

AN ADLERIAN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT
INVENTORY: A VALIDATION STUDY

by

Vicki Wickman Straub

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 7

Copyright 1977 Vicki Wickman Straub

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

78-5679

STRAUB, Vicki Wickman, 1944-
AN ADLERIAN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT
INVENTORY: A VALIDATION STUDY.

The University of Arizona,
Ph.D., 1977
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1978

VICKI WICKMAN STRAUB

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

AN ADLERIAN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT
INVENTORY: A VALIDATION STUDY

by

Vicki Wickman Straub

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 7

Copyright 1977 Vicki Wickman Straub

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my
direction by Vicki Wickman Straub
entitled AN ADLERIAN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY:
A VALIDATION STUDY
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Bill W. Hillman
Dissertation Director

10-21-77
Date

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify
that we have read this dissertation and agree that it may be
presented for final defense.

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <u>Bill W. Hillman</u> | <u>10-21-77</u> |
| <u>Philip J. Kauer</u> | <u>Nov 10, 1977</u> |
| <u>W. C. ...</u> | <u>11/14/77</u> |
| <u>Walter Stephenson</u> | <u>10/21/77</u> |
| <u>James R. Hine</u> | <u>10/21/77</u> |

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent
on the candidate's adequate performance and defense thereof at the
final oral examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED:

Vicki Wickman Straub

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

For his support, encouragement and belief in me, I am especially appreciative of my husband James. From my son Jason who arrived during the development and completion of this study, I have learned and grown in flexibility and spontaneity.

Dr. Bill Hillman, my major advisor and friend, has given direction, support for excellence and attention to details that have been helpful and important. I am grateful for the encouragement of Dr. Phil Lauver, Dr. Oscar Christensen, Dr. James Hine and Dr. Victor Christopherson who comprise the rest of my major and minor committee.

I commend the following people who were instrumental in organizing, collecting and processing the data for this dissertation: Dr. Darrell Sabers, John Luiten, Dr. Maxine Ijams, Dr. Gary McKay, Joan Beigel and Penny McNeilly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | v |
| ABSTRACT | vi |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Theoretical Rationale for the Study | 2 |
| Statement of the Problem | 11 |
| Hypotheses | 12 |
| Definitions | 12 |
| 2. METHODS AND PROCEDURES | 14 |
| Data Gathering Procedures | 14 |
| Characteristics of the Subjects and the Raters | 16 |
| Instrumentation | 18 |
| Data Analysis and Statistical Techniques | 20 |
| 3. RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS | 21 |
| Analysis of Results | 21 |
| Discussion of Results | 24 |
| Implications | 26 |
| Summary | 30 |
| APPENDIX A: LIFE TASK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT | 32 |
| APPENDIX B: LOCKE MARITAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE AND QUESTIONNAIRE | 34 |
| APPENDIX C: COUNSELOR-RATER FORM | 37 |
| APPENDIX D: PROCEDURES FOR ANALYSIS OF DATA IN STEP 2 | 39 |
| REFERENCES | 46 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Means and F-Ratios for the Adjusted and the Maladjusted Groups | 22 |
| 2. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Counselor-Raters' Scores and Self-Referred Couples Scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument | 23 |
| 3. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale and the Scales and Scale Combinations of the Life Task Assessment Instrument | 24 |
| 4. Results of Cronbach's Alpha Scale and Scale Combinations of the Life Task Assessment Instrument | 25 |

ABSTRACT

The field of marriage counseling has been criticized for being undeveloped and unscientific. Although there are many tests in the field, most of the tests are too lengthy and inadequately validated. The purpose of this study was to validate a short marital adjustment assessment device, based on the Adlerian concept of life tasks. Three aspects of this study which were responsive to current criticism of the field of marriage counseling and its research were stressed: (1) the instrument was short, easy to administer and take; (2) an important validation process often ignored in test construction, construct validation, was provided for in the research design; (3) the instrument was based on work done by two well-known Adlerian marriage counseling practitioners, thus bridging the gap between research and practice.

The primary focus of the study was to determine the construct validity of the instrument by using the following four-step paradigm: Step 1, the test should discriminate between people high and low on the construct; Step 2, the test should be sensitive to change; Step 3, the test should correlate with an established test in the field; Step 4, the test should be internally consistent.

The results of the study strongly supported three of the four steps. The Life Task Assessment Instrument met the requirements for construct validity by discriminating between people high and low on the construct, correlating with an established test in the field and showing internal consistency. Although it did not show sensitivity to change, the results of this step were suspected to be invalid.

The study presented a number of implications for further research and for clinical use of the Life Task Assessment Instrument.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The field of marriage counseling has been criticized for being undeveloped and unscientific. Marriage counselors frequently counsel without relying on integrated theory and instrumentation for direction. Often couples seek counseling in a last-chance crisis stance, not in a preventive or enriching attitude. There is a need to accurately, validly and efficiently assess the degree of marital adjustment of couples. There is also a need to focus counseling attention and outside follow-up with specificity unique to individual couples. Although there are many tests in the field of marriage counseling, two disadvantages appear: most tests are too lengthy, taking up valuable counselor and couple time; and most tests are inadequately validated, especially in the construct validation process. Additionally, there too frequently exists a wide gulf between what marriage counseling practitioners actually do in their work and the focus of research efforts (Blood, 1976; Cronbach and Meehl, 1955; Goodman, 1973; Gurman, 1975a; Locke and Wallace, 1959; McGuire, 1969; Olson, 1975; Phillips, 1973; Taylor, 1967).

The purpose of this study was to validate a short marital adjustment assessment device, based on the Adlerian

concept of life tasks. Three aspects of this study which were responsive to current criticism of the field of marriage counseling and its research were stressed: (1) the instrument was short, easy to administer and take; (2) an important validation process often ignored in test construction, construct validation, was provided for in the research design; (3) the instrument was based on work done by two well-known Adlerian marriage counseling practitioners, William Pew, M. D. and Miriam Pew, M. S. W., thus bridging the gap between practice and research.

Theoretical Rationale for the Study

The following sections will discuss (1) the history of marital assessment, (2) needs addressed in the literature, and (3) how the Life Task Assessment Instrument meets those needs.

History of Marital Assessment--Whether to assess the marital adjustment of couples as a precursor to counseling is not an issue in the field of marriage counseling. There are numerous tests, theories and directives for assessment of marital adjustment. As early as 1929 the assessment of the degree of marital adjustment had received attention (Hamilton, 1929). What aspects to assess within a relationship that correlate with marital adjustment has, however, been an area of disagreement.

Two main factors have most often been evaluated in the process of marital assessment. They are: (1) the personality constructs of marital partners, and (2) the expectations and perceptions of roles within the marital relationship.

The older, more traditional focus has been on personality assessment. From this point of view, the personality constructs of two married individuals are the best indicators and predictors of marital adjustment (Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Kelly, 1941; Peltz, 1952; Terman, 1938). In testing, this focus has taken the form of self-reports in which an individual usually responds to standard items about himself/herself as true or false. His/her scores are compared statistically with others who have taken the test (Phillips, 1973). Some of the personality constructs on which these tests are based include: composed-nervous, submissive-dominant, sympathetic-indifferent on the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Test; deference, order, exhibition, autonomy on the Edwards Personal Preference Scale; introversion-extroversion, hysteria, paranoia on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; dominant-submissive and hostility-love on the Interpersonal Check List.

From this writer's perspective, the personality construct assessment approach seems to be a stagnant, non-movement approach. The interrelationship of personality

constructs may not have a direct bearing on the relationship of a couple. In addition, it provides labels clients often hide behind as a way of avoiding responsibility for themselves, and counselors use as a way of avoiding responsibility for facilitating client movement. The purpose of marriage counseling is not to change, if it is even possible, the personality of an individual (Bolte, 1970). From this point of view, if individuals do not match or complement each other, the question of why a marriage may not be working is considered answered, but there is little if any direction for counseling, effecting change and resolving conflict.

The other primary theme in marital adjustment assessment is that of perceptions and expectations in attitudinal and role fulfillment. From this point of view, it is how a person perceives his/her roles in a marriage, what he/she expects of himself/herself in those roles, and whether those roles are actually fulfilled within the relationship that are the best indicators and predictors of marital adjustment. It is upon these expectations and perceptions that a relationship is built (Beutler, 1971; Kotlar, 1965; Murstein, 1971; Olson, 1975; Struckert, 1963; Taylor, 1967). These perceptions include how an individual views himself/herself, the partner, the idealized self and the idealized partner.

From this writer's perspective, the perception/expectation assessment approach is dynamic and movement-oriented. This approach is concerned with what a couple

does, sees and expects in daily living experiences. It focuses on perceptions and expectations which can be checked against realities, societal norms and actual behaviors. There is more opportunity for a marriage counselor to present another view, to challenge biased and self-defeating expectations and perceptions that have been learned.

From the perception/expectation orientation in marital adjustment assessment, several controversial issues appear in the literature. One is whether it is better to assess interperceptions, those between individuals, or intraperceptions, those within a person (Murstein and Beck, 1972). It would appear that assessing both types of perception is important since in a relationship each person is not only living and relating with himself/herself, but with his/her partner. A combined inter- and intraperception approach would include self-perceptions and expectation checks as well as other-perception and expectation checks. The literature in the field strongly supports the concept that when performance is congruent with role perceptions/expectations, there is high marital adjustment (Hicks and Platt, 1970).

The type of roles which are important within a marital relationship is another controversial issue within the perception/expectation orientation. Two main categories of roles have been delineated: (1) instrumental roles, and (2) affective roles (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Instrumental roles

are those which include the providing for shelter, food and transportation needs and the caring and raising of children. Affective roles focus on the relationship aspects of a marriage and include communication, intimacy, leisure and recreational pursuits.

Historically, more research has been focused on instrumental roles and their relationship to marital adjustment than on affective roles (Hicks and Platt, 1970). With the focus and emphasis on communication, leisure time and many forms of intimacy evident in the mass media today, the affective roles in relationships are even more important to assess than in the past. It would, then, appear advantageous to include both types of roles in perception and expectation assessment of the marital relationship.

In sum, the more traditional approach to marital adjustment assessment has been through personality construct evaluation of each partner. A newer approach to assessment emphasizes an individual's perceptions and expectations of his/her role within the marital relationship and perceptions or expectations of his/her spouse. From the perception/expectation orientation there are several controversial issues regarding: intraperception versus interperception; instrumental roles versus affective roles. This study used the perception/expectation orientation and included intraperceptions and interperceptions as well as instrumental and affective roles.

Measurement Needs--Several measurement needs are apparent based on problems posed in the literature on marital adjustment assessment. These needs pivot around (1) the length of tests, (2) the type of perceptions and expectations to assess, (3) the rigors of research designs, and (4) the gap between practitioners and researchers.

Marriage assessment devices need to be short and easy to administer, take, and interpret. Many assessment instruments are too long, taking up valuable counselor and couple time (Kimmel and Van der Veen, 1974; Locke and Wallace, 1959). When a marital partner focuses on his/her perceptions and expectations for himself/herself and the other person, he/she frequently feels closer and more in-tune with his/her partner (Gurman, 1975b). This focusing does not need to be complicated, lengthy, boring or difficult to understand. Short, interesting and easily understood instruments provide an effective bridge to immediate task orientation. Couples who seek marriage counseling frequently are discouraged and at a point where one or both feel "something must be done; our marriage can't go on like this." Clear and concrete information from tests can encourage direction-oriented counseling for the discouraged and disoriented.

The roles on which self and other expectations are based need to be delineated. It is important to determine

which roles correlate with marital adjustment so they can be used more effectively in dealing with potential or actual role conflict (Kotlar, 1965). When individual expectations of instrumental and/or affective roles are delineated, then the focus of counseling intervention and follow-up assignments can be made with more specificity and appropriateness for the unique situation.

Connected closely with the above is a need for more knowledge regarding which areas of perception are most strongly associated with marital adjustment (Murstein and Beck, 1972). Arguments for both intraperception and inter-perception checks can be convincing. The issue need not be the elimination of one or the other, but rather an integration of both types of perception. Using both types of perception assessment in the areas of both instrumental and affective roles appears to be an effective combination that is potentially stronger and more useful in terms of information and direction.

The need for more vigorous, scientific studies in marriage counseling is cited throughout the literature (Blood, 1976; Goodman, 1973; Gurman, 1975a; Olson, 1975). Validation procedures, especially of constructs, are frequently inadequately approached in test construction in many fields. Marriage counseling is not the exception. A

prevailing comment in Buros' Mental Measurement Yearbook concerning marriage measurement instruments is "questionable validity" (Buros, 1972).

Finally, more communication between practitioners in the field and researchers in the area is needed. When a practitioner finds an effective method for working with couples, exploration of the generalizability of that method for other counselors and clients in other situations can be a way of advancing the field. At this point, many practitioners do not have the time, energy or research skills to adequately study the methods they use (Goodman, 1973; Olson, 1975). Most articles in the field are written by practitioners who use a case study and self-report format based on small samples, with little if any controls (Goodman, 1973; Gurman, 1975a). Researchers need to work hand in hand with practitioners in exploratory as well as evaluative studies.

The Life Task Assessment Instrument--The Life Task Assessment Instrument (LTAI) is theoretically grounded in the concept of life tasks which Adler (1931) talked about in the 1920's. His concepts are currently relevant to needs expressed in the literature on marital adjustment.

From a theoretical view, Adler delineated three life tasks or areas of life that people in our society must deal with and solve in order to be fully functioning. These tasks are occupation, love and marriage, and friendship (Adler,

1931; Orgler, 1963). When these tasks are avoided by one or both partners, a breakdown in the relationship is indicated (Adler, 1931). When a life task is over-emphasized, there is generally avoidance of the other life task areas (Adler, 1931; Orgler, 1963).

Two Adlerian marriage counselors, William Pew, M. D. and Miriam Pew, M. S. W., have expanded these three life tasks into eight roles which reflect changes in today's society (Pew, 1975; Pew and Pew, 1972; Pew and Pew, 1975). These roles include; worker, friend; lover; spouse; player; parent; and two intrapersonal roles, getting along with self and finding meaning in life. These expanded roles include both instrumental and affective roles.

The Pews use these expanded life task roles to assess couples who are being counseled conjointly. They have named their assessment technique The Marriage Temperature Test. Each individual is asked to verbally rate himself/herself and how he/she thinks his/her spouse will rate him/her. Finally, a comparison rating of actual spouse-rating with perceived spouse-rating is made.

From the basic assessment format described above, the Pew's device was modified by the author to include additional areas of perception as well as greater specificity. The modifications included making the verbal assessment procedure a short paper and pencil task, delineating each of the eight

roles with short descriptor phrases and including three additional areas of perception. These modifications met the following needs as found in the literature: (1) the revised instrument included both intraperception and interperception response items; (2) the instrument included both instrumental and affective roles based on a specific range of roles from the theoretical framework of Individual Psychology; (3) the research design met the requirements of construct validation; (4) the device was short and easy to administer; (5) the instrument was based on work of recognized practitioners in the field of marriage counseling.

Statement of the Problem

Validation is required for sound test construction. Of the various types of validation, the procedures for construct validation are the most elusive and frequently ignored. Chase (1974) has delineated a four-step paradigm for testing the construct validity of tests. These steps are: (1) the test should discriminate between people high and low on the construct; (2) the test should be sensitive to change; (3) the test should correlate with an established test in the field; (4) the test should be internally consistent. Therefore, the problem to be specifically examined in this study was: Does the expanded Adlerian-oriented Life Task Assessment Instrument meet the requirements for construct validation described in Chases' four-step paradigm?

Hypotheses

In order to solve the problem stated on the previous page, the following hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1--Couples who are identified as adjusted will score significantly higher on the Life Task Assessment than those identified as maladjusted.

Hypothesis 2--Clinical ratings of marital adjustment will have a significant positive correlation with scores of marital adjustment on the Life Task Assessment Instrument.

Hypothesis 3--Scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument will have a significant positive correlation with scores on the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale.

Hypothesis 4--Scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument will be internally consistent.

Definitions

The following definitions of terms were used.

Adjusted couples--Couples identified as adjusted through interviews, tests and observation in Dr. James Hine's longitudinal marital study of successful marriages.

Maladjusted couples--Couples in which one or both had petitioned for marriage dissolution and had been referred to the Conciliation Court of Tucson, Arizona.

Clinical ratings--The subjective judgments of marriage counselors regarding the marital adjustment of self-referred couples seeking marriage counseling in a private setting.

Marital adjustment--Scores that fall within the adjusted range on the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale.

Internally consistent--Items on the Life Task Assessment Instrument that have reliability coefficients of .70 or higher as measured by Cronbach's Alpha (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

Significant--The .05 level of significance will be accepted.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The research methodology is discussed in this chapter. Included are the paradigm on which data gathering procedures were based, the characteristics of the subjects and the raters, instrumentation, and an overview of the data analysis and statistical techniques used.

Data Gathering Procedures

Procedures for this study were based on the paradigm for construct validation as delineated by Chase (1974). He formulated a four-step procedure for assessing construct validity as defined by Cronbach and Meehl (1955) in their classic treatment of the subject. The following addresses each of Chase's steps and gives the procedures which the study used to accommodate the step:

Step 1--The test should discriminate between high scorers and low scorers. To provide for this step, a maritally mal-adjusted group, comprised of couples who were referred to Conciliation Court, were compared with a maritally adjusted group consisting of participants in a longitudinal marital adjustment study by Dr. James Hine. Each group was given a battery of tests comprised of the Life Task Assessment

Instrument (LTAI), the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale (LMAS) and a three item questionnaire at the end of the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale (Appendix A and B).

Step 2--The test scores should be sensitive to change and be positively correlated with clinical ratings. To provide for this step, couples who referred themselves to a marriage counselor in private practice took the test battery found in Appendix A and B one-half hour prior to their first and third marriage counseling sessions. Following the first and third marriage counseling sessions, couples were rated by other marriage counselors. The counselor-raters made their assessments of marital adjustment by listening to audio tape recordings of the sessions. Counselor-raters used the Counselor-Rater Form (C-RF) to evaluate marital adjustment (Appendix C). The purpose of this step was to determine whether the LTAI positively correlated with clinical ratings and was sensitive to change in clinical ratings over a time period.

Step 3--The test should positively correlate with an established test in the field. To provide for this step, the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale, a well-known short marital assessment device, was included in the test battery. Marital adjustment scores on the LTAI were compared with the marital adjustment scores on the LMAS. Test scores were available from the maritally maladjusted group, the maritally adjusted group and the self-referred couples group.

Step 4--The test should be internally consistent. To provide for this step, each item of the LTAI was analyzed to determine if the item discriminated between high scorers and low scorers. This statistical procedure to determine internal consistency was accomplished by computer analysis of the data from the maritally adjusted group, the maritally maladjusted group and the self-referred group.

Characteristics of the Subjects and the Raters

Couples for this validation study came from three populations: (1) seventeen presumably maladjusted couples referred to the Conciliation Court of Tucson, Arizona; (2) sixteen presumably adjusted couples who were participating in a longitudinal marital study conducted by Dr. James Hine and identified by him as highly adjusted; (3) eight couples who were seeking marriage counseling from a marriage counselor in private practice.

The couples considered maritally maladjusted for the purposes of this study were comprised of couples referred to Conciliation Court for marital counseling. Referral to Conciliation Court can be initiated by the presiding judge of a divorce proceeding, one of the spouses, a child or children of a couple, or a lawyer involved. In all cases, one or both marital partners had filed for marital dissolution.

The couples considered maritally adjusted for the purposes of this study were couples who are participating in Dr. James Hine's longitudinal study of maritally adjusted couples. These couples have had a number of interviews and tests administered by Dr. Hine in his study of the dynamics of successful marriages (Hine, 1976).

The self-referred couples for this study were comprised of couples who were seeking marriage counseling from an established marriage counselor. This sample was considered more representative of the type of clientele involved in marriage counseling within a private practice and/or agency setting. This group did not come from the presumably discrete populations as in the above two groups, but were considered as more scattered along a continuum between the two extremes of adjusted and maladjusted end.

Raters for the self referred group were four marriage counselors who were experienced in marriage counseling. Each had a minimum of two years experience as a marriage counselor. They had a minimum of a master's degree in counseling and had a background in Individual Psychology. The selection procedure for each counselor-rater was based on his/her professional reputation as a marriage counselor within the counseling community, his/her work within an established agency and/or private practice, and his/her willingness to be involved. Two sessions were spent by the author training the raters in the use of the rating procedure.

Instrumentation

The Locke Marital Adjustment Scale is a short form marital adjustment and prediction test. It is comprised of the most discriminatory test items from longer marital inventories (Kimmel and Van der Veen, 1974; Locke and Wallace, 1959). The LMAS is well accepted and considered one of the best short questionnaire measures for discriminating between successful and unsuccessful marriages and predicting marital stability (Gottman, Notarius, Ganso and Markman, 1976; Spanier, 1976). The reliability coefficient of the adjustment test is .90 and .84 for the prediction test. These coefficients are approximately the same as those of longer tests (Locke and Wallace, 1959). Validity of the test is purported by the authors since only 17 per cent of the maladjusted group sample in the original experiment achieved scores within the adjusted range, whereas 96 per cent of the well-adjusted group achieved scores within the adjusted range. The LMAS has recently been revised (Kimmel and Vander Veen, 1974) and has been tested on the social desirability response set (Hawkins, 1966). LMAS scores were correlated with Marlowe-Crown social desirability scores. Significant but low correlations led to the conclusion that social desirability is not a major factor in the Locke Test scores (Appendix B).

The Life Task Assessment Instrument developed for this study was an expansion of the Marriage Temperature Assessment technique, a verbally administered rating scale, developed by William Pew, M. D. and Miriam Pew, M. S. W. This scale, based on the Adlerian concept of life tasks, measures intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions. The LTAI contains eight roles or tasks of life. These are called: worker, friend, lover, spouse, player, parent, purpose and person. Each role contains at least two aspects of that role which are presented as a total of 17 statements. Five scales were developed on which a person rates himself/herself or his/her spouse from 1 to 5 on each of the role statements. The five scales are: myself, my ideal self, my spouse, my ideal spouse, and spouse sees me. For the purposes of this study, data from the ratings on each of the five scales were used for statistical analysis.

For scoring and use within a clinical setting, the differences between the scales can be subtracted, squared and summed in order to maximize bigger differences and minimize smaller differences. For example, the ratings from the scale myself would be subtracted from my ideal self, squared and added. The larger score would indicate more dissatisfaction, while the smaller score would indicate greater satisfaction. This rating scale instrument is designed for quick administration and ease in scoring. The instrument

includes both interperception and intraperception response items as well as items that include instrumental and affective roles (Appendix A).

Data Analysis and Statistical Techniques

The data were analyzed and tested for significance according to the following procedures:

Hypothesis 1--A two-way analysis of variance was used (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

Hypothesis 2--Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

Hypothesis 3--Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

Hypothesis 4--Cronbach's Alpha was used (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the construct validity of a marital adjustment inventory, the Life Task Assessment Instrument. A four-step paradigm delineated by Chase (1974) for testing the construct validity of tests was used.

Analysis of Results

The following addresses each of the steps in the paradigm and gives the results.

Step 1--The test should discriminate between high scorers and low scorers. Scores from each scale on the Life Task Assessment Instrument were subjected to an analysis of variance of the means between Group 1, the presumably maritally maladjusted, and Group 2, the presumably maritally adjusted population. Table 1 presents the results of this analysis on 34 means in Group 1 and 32 means in Group 2. The difference between groups on each scale was significant at the .002 level or better. The adjusted group scored higher than the maladjusted group on every scale of the LTAI. Further, in additional analyses of the variance no significant differences between husbands and wives were indicated for either group.

Table 1. Means and F-Ratios for the Adjusted and the Maladjusted Groups

| Scales | MAL Group 1 Mean | ADJ Group 2 Mean | F Ratio | Probability |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|
| Myself | 59.471 | 68.594 | 17.955 | <.001 |
| My Ideal Self | 74.971 | 80.313 | 11.081 | <.002 |
| My Spouse | 56.441 | 74.0 | 69.555 | <.001 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 72.941 | 80.25 | 18.570 | <.001 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 51.883 n = 34 | 68.657 n = 32 | 58.357 | <.001 |

Critical value = 4.00 at the .05 level with 1 and 62 df

Step 2--The test scores should correlate with clinical ratings. Data from the scales on the LTAI were subjected to a Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis with the ratings from four counselor-raters (Appendix D). Table 2 presents the results of this analysis for husbands and wives. The eight self referred couple scores were not significantly correlated with raters scores on any of the scales.

Step 3--The test should correlate with an established test in the field. Data from the scales and scale combinations on the LTAI were subjected to a Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis with the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale. Table 3 presents the results of

Table 2. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Counselor-Raters' Scores and Self-Referred Couples Scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument

| Subscales | Correlation for Husbands | Correlation for Wives | Probability |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Myself | .021 | .008 | N.S. |
| My Ideal Self | .383 | -.073 | N.S. |
| My Spouse | .699 | .632 | N.S. |
| My Ideal Spouse | .308 | -.061 | N.S. |
| My Spouse Sees Me | .167 | .507 | N.S. |
| | n = 8 | n = 8 | |

Critical value = .707 at the .05 level with 6 df

Table 3. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale and the Scales and Scale Combinations of the Life Task Assessment Instrument

| Scales and Combinations | Correlation | Probability |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Myself | .5060 | <.001 |
| My Ideal Self | .3904 | <.001 |
| My Spouse | .7532 | <.001 |
| My Ideal Spouse | .4610 | <.001 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | .6557 | <.001 |

Critical value = .250 at the .05 level with 64 df
n = 66

this analysis. Each scale and scale combination was correlated at the .001 level of significance with the LMAS.

Step 4--The test should be internally consistent. Data from each scale and scale combination were analyzed for reliability using Cronbach's Alpha procedure. Table 4 presents the results of the reliability tests. Each scale and scale combination had reliability coefficients of .86 or much higher for most. The scale and scale combinations follow the usual pattern of higher reliability for single scales and lower reliability for combinations (Glass and Stanley, 1970).

Discussion of Results

Following is a discussion of how the results affected each of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1--This hypothesis stated that couples who were identified as adjusted would score higher at the .05 level of significance on the Life Task Assessment Instrument than those identified as maladjusted. The results of the analysis supported hypothesis 1 beyond the .002 level of significance or better. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was accepted.

Hypothesis 2--This hypothesis stated that scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument would correlate with clinical ratings. The results of the analysis did not support hypothesis 2 at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Table 4. Results of Cronbach's Alpha Scale and Scale Combinations of the Life Task Assessment Instrument

| Source | Reliability Coefficients |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Myself | .86 |
| My Ideal Self | .88 |
| My Spouse | .91 |
| My Ideal Spouse | .94 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | .93 |

Hypothesis 3--This hypothesis stated that scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument would correlate positively with scores on the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale at the .05 level of significance. The results of the analysis supported hypothesis 3 beyond the .001 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was accepted.

Hypothesis 4--This hypothesis stated that scores on the Life Task Assessment Instrument would be internally consistent with reliability coefficients \geq than .70. The results of the analysis indicated reliability coefficients between .86 and .94. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Implications

Since the results of this exploratory study indicate that the Life Task Assessment Instrument does meet three out of four of the requirements for construct validity and is a potentially valid assessment device for use in marriage counseling, implications for the researcher and/or practitioner are addressed.

From a research point of view, replication of this study with a larger population is in order for all the steps. This is particularly relevant for the clinical ratings step. Since the other three steps were clearly and strongly supported, the clinical ratings are suspected to be invalid. The clinical ratings step could use a larger sample size, a more sensitive counselor-rater form and a less complicated procedure for rating couples. Use of a one-way mirror system or video tapes, where counselor-raters could both see and hear couples and counselors could improve the rating procedure. In addition, since the rating task itself appeared difficult for some of the raters in terms of committed follow through, a change in the composition of the group of raters could alter appreciably the results of the clinical ratings step.

There are various considerations for the researcher surrounding other variables that might be explored through replication of all four steps. These include: (1) would

couples from different regions and countries score differently than those sampled in this study? (2) would different ethnic groups differ in their responses? (3) would couples in second and third marriages respond differently than couples in first marriages? (4) would the age of couples and length of marriages appreciably alter the results? (5) would the presence or absence of children in the home have influences on responses? (6) does the socio-economic status of couples influence results? (7) does religious affiliation and/or conviction affect the results?

Other possibilities for the researcher include longitudinal research to help determine the validity of the instrument as a predictor of marital stability and satisfaction. In addition, the previously suggested investigations could be used as the basis for the development of intrapersonal and interpersonal norms.

To better bridge the gap between research and practice, a researcher might survey marriage counselors who are using the LTAI as to its usefulness and effectiveness in counseling. More formal feedback from the field concerning additional uses and limitations could be helpful to improve and change the instrument.

For the practicing marriage counselor, the LTAI provides both interpersonal and intrapersonal information about a couple. This gives potential direction to both couple and counselor since the data are easily understood and "make

sense" to most couples according to practitioners who have used the LTAI in clinical situations. The LTAI information gives direction by providing a starting point on which to focus the emphasis of both counseling sessions and follow through activities. The potential direction might be, for example, a focus on the life task role of Lover. If the scales indicated an interpersonal dissatisfaction in ratings, a counselor might explore with a couple self and other expectations in this area in more depth within the counseling session(s) as well as provide bibliotherapy and specific follow through activities for involvement.

The data from the various scales could be used in individual and couple profiles. Such profiles could graphically indicate areas of incongruence which need further exploration as well as areas of strength on which to build. To illustrate, for one couple counseled by the writer the areas of intrapersonal and interpersonal congruence included the life task roles of Parent, Worker, Spouse and Friend. Areas of incongruence for them as a couple included the life task roles of Player and Lover. In the individual profile for the husband, two roles of incongruence that indicated the need for emphasis were Player and Person. The wife's individual profile indicated the need for an emphasis on the roles of Lover, Person and Purpose. The counseling

emphasis was focused both on the intrapersonal life tasks of the husband and wife as well as on their interpersonal life tasks as a couple.

Feedback from practitioners who have used the LTAI clinically indicates that the sharing of the data has provided a sense of relief for some couples who find more strength in the relationship than they had expected. For other couples, the specific feedback as to problems in the relationship helped them grasp the seriousness of the problems, and in some cases stimulated greater commitment on the part of a reluctant spouse.

The LTAI is not restricted to use only as a diagnostic tool. It can also be used to stimulate couple interaction both in marital and pre-marital relationships. For example, a counselor might point out that a wife rates her ideal self lower in the role of Worker than her perception of her ideal spouse. The counselor might determine if this is a conflict area and ask the couple to turn to each other and discuss the discrepancy while the counselor listens to their communication patterns and problem-solving approach(es).

The LTAI can be used by the counselor and couple to point out false assumptions derived from the self and spouse expectations perception checks. As an illustration of the use of false assumptions as a stimulus, a counselor might show a husband who indicates his wife rates him low as a Worker, Lover and Spouse that the wife does not. Indeed, the

husband might rate himself low with the expectation that his wife's views are the same as his.

Further, the LTAI can be used as a basis for problem solving and goal setting in areas of conflict that can be defined from the information provided. For example, the LTAI results might indicate low ratings intrapersonally and interpersonally in the life task role of Player for a couple. Counseling could focus on making and developing use of leisure time.

Finally, the LTAI lends itself to pre- and post-assessment of couple progress in counseling for both couple and counselor. However, if it is used extensively as a stimulus in counseling, its value as a post-counseling assessment tool is negated except on an informal basis.

Summary

The Life Task Assessment Instrument was developed and expanded from the Adlerian life task concept. The instrument was tested for its construct validity by using a four step paradigm delineated by Chase (1974). Three of the four steps were strongly supported while the results of the unsupported step were suspected to be invalid. Implications for the researcher include replication of all of the four steps with larger populations and attention to extraneous

variables. Implications for the marriage counseling practitioner include use of the LTAI as a diagnostic and stimulus tool or as a pre-post assessment of counseling progress.

APPENDIX A

LIFE TASK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Circle the number which best rates how you see yourself and your spouse. Go all the way across before going to the next item.

| | MYSELF (how you see yourself) | | | MY IDEAL SELF (how you would like to be) | MY SPOUSE (how you see your spouse) | MY IDEAL SPOUSE (how you would like your spouse to be) | SPOUSE SEES ME (how you think your spouse sees you) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | L | A | H | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| As a WORKER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Doing paid or unpaid job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Starting and finishing tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| As a FRIEND | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Being a good friend | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Making and keeping friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| As a LOVER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Giving affection | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Receiving affection | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Being a good sexual partner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| As a SPOUSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Committed to the marriage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Taking responsibility within the marriage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| As a PLAYER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Making time for fun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Having fun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| As a PARENT -- if no children, with relatives and/or neighborhood kids | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Getting along with children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Providing guidance and discipline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| As a PERSON | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Liking oneself | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Doing for others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| PURPOSE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Finding meaning in life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Feeling useful and worthwhile | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX B

LOCKE MARITAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE
AND QUESTIONNAIRE

All the questions can be answered by placing a check next to the appropriate answer. Please fill out all items. If you cannot give the exact answer to a question, answer the best you can. Give the answers that best fit your marriage at the present time. Thank you very much.

1. Have you ever wished you had not married?
 a. Frequently _____
 b. Occasionally _____
 c. Rarely _____
2. If you had your life to live over again would you:
 a. Marry the same person _____
 b. Marry a different person _____
 c. Not marry at all _____
3. How many outside activities do husband and wife engage in together?
 a. All of them _____
 b. Some of them _____
 c. Few of them _____
 d. None of them _____
4. In leisure time, which do you prefer?
 a. Both husband and wife to stay at home _____
 b. Both to be on the go _____
 c. One to be on the go and other to stay at home _____
5. Do you and your mate generally talk things over together?
 a. Never _____
 b. Now and then _____
 c. Almost always _____
 d. Always _____
6. How often do you kiss your mate?
 a. Every day _____
 b. Now and then _____
 c. Almost never _____
7. Check any of the following items which you think have caused serious difficulties in your marriage
- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| *Mate's attempt to control my spending money _____ | *Adultery _____ | *Desire to have children _____ |
| *Other difficulties over money _____ | *Sterility of husband or wife _____ | *Venereal diseases _____ |
| *Religious differences _____ | *Mate paid attention to (became familiar with) another person _____ | *Desertion _____ |
| *Different amusement interests _____ | | *Nonsupport _____ |
| *Lack of mutual friends _____ | | *Gambling _____ |
| *Constant bickering _____ | | *Mate sent to jail _____ |
| *Interference of in-laws _____ | | |
| *Lack of mutual affection _____ | | |
| *Unsatisfying sex relations _____ | | |
| *Selfishness and lack of cooperation _____ | | |
8. How many things satisfy you most about your marriage?
 a. Nothing _____
 b. One thing _____
 c. Two things _____
 d. Three or more _____
9. When disagreements arise they generally result in:
 a. Husband giving in _____
 b. Wife giving in _____
 c. Neither giving in _____
 d. Agreement by mutual give and take _____
10. What is the total number of times you left mate or mate left you because of conflict?
 a. No times _____
 b. One or more times _____
11. How frequently do you and your mate get on each other's nerves around the house?
 a. Never _____
 b. Occasionally _____
 c. Frequently _____
 d. Almost always _____
 e. Always _____
12. What are your feelings on sex relations between you and your mate?
 a. Very enjoyable _____
 b. Enjoyable _____
 c. Tolerable _____
 d. Disgusting _____
 e. Very disgusting _____
13. What are your mate's feelings on sex relations with you?
 a. Very enjoyable _____
 b. Enjoyable _____
 c. Tolerable _____
 d. Disgusting _____
 e. Very disgusting _____

APPENDIX C

COUNSELOR-RATER FORM

Rate the couple you have just counseled or heard on audio tape in the following way:

Circle a number from 1 to 5 which best indicates how you perceive the focus couple as they entered the counseling session. (1) is the lowest rating, (5) is the highest and (3) is average.

1 lowest 2 3 average 4 5 highest

MALE

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Myself | 1. | Satisfaction with self | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Spouse | 2. | Satisfaction with partner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 3. | Accuracy of perception of spouse | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Ideal Self | 4. | Realistic goals for self | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 5. | Realistic goals for partner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 6. | Realistic goals for relationship | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

FEMALE

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Myself | 1. | Satisfaction with self | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Spouse | 2. | Satisfaction with partner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 3. | Accuracy of perception of spouse | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Ideal Self | 4. | Realistic goals for self | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 5. | Realistic goals for partner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 6. | Realistic goals for relationship | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | Overall Relationship | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Counselor Code _____
 Couple Code _____
 Session # _____

APPENDIX D
PROCEDURES FOR ANALYSIS OF
DATA IN STEP 2

Procedures for Analysis of Clinical Ratings
with Couple Ratings on the LTAI

Following are the three basic steps used to assess change in couples' ratings on the LTAI prior to first and third marriage counseling sessions:

1. At the first testing, husband and wife ratings were each totaled for the five scales. The sum of each scale was divided by seventeen to obtain an average score for each scale. Therefore, both husband and wife obtained a single averaged rating for the scales: Myself, My Ideal Self; My Spouse, My Ideal Spouse, My Spouse Sees Me.
2. At the second testing, responses were again averaged for each scale for husband and wife.
3. To determine if there was a difference or no difference between the first and second responses on the LTAI, the first ratings were subtracted from the second ratings.

Following are the three basic steps used to assess the raters' ratings of husbands and wives:

1. The raters rated husband and wife on each scale, Myself, My Ideal Self, My Spouse, My Ideal Spouse, My Spouse Sees Me, from an audio tape recording of the first of three marriage counseling sessions.

2. The raters rated each husband and wife on each scale from an audio tape recording of the third marriage counseling session.
3. To determine if there was a difference or no difference between the first and second ratings, the first ratings were subtracted from the second ratings.

To determine whether the LTAI scores correlated with the raters' judgments, the following procedure was used: husband and wife difference scores for the five scales were correlated with the difference scores of the raters, using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis.

Ratings of Husband and Wives on the LTAI for
First and Second Test Administrations

| SCALES | 1st TESTING | | 2nd TESTING | | DIFFERENCE | |
|-------------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Couple A | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 3.06 | 3.41 | 4.41 | 3.12 | 1.35 | -.29 |
| My Ideal Self | 3.82 | 4.35 | 5.00 | 3.65 | 1.18 | -.70 |
| My Spouse | 3.18 | 3.71 | 4.35 | 3.41 | 1.17 | -.30 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 3.53 | 4.35 | 5.00 | 3.71 | 1.47 | -.64 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.94 | 2.71 | 4.24 | 2.82 | 1.30 | .11 |
| Couple B | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.65 | 3.47 | 2.82 | 3.35 | 1.17 | -.12 |
| My Ideal Self | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.88 | 0 | -.12 |
| My Spouse | 4.00 | 2.88 | 3.77 | 3.29 | -.23 | .41 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 4.88 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.94 | -.11 | -.06 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.65 | 3.35 | 2.41 | 3.35 | -.24 | 0 |
| Couple C | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 3.41 | 4.24 | 3.65 | 3.88 | .24 | -.36 |
| My Ideal Self | 4.47 | 4.88 | 4.82 | 4.94 | .35 | .06 |
| My Spouse | 3.12 | 4.12 | 3.47 | 4.00 | .35 | -.12 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 4.24 | 4.88 | 4.24 | 5.00 | 0 | .12 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.24 | 3.71 | 2.59 | 3.65 | .35 | -.06 |
| Couple D | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 3.12 | 4.06 | 3.00 | 4.29 | -.12 | .23 |
| My Ideal Self | 4.59 | 4.71 | 4.29 | 4.88 | 0 | .17 |
| My Spouse | 3.29 | 3.94 | 3.47 | 4.00 | .18 | .06 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 4.47 | 4.59 | 4.18 | 4.76 | -.29 | .17 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 3.29 | 3.59 | 3.41 | 3.59 | .12 | 0 |
| Couple E | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.82 | 4.35 | 3.53 | 4.76 | .71 | .41 |
| My Ideal Self | 3.59 | 5.00 | 4.06 | 5.00 | .47 | 0 |
| My Spouse | 3.71 | 3.41 | 3.53 | 3.65 | -.18 | .24 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 3.71 | 5.00 | 3.82 | 5.00 | .09 | 0 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.24 | 3.82 | 2.59 | 4.47 | .35 | .65 |

| SCALES | 1st TESTING | | 2nd TESTING | | DIFFERENCE | |
|-------------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Couple F | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.82 | 2.94 | 2.94 | 3.29 | .12 | .36 |
| My Ideal Self | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.18 | 4.65 | 0 | .36 |
| My Spouse | 3.65 | 2.82 | 3.65 | 3.47 | 0 | .65 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 4.06 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.53 | 0 | .24 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.53 | 3.53 | 2.53 | 3.71 | 0 | .18 |
| Couple G | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.88 | 3.35 | 2.88 | 3.29 | 0 | -.06 |
| My Ideal Self | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.76 | 4.76 | .05 | .06 |
| My Spouse | 4.59 | 3.71 | 4.24 | 3.06 | -.35 | -.65 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 4.88 | 4.70 | 4.65 | 4.65 | -.23 | -.15 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 3.35 | 3.76 | 2.94 | 3.00 | -.41 | -.76 |
| Couple H | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 3.06 | 3.59 | 3.00 | 3.65 | -.06 | .06 |
| My Ideal Self | 4.24 | 4.41 | 4.24 | 4.35 | 0 | -.06 |
| My Spouse | 3.35 | 3.41 | 3.11 | 3.29 | -.24 | -.12 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 4.24 | 4.35 | 4.29 | 4.00 | .05 | -.35 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 3.24 | 3.53 | 2.88 | 3.47 | -.36 | -.06 |

Cummulative Clinical Ratings of Husbands and Wives
Based on Audio Tape Recordings

| SCALES | 1st TAPE | | 2nd TAPE | | DIFFERENCE | |
|-------------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Couple A | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.25 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.50 | .75 | .50 |
| My Ideal Self | 2.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 3.00 | .25 | .25 |
| My Spouse | 1.75 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 3.25 | .75 | .25 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 2.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 3.00 | .25 | .25 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.25 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | .75 | .50 |
| Couple B | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.00 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.50 | .25 | .25 |
| My Ideal Self | 2.00 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0 | .25 |
| My Spouse | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.75 | 2.75 | -.25 | .75 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 2.00 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0 | .25 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 0 | .25 |
| Couple C | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.00 | 1.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | .50 | 1.00 |
| My Ideal Self | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| My Spouse | 2.00 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 2.50 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.50 | .50 | .50 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.00 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.50 |
| Couple D | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | .75 | 1.00 |
| My Ideal Self | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | .50 | 0 |
| My Spouse | 1.50 | 2.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 1.25 | .25 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 2.00 | 2.75 | 2.50 | 2.75 | .50 | .25 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Couple E | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 3.00 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | -.25 | 0 |
| My Ideal Self | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | -.50 | 0 |
| My Spouse | 2.25 | 2.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | .25 | .25 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.75 | 0 | -.25 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.75 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | .25 | 0 |

| SCALES | 1st TAPE | | 2nd TAPE | | DIFFERENCE | |
|-------------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Couple F | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.50 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 2.75 | .25 | .75 |
| My Ideal Self | 2.25 | 1.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | .25 | 1.00 |
| My Spouse | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | .25 | 1.00 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 2.75 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 2.00 | 0 | .50 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 0 | .25 |
| Couple G | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 1.75 | 2.00 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 0 | 0 |
| My Ideal Self | 1.75 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.50 | .25 | .75 |
| My Spouse | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.00 | 2.00 | -.25 | -.25 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 1.75 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.00 | .25 | .25 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.25 | 2.75 | 2.25 | 2.50 | 0 | -.25 |
| Couple H | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | | Husband/Wife | |
| Myself | 2.75 | 3.25 | 3.00 | 3.50 | .25 | .25 |
| My Ideal Self | 2.75 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 3.00 | .25 | .25 |
| My Spouse | 2.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | .25 | 0 |
| My Ideal Spouse | 2.50 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 2.75 | .50 | 0 |
| My Spouse Sees Me | 2.75 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 2.75 | .25 | 0 |

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. What life should mean to you. Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1931.
- Beutler, L. D. Attitude similarity in marital therapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 298-301.
- Blood, R. O. Research needs of a family life education and marriage counselor. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 7-12.
- Bolte, G. L. Communications approach to marital counseling. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 32-40.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The seventh mental measurement year-book. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Chase, E. I. Measurement for educational evaluation. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Series in Education, 1974.
- Corsini, R. Understanding and similarity in marriage. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1956, 52, 157-164.
- Cronbach, L. J. and Meehl, P. E. Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 281-302.
- Dymond, R. Interpersonal perception and marital harmony. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1954, 9, 164-171.
- Glass, G. V. and Stanley, J. D. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Goodman, E. S. Marriage counseling as science: Some research considerations. The Family Coordinator, 1973, 21, 111-116.
- Gottman, J., Notarius, C., Ganso, J. and Markman, H. A couple's guide to communication. Champaign, Ill.: Research Press, 1976.

- Gurman, A. S. Emerging trends in research and practice. In A. S. Gurman and D. G. Rice (Eds.), Couples in conflict. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc., 1975. (a)
- Gurman, A. S. Some therapeutic implications of marital therapy. In A. S. Gurman and D. G. Rice (Eds.), Couples in conflict. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc., 1975. (b)
- Hamilton, G. V. A research in marriage. New York: Boni, 1929.
- Hawkins, J. L. The Locke marital adjustment test and social desirability. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1966, 28, 193-195.
- Hicks, M. W. and Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 553-573.
- Hine, J. Personal Communication. Associate Professor, School of Home Economics, The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, March 1976.
- Kelly, E. H. Marital compatibility as related to personality tests of husbands and wives as rated by self and spouse. Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 193-198.
- Kimmel, D. and Van der Veen, F. Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's marital adjustment test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 57-63.
- Kotlar, S. L. Middle-class marital role perception and marital adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 1965, 49, 284-291.
- Locke, H. J. and Wallace, K. M. Short marital adjustment and prediction test: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.
- McGuire, W. J. Theory-oriented research in natural settings: The best of both worlds for social psychology. In M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif (Eds.), Interdisciplinary relations in social sciences. Chicago: Adlinen Publications, 1969.
- Murstein, B. I. Self-ideal, self discrepancy and the choice of marital partners. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 47-52.

- Murstein, B. I. and Beck, G. D. Person perception, marriage adjustment and social desirability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 396-403.
- Olson, D. H. A critical overview. In A. S. Gurman and D. G. Rice (Eds.), Couples in conflict. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc., 1975.
- Orgler, H. Aldred Adler, the man and his work. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1963.
- Peltz, W. L. Impressions of personality as a function of marital conflict. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1952, 47, 326-336.
- Pew, M. L. Personal communication. Private Practice, Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 1975.
- Pew, W. and Pew, M. L. On Adlerian marriage counseling. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1972, 28, 192-202.
- Pew, W. and Pew, M. L. Personal communication. Workshop on Adlerian marriage counseling, Tucson, Arizona, March 1975.
- Phillips, C. E. Some useful tests for marriage counseling. The Family Coordinator, 1973, 22, 43-53.
- Spanier, G. B. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 15-38.
- Struckert, R. P. Role perception and marital satisfaction-- a configurational approach. Marriage and Family Living, 1963, 25, 415-419.
- Taylor, A. B. Role perception, empathy and marital adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 1967, 52, 22-34.
- Terman, L. M. Psychological forces in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.