

31. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

_____ I want desparately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.

_____ I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.

_____ I want very much for my relation to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.

_____ It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.

_____ It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.

_____ My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

APPENDIX E

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCORING KEY

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE

(Developed by G. B. Spanier, 1980)

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

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occa-sionally Disagree	Fre-quently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1. Handling family finances	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Matters of recreation	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Religious matters	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Demonstrations of affection	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Friends	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Sex relations	5	4	3	2	1	0
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	5	4	3	2	1	0
8. Philosophy of life	5	4	3	2	1	0
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	5	4	3	2	1	0
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important	5	4	3	2	1	0
11. Amount of time spent together	5	4	3	2	1	0
12. Making major decisions	5	4	3	2	1	0
13. Household tasks	5	4	3	2	1	0
14. Leisure time interests and activities	5	4	3	2	1	0
15. Career decisions	5	4	3	2	1	0

	All the time	Most of the time	More often than not	Occa-sionally	Rarely	Never
16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	0	1	2	3	4	5

	All the time	Most of the time	More often than not	Occa-sionally	Rarely	Never
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?	0	1	2	3	4	5
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?	5	4	3	2	1	0
19. Do you confide in your mate?	5	4	3	2	1	0
20. Do you ever regret that you married? (or lived together)	0	1	2	3	4	5
21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	0	1	2	3	4	5
22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"	0	1	2	3	4	5

	Every Day	Almost Every Day	Occa-sionally	Rarely	Never
23. Do you kiss your mate?	4	3	2	1	0

	All of them	Most of them	Some of them	Very few of them	None of them
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?	4	3	2	1	0

	Never	Less than once a month	Once or twice a month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	0	1	2	3	4	5
26. Laugh together	0	1	2	3	4	5
27. Calmly discuss something	0	1	2	3	4	5
28. Work together on a project	0	1	2	3	4	5

There are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Check yes or no)

	Yes	No	
29.	0	1	Being too tired for sex.
30.	0	1	Not showing love.

31. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

5 I want desparately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.

4 I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.

3 I want very much for my relation to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.

2 It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.

1 It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.

0 My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

APPENDIX F

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Your Age: _____ Your Sex: _____

Wedding date of current marriage: _____

Have you ever been: divorced _____ widowed _____

If you have children, please list their ages and sex.

Age	Sex	Living in the Home (Yes or No)

Educational Background (list highest level completed):

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

Employment:

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

APPENDIX G

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THERAPISTS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THERAPIST

Thank you for your cooperation in gathering data for this research project. To ensure consistency in the information gathering process please follow these instructions:

1. The "Information Sheet for Therapists" suggests a way of informing your clients of the purpose of this study and of the protection of their rights.
2. Have your clients sign the "Informed Consent Form" and KEEP this form in your file. This insures your client's anonymity. If they desire information regarding results of the study they may detach the bottom half of this form and mail it to me.
3. Each packet is marked with a number and a letter. IMPORTANT: Give the packet marked H to the husband and the packet marked W to the wife.
4. Please encourage your clients to fill out the instruments in your clinic. If this is not possible, they may be taken home and returned to you the following week.

The packets will be collected on _____.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (405) 341-4206. Thanks again for your cooperation.

Ruth Brandt

APPENDIX H

INFORMATION FOR THERAPISTS

INFORMATION FOR THERAPISTS

TO USE IN INFORMING CLIENTS OF THE PURPOSE

OF THIS STUDY AND OF THEIR RIGHTS.

Therapist: The following is a sample of a dialogue that you may use to inform your clients of what is involved in participation in this study and of their rights.

"You have been selected as a possible subject for participation in a study for a dissertation at Oklahoma State University. You do not have to consent to participate."

"If you would like to participate, your identity will be kept confidential. Your name will not be used and the results will not reflect your individual information. The information requested will involve about 35 minutes of your time. The questionnaires and instruments used will pertain to your marital relationship and you will be asked to complete the information without consulting or sharing the information with your spouse. If you desire to have feedback about the results of this study, you may indicate your desire and information will be furnished when the study is completed."

APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A STUDY OF MARRIED COUPLES AS PART OF A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION FOR OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY.

I, _____, agree to participate in the above identified study being conducted by Ruth Brandt. I understand that I will be given a questionnaire about my life situation and three short instruments.

I understand that I may receive information regarding the results of this study if I so desire.

All information pertaining to me will remain confidential and my basic human rights will be protected and preserved at all times. My participation in this study is voluntary.

_____ _____

Signature Date

If you desire a summary of the results of this study, please detach at the dotted line and mail to:

Ruth Brandt
408 Steve Douglas
Edmond, OK 73034

Results will be available sometime in 1987.

Please include your name and address.

APPENDIX J

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for your cooperation in participating in this research study. It is essential that all of the sheets provided be filled out. Your name will not be necessary; your responses will remain confidential. Please answer the questions honestly as they pertain to you at the present time.

Please check to be sure you have responded to:

1. Background Information
2. Value Survey
3. Opinion Survey
4. Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

When you have completed the above instruments, please replace them in the manila envelope, seal, and RETURN THEM TO YOUR THERAPIST OR DESIGNATED PERSON WITHIN ONE WEEK.

VITA

Ruth Ann Brandt

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: VALUE SIMILARITY AND DOGMATISM AS RELATED TO MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF COUPLES IN THERAPY

Major Field: Applied Behavioral Studies

Specialization: Counseling Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Topeka, Kansas, August 14, 1934, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Chalmers Waller.

Education: Graduated from Atchison High School, Atchison, Kansas, in May, 1951; received Bachelor of Science in Home Economics Education from Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, in 1955; received Master of Education in Counseling Psychology from Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma, in 1980; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1987.

Professional Experience: Home Economics and English teacher at St. George High School, 1955-56; Practicum counselor at Oklahoma Health Sciences Center in Pediatric Psychology and Speech and Hearing Clinic, 1979-80; Co-owner and counselor in private practice, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1980-84; Doctoral practicum intern HCA Presbyterian Hospital Center for Counseling and Psychotherapy, 1984-86; Senior Intern HCA Center for Counseling, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Doctoral intern Oklahoma City Clinic, Bethany Pavillion, Bethany Hospital, Bethany, Oklahoma, 1986-87.