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ABSTRACT

The present study precisely sought to determine:

1. the relationship between Marital Locus of Control (MLOC) and Social Intimacy (SI), Marital Locus of Control and Approval Motivation (AM), and Social Intimacy and Approval Motivation among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted complementary Group I and Group II;
2. the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives, and adjusted and maladjusted couples in two Zr coefficients (i.e. relationship between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM scores);
3. the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in two Zr coefficients (i.e. relationship between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM scores);
4. the partial correlations between MLOC and SI scores (when the variable of AM is partialed out), between MLOC and AM scores (when the variable of SI is partialed out), and between SI and AM scores (when the variable of MLOC is partialed out), among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II;
5. the significance of partial r at the .95 confidence interval for husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II;
6. the multiple coefficient of correlations between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the MLOC from the two variables SI and AM scores (i.e. to what extent MLOC scores are related to SI and AM scores) among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and
and Group II; (7) the critical values of multiple R for husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II; and (8) B coefficients, of the independent contribution of the variables SI and AM in determining the predicted value of the criterion variable MLOC among husbands, wives, and couples, of adjusted, maladjusted complementary Group I and Group II.

The main findings of the study were:

(a) Significant positive relationships were found to exist between Marital Locus of Control (MLOC) and Social Intimacy (SI) scores, and marital locus of control and approval motive (AM) scores among adjusted husbands, wives, and couples.

(b) Marital Locus of Control scores were negatively correlated with SI scores among maladjusted husbands, wives, and couples. Social Intimacy scores were also negatively correlated with AM scores among maladjusted husbands and couples.

(c) No significant relationships were found to exist between MLOC scores and SI scores, MLOC scores and AM scores and SI scores and AM scores among husbands, wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II.

(d) Significant differences were found to exist between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives, and adjusted and maladjusted couples in the relationships scores of MLOC and SI and MLOC and AM.

(e) No significant differences existed between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and
couples of complementary Group I and Group II in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM.

(f) The values of partial r's were found to be significant at the .95 confidence interval among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted and maladjusted groups.

(g) The .95 confidence interval were quite wide for partial r's (r_{12.3}, r_{13.2}, r_{23.1}) of husbands, wives and couples of complementary Group I and Group II and in some cases the lower limit of the confidence range approached zero.

(h) The values of Critical R (obtained by F-test) were found to be significant among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted group and maladjusted husbands and adjusted wives of complementary Group II.
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"For most adults in almost every culture there is no more significant life domain than the marital relationship".

(Doherty & Jacobson, 1982)
Chapter One
INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Marriage is of paramount importance in understanding the relationship between husbands and wives as well as in marital interaction and adjustment. Although historically the study of marriage dates back to 1924, it got popularity only with the work of Terman et al. (1938) on 'Psychological factors in marital happiness'. The study of marriage has traditionally been the field of sociologists, who have relied primarily on large-sample questionnaire or interview data rather than on direct observation. Psychological research on marriage has generally been based on relatively small samples and has employed a variety of coding systems, many of which lack sufficient descriptive details. The present study has taken particular cognizance of both the sociological and psychological studies on marriage and has tried to oversee the limitations inherent in the theory and methodology adopted in earlier studies.

Contemporary research on the marital relationship has focussed on similarity in physical, cultural, mental health and social characteristics of married couples. The first empirical study in the area of marital relationship was conducted by Hamilton in 1924 on the problem of sexual behaviour of couples. During the 1930's numerous studies relationships between attraction on the one hand and
similarity of attitudes, opinions, believes and values (of husbands and wives being much more similar than could be expected by chance), on the other, were investigated (Newcomb and Svehla, 1937; Schiller, 1932; Schooley, 1936). Tharp (1963), Barry (1970) and Lewis and Spanier (1979), reviewed research on personality and marital satisfaction/dissatisfaction and highlighted several consistent findings. First, neurotic traits in individual spouses are associated with lower marital satisfaction as measured by a variety of indices; Second, wife's marital satisfaction is more highly correlated with husband's personality characteristics than husband's satisfaction is with wife's personality; and third, highly satisfied couple tend to be more similar in measured personality characteristics than distressed couples.

Broadly speaking, two research traditions emerged prominently from (reviewed hereafter) personality and marriage studies. The first tradition is concerned with similarity of personality (like similarity in attitudes) or personality correlates of marital adjustment (Dymond, 1954; Tharp, 1963). The results of these studies support the similarity hypothesis, i.e. similarity of personality is a characteristic of happily married couples. The second personality and marriage research tradition has supported the notion that 'opposites attract', better known as complementary need hypothesis (Winch, 1958; Winch, Ktsanes & Ktsanes, 1954). Besides, it also seeks
answer to the question whether spouses tend to be similar or complementary in personality characteristics. Some researches have supported both the similarity and complementary need hypothesis (Becker, 1964; Katz, Glucksberg, & Krauss, 1960; Seyfried and Hendrick, 1973).

Doherty and Ryder (1979) pointed out that there are at least two problems with earlier studies in the area of marital relationship that may help to explain this decline in interest. First, the major findings added little to the common sense notions that 'likes marry likes' and that 'unhappy individuals are apt to have unhappy marriages'. Second, on a methodological level, these studies suffered from a reliance on global, theoretical personality traits as independent variables (e.g. neuroticism and mal-adjustment) and on self-reports of overall marital adjustment as criterion variables. Therefore, personality psychologists and marriage researchers have turned to include cognitive personality constructs in marriage studies.

A study entitled 'The construction and development of the Miller Marital Locus of Control Scale' conducted by Miller et. al. (1983) provides an impetus to undertake this investigation. The present study includes cognitive personality constructs namely, Marital Locus of Control, and Social Intimacy and approval Motive (as opposed to traditional personality trait dimensions). The assumption
behind these cognitive personality variables is that, while specific behaviour is perhaps highly viable between situations, certain cognitive 'sets' or modes of personality may be used more or less consistently by the individual in a variety of situations. Although the validity of cognitive personality characteristics is the object of controversy, a number of personality psychologists believe that they represent a major advance over the traditional global trait approach (Endler and Magnusson, 1976; Mischel, 1973).

Locus of Control:

The concept of 'Locus of Control' (internal Vs. external control) was coined by Rotter (1966) and defined as 'when a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted this way by an individual we have labelled this belief external control; If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this belief internal control'. (P,1)
Locus of control is not a typological concept. It is not the case that people are either internally or externally controlled. Locus of control is a continuum and people can be ordered along that continuum. Since 1966 hundreds of studies have been carried out employing this concept. Locus of control is a personality construct that has been shown to have a great deal of relevance to competence and coping skills in many important areas of human functioning (Lefcourt, 1982). Furthermore, it has been linked to social sensitivity in both affiliative (Lefcourt, Martin, Fick & Saleh, 1985) and marital context (Sabattelli, Buck & Dreyer, 1983).

The empirical work conducted on locus of control and marital relationship has centered on the relationship between locus of control and marital satisfaction and stability (Constantine & Bahr, 1981; Doherty, 1980, 1981, 1983; Mlott & Lira, 1977) and problem solving behaviour in marriage (Doherty & Ryder, 1979, 1981). These studies have revealed weak and inconsistent results (Doherty, 1980, 1981; Kawash & Scherf, 1975). This might be due to the lack of theoretical attention typically paid to the mediating chain of events linking locus of control to specific behaviours that could interfere with or facilitate to marital problem solving and, ultimately marital satisfaction. Additionally
the very general locus of control measures used in these studies might make it difficult to establish a strong connection between individuals' orientations and specific behaviours within the restricted domain of marital interaction.

The present study employed a locus of control measure more relevant to assess marital relations in the hope that the higher predictive power of the situation specific scale would allow for the clarification of some of the relationship already determined with measures generalized locus of control. The Miller Marital Locus of Control Scale (MMLOC; Miller, Lefcourt, & Ware; 1983) should provide better understanding of the role of locus of control in marriage. The scale measures individual's locus of control specifically for marital satisfaction. Individuals who are internal for marital satisfaction have expectations that marital outcomes, whether positive or negative are the result of their own efforts and abilities whereas individuals who are external for marital satisfaction take little personal responsibility for marital outcomes. Not many studies have been conducted on the relationship between marital locus of control and marital interaction behaviour (Sabattelli, Buck & Dreyer, 1983; Winkler & Doherty, 1983), marital problem solving (Miller Lefcourt, Homes, Ware & Saleh, 1986), social intimacy and marital satisfaction (Husain & Gupta, 1987, Miller, Lefcourt
& Ware, 1983; White, 1984) and approval motivation (Gupta & Husain, 1988). These studies have produced enough intriguing results that have necessitated further research on the subject using Miller Marital Locus of Control Scale. Locus of Control has thus proved a relevant variable in the context of marital relationship.

Social Intimacy:

Another personality dimension employed here is social intimacy. "Intimacy may be defined as a strong relationship, characterized trust and familiarity between two people. It is not necessity of life, like food or water. People can live without intimacy but it may well be a necessity for happiness and possibly for mental health as well" (Calhoun & Acocella, , 1978, p. 346). There is ample evidence on the psychological significance of marriage, close relationships with others and bereavement which suggests that intimacy is an important predictor of healthy psychological and physiological functioning. A number of researchers have noted the importance of closeness with others (including closeness with spouse, with friends, or with family members) for the prediction of healthy functioning (Berkman & Syme, 1979; Jacobs Charles, 1980; Medalie & Goldbourt, 1976; Thomas & Duszynski, 1974).
The role of social intimacy in predicting individual's response to stress has received empirical support despite crude and global measures employed. Brown and his associates (1973, 1975, 1977, 1978) asked their subjects a few questions to assess whether or not they had a confidence. Medalie and Goldbourt (1976) asked subjects a single question to assess the quality of their marital relationships and rated the response dichotomously. Many other investigators have simply employed marital status to assess intimacy. Nuckolls et. al. (1972) assessed subject's feelings and perceptions of self, marriage, extended family, social resources and pregnancy and referred to the composite as a measure of social assets. While other researchers have developed measures of social support (e.g. Habif & Lahey, 1980; Kaplan, 1977, Cited in Turner, 1981; Sandler & Lakey, 1982). David and Edward (1985) employed sexual satisfaction as a criterion for measuring marital intimacy. They found that higher sexual satisfaction group have greater marital intimacy. None have directly assessed intimacy which has been implicated as an important variable in predicting the individual's response to stress. Dean and Lin (1977), noting the absence of a measure to assess intimacy, discuss the need for development of precise and valid measure to further explore the important function of close relationship.
In response to the need for a more precise and standardized instrument, the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (MSIS, Miller & Lefcourt, 1982), a 17-item measure of the maximum level of intimacy currently experienced in the context of friendship on marriage, was developed. In the light of evidence supporting the reliability and validity of the MSIS (Miller and Lefcourt, 1982; 1983), it seems clear the MSIS can be a more precise measure of intimacy in the context of marriage.

Approval Motive:

The study of approval motive is an extension of the studies made in respect of social desirability variable effecting the respondents' responses on a personality test. Originally the concept of social desirability was introduced by Edwards (1953, 1957). The concept of social desirability refers to the extent to which a person or respondent acquiesence to statements that depict some behaviours, attitudes, or a dispositions that are in conformity with the norms, values and aspirations of the social spectrum of which the respondent is a member.
Social desirability is a concept that denotes the underlying motive toward seeking approval. A number of studies have been conducted on response distortion because of social desirability/undesirability of the personality test items. Since the original work of Edwards (1953), extensive efforts have been devoted to investigate the relationship between the social desirability of the personality test items and the probability of their being acknowledged by subjects in self description. Crowne and Marlowe (1960, 1964) extended the concept of social desirability in their concept of 'need for approval' and proposed an alternative which is free from psychopathological effect.

The term approval motive has been used as an explanatory construct. It has been assumed that one agrees or disagrees with social desirability or undesirability statements because of a motivational disposition which has been designated as approval motive. This has been designed on the assumption that one having high degree of approval motive would agree to greater number and varieties of socially desirable statement. The approval motive also reflects in other types of behaviour which are quite different from social desirability, (i.e. avoidant of disapproval) here a person would be expected to defensive in situation and subjected to social censure. The need for social approval, according
to Crowne and Marlowe (1964) meant something of a reliance on the evaluative judgements of others which was believed to stem from two factors (a) a motive to seek approval (approach behaviour) and (b) a motive to shun disapproval (avoidance behaviour).

That the need to seek approval is consistently related to a variety of cognitive and behavioural attributes such as conformity, compliance and suggestibility etc. has been evidenced in a number of studies (Strickland, 1977). These findings are consistent with the initial formulation of approval motive put forth by Crowne and Marlowe (1964). They emphasised that the goals or needs of approval dependent person include social recognition, social dependence, love and attraction, positive self presentation and denial of inadequacies. Crowne's (1979) suggestion that approval motive has a transcultural validity is empirically tested in two studies conducted by Tripathi (1980); Misra and Tripathi (1981) employing Indian subjects. The need for approval is a dimension of the individual personality.

Theoretical Approaches to Personality and Marriage Research

There are four major approaches to personality and marriage research and theory.
1. **Psychoanalytic Theory**

Psychoanalysts have focused on the influence of personality maturity on adjustment and success in marriage (Blanck & Blanck, 1968; Meissner, 1978). Maturity requires that the spouse has (a) worked through childhood prohibitions toward sexuality; (b) achieved an adequate degree of psychological separations from parents; and (c) attend a level of object relations that allows for a mutual — as opposed to self-oriented — relationship with the parents. Blanck and Blanck (1968) posited marriage offers a developmental opportunity for developing autonomy within the context of closeness and other potential benefits from internalizing positive features of the partners' personality.

Bowen (1976) gave emphasis on the differentiation of self as determinant of the quality of the marital relationship. Differentiation of self is achieved through an orderly transition from the emotional fusion with the family in childhood to the establishment of a separate identity. Bowen pointed out that the differentiation of self represents the extent to which feeling and intellectual processes are kept distinct, so that the individual is not a captive of his or her feelings. Like Meissner (1978), Bowen believes that two levels of differentiations in spouses are associated with destructive marital conflict and other marital ills.
Studies on emotional maturity and marital adjustment are nevertheless consistent with the psychoanalytic framework's assumption that lower personal maturity leads to lower marital adjustment (Dean, 1966; Cole, Cole & Dean, 1980). These studies, however, are not derived explicitly from a psychoanalytic framework.

2. Phenomenological Theory:

Roger's phenomenological theory to personality and marriage research emphasized self-perception and self-actualization. The empirical studies based on this personality theory have centered on self and partner perception. Marital researchers have found that more favourable self rating, and more favourable ratings of the spouse are associated with greater self reported marital satisfaction (See, the review by Tharp). Further studies in the Rogerian tradition were conducted on the Congruence of self-perception and partner's perception of self (Luckey, 1960) and on the role of the self discloser of feelings in marriages (Levinger & Senn, 1967). A bulk of research exists, following the phenomenological theory, but no systematic theoretical work has been done on the relationship between this view of personality and marriage relationship.
3. Trait-Approaches to Personality and Marriage:

Some researchers have taken the position that neurotic traits in individual spouses are associated with lower marital happiness scores, with correlations typically ranging from .20 to .40 (Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Burchinal, Hawkes, & Gardner, 1957; Terman et al., 1938). Unhappily married spouses, for example report themselves to be more emotionally unstable, critical of others, and dominating than do happily married spouses (Burgess & Wallin, 1953). An additional finding from this literature is that marital happiness is associated with higher husband-wife correlations on personality scores (Burgess & Wallin, 1953, Byrne & Blaylock, 1963, Pickford, Signori & Rempel, 1966). Bentler and Newcomb, (1978) reported higher correlations but greater mean differences on personality traits between couples who stayed married versus those who divorced. Unfortunately the trait approach to understanding marriage has not advanced, beyond the common sense viewpoint that maladjusted individuals are likely to be involved in maladjusted marriages. In particular the role of personality traits in the broad spectrum of marital interaction beyond marital satisfaction is largely unexplored (Doherty, 1983).

Doherty (1983) has pointed out that the research tradition in the personality and marriage area has suffered
from over reliance on measures of personal adjustment and
exclusive focus on marital satisfaction or marital adjustment
as the dependent variable. Furthermore, he pointed out
that the area has not paid systematic attention to theory
building, leaving many of the empirical findings uncorrected
and unexplained.

4. Locus of Control and Marital Relationship:

Doherty (1983) have presented a systematic theory
relating to locus of control and marital interaction.
He proposed that internality influences likelihood of problem-
solving behaviour that is direct, persistent and moderate
(assertive) and that leads to lower effective solutions.
Externality leads to passive or indirect involvement in
problem-solving or to aggressive behaviour, depending on
how frustrating the situation is to the individual. Locus
of control effects marital satisfaction and marital stability
through its influence on problem solving behaviour and
effective outcome. The relationship between locus of control
and marital interaction is viewed as by directional, with
major success and major failure at marital problem solving
effect the locus of control orientations of the partners.
Doherty's theoretical model was systematically tested in
a study entitled 'Marital locus of control and marital
problem solving' by Miller et. al. (1986).
Relationship Between Marital Locus of Control, Social Intimacy and Approval Motivation:

The main purpose of the present study is to determine the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy, marital locus of control and approval motivation and social intimacy and approval motivation among adjusted-maladjusted married couples. The marital relationships involved two personalities as well as their emergent relationship, a theoretical linkage must deal between the spouses personalities.

There is one empirical study on the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy (Miller, Lefcourt, & Ware, 1983). The findings of the study revealed that the significant negative relationship existed between MLOC and SI scores (r = -.37, P < .01). This finding explains that the more external for marital interaction, the less intimacy between spouses. The MLOC correlated significantly with discrepancy scores between partners on this scale (r = .16, P > .05). The more external for marital interaction, the more discrepant intimacy scores of spouses were. This was particularly the case for husbands (r = 23, P. 05). Discrepancy scores for wives were not significantly related to MLOC scores (r = .12, P > .05). This study suggested that there is association between MLOC and SI. A different pattern of relationship might be anticipated between MLOC and SI among adjusted-maladjusted married couples.
Previous research on the relationship between marital locus of control scale and approval motive scale indicated positive relationship among younger and older wives, and younger couples (Gupta & Husain, 1988). This finding indicates that externality increases with the high degree of approval. In another study conducted by Miller et. al. (1983), the MLOC score was significantly correlated with the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability scale \( r = -.29, P < .05 \), indicating that who are high in the need for approval tend to report that if they were married they would choose a spouse with more internal locus of control for marital interaction. This finding was largely accounted for by the manner in which subjects made attributions for negative outlook in marriage.

On the basis of the above mentioned studies it is clear that there is a cultural differences on the relationship between these two variables. Another reason seems to be the nature of conceptualization and measurement of approval motivation. Miller and others measured approval need through MCSD scale, whereas in the study conducted by Gupta and Husain (1988), approval motive scale (Tripathi& Tripathi 1980) was used.

**Significance of the Present Study:**

The present study departs from earlier studies in three respects.
1. The present study has employed cognitive personality variables - Marital locus of control and social Intimacy and Approval Motivation, as opposed to traditional personality trait dimensions such as marital adjustment or marital satisfaction as the dependent variables in marriage researches.

2. The present study used situation specific measures i.e. relating to the sample under the study. For example - Marital Locus of Control fits the isomorphic and causality criteria for personality and marriage research. Doherty (1983) suggested that the most useful strategy for linking personality and marital interaction may be to select construct that have a degree of parallelism in both units of analysis (i.e. individual and couples combination).

3. In earlier researches, two extreme groups of subjects (adjusted and maladjusted) were classified on the basis of marital adjustment scores, whereas the present study has employed four groups of subjects (adjusted maladjusted spouses and couples and complementary Group I and Group II- either of the spouse is adjusted or maladjusted.)
Objectives of the Present study:

The main objectives of the present study are as follows:

1- To determine the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy, marital locus of control and approval motivation, and social intimacy and approval motivation among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.

2- To determine the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy, marital locus of control and approval motivation, and social intimacy and approval motivation among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples.

3- To determine the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy, marital locus of control and approval motivation, and social intimacy and approval motivation among adjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I (i.e. adjusted husbands and maladjusted wives.)

4- To determine the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy, marital locus of control and approval motivation, and social intimacy and approval motivation among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II (i.e. maladjusted husbands and adjusted wives).
5- To determine the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives and adjusted and maladjusted couples in two Z coefficients (i.e. the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy scores).

6- To determine the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in two Z coefficients (i.e. the relationship between marital locus of control and social intimacy scores).

7- To determine the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives, and adjusted and maladjusted couples in two Z coefficients (i.e. the relationship between marital locus of control and approval motivation scores).

8- To determine the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in two Z coefficients (i.e. the relationship between marital locus of control and approval motivation scores).

9- To determine the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives, and adjusted and maladjusted couples in two Z coefficients (i.e. the relationship between social intimacy and approval motivation scores).
10- To determine the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in two $Z_r$ coefficients (i.e. the relationship between social intimacy and approval motivation scores).

11- To determine the partial correlations between marital locus of control scores and social intimacy scores (when the variable of approval motivation is partialed out), between marital locus of control and approval motivation scores (when the variable of social intimacy is partialed out), and between social intimacy and approval motivation scores (when the variable of marital locus of control is partialed out), among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.

12- To determine the partial correlations between marital locus of control scores and social intimacy scores (when the variable of approval motivation is partialed out), between marital locus of control and approval motivation scores (when the variable of social intimacy is partialed out), and between social intimacy and approval motivation scores (when the variable of marital locus of control is partialed out), among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples.
13- To determine the partial correlations between locus of control scores and social intimacy scores (when the variable of approval motivation is partialed out), between marital locus of control and approval motivation scores (when the variable of social intimacy is partialed out), and between social intimacy and approval motivation scores (when the variable of marital locus of control is partialed out), among adjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I.

14- To determine the partial correlations between locus of control scores and social intimacy scores (when the variable of approval motivation is partialed out), between marital locus of control and approval motivation scores (when the variable of social intimacy is partialed out), and between social intimacy and approval motivation scores (when the variable of marital locus of control is partialed out), among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II.

15- To determine the significance of partial r at the .95 confidence interval among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.

16- To determine the significance of partial r at the .95 confidence interval among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples.
17- To determine the significance of partial $r$ at the .95 confidence interval among adjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I.

18- To determine the significance of partial $r$ at the .95 confidence interval among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II.

19- To determine the multiple coefficient of correlations between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the marital locus of control from the two variables social intimacy and approval motivation scores (i.e. to what extent marital locus of control scores are related to social intimacy and approval motivation) among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.

20- To determine the multiple coefficient of correlations between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the marital locus of control, from the two variables - social intimacy and approval motivation scores among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples.

21- To determine the multiple coefficient of correlations between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the marital locus of control, from the two variables - social intimacy and approval motivation scores among adjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I.
22- To determine the multiple coefficient of correlations between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the marital locus of control, from the two variables—social intimacy and approval motivation among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II.

23- To determine the critical values of multiple R among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.

24- To determine the critical values of multiple R among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples.

25- To determine the critical values of multiple R among adjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I.

26- To determine the critical values of multiple R among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II.

27- To determine $\beta$ coefficients of the independent contribution of the variables social intimacy and approval motivation in determining the predicted value of the criterion variable—marital locus of control among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.
28- To determine $\beta$ coefficients of the independent contribution of the variables social intimacy and approval motivation in determining the predicted value of the criterion variable - marital locus of control among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples.

29- To determine $\beta$ coefficients of the independent contribution of the variables social intimacy and approval motivation in determining the predicted value of the criterion variable - marital locus of control among adjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I.

30- To determine $\beta$ coefficients of the independent contribution of the variables social intimacy and approval motivation in determining the predicted value of the criterion variable - marital locus of control among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II.
Chapter Two

REVIEW OF RELEVANT STUDIES

==================================
CHAPTER - TWO

REVIEW OF RELEVANT STUDIES

A large number of studies on marriage have been devoted to personality and social or demographic concomitants of marital happiness, marital adjustment, marital satisfaction or marital success, needs similarity hypothesis, need complementary - similarity hypothesis, social, physical and mental health characteristics of married couples. This chapter comprises only those studies which are directly related to our purpose (i.e. the variables under study) or having some implication for the study. Indian studies will also be reviewed to be abreast with the research tradition in this area.

The plan of this chapter is to review the empirical studies on the relationship between (a) locus of control and marital satisfaction, (b) locus of control and marital problem solving, (c) locus of control and approval motivation (d) locus of control and social intimacy and other social-psychological variables and (e) personality and social correlates of marital adjustment.
(a) **Locus of control and Marital Satisfaction**

For many years, marital satisfaction or marital adjustment has been the most commonly studied aspect of the marital relationship (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). Most of the research literature on locus of control and marriage has postulated a direct relationship between locus of control and marital satisfaction—specially that internality would influence marital satisfaction positively. In this section the review is intended to present the studies on the relationship between individual locus of control and couple combinations of locus of control with marital satisfaction.

There is mixed evidence to both individual and couple locus of control configuration—husband more internal and marital dissatisfaction. Mlott and Lira (1977) reported that a significant difference in locus of control scores existed with wives being more external and husbands more internal, in a sample of maritally distressed couples presenting themselves for treatment.

Replicating Mlott and Lira's finding in his newly sample, Doherty (1981) reported the relationship between spouses' individual expectancy for internal versus external control of reinforcements and their level of marital dissatisfaction. It was hypothesized that a marital pattern
in which the wife was relatively more external and the husband more internal would be associated with high levels of marital dissatisfaction. This hypothesis was supported for wives but not for husbands. Additional data on self and other descriptions suggested that external wives may believe that their dependency needs are not being met sufficiently by their relatively more self contained internal husbands.

Using a slightly modified version of Rotter's I.E. scale in a secondary analysis of American adults, Doherty (1980) found a correlation of .12 (β = .007) between locus of control and a four item measure of satisfaction with marriage and family life. This correlation indicated a small but statistically reliable positive association between internality and marital and family satisfaction.

Using a smaller sample of 10 marital therapy clinic and 10 nonclinic couples, Genshaft (1980) found that clinic wives were more external than non-clinic wives; clinic wives were also more external than their husbands, but this difference was not statistically significant.

Miller (1981) developed a 44-item marital locus of control scale with adequate reliability and validity. Using a sample of over 200 married student couples, Miller found significant correlations of .37 and .29 between internality and a measure of marital intimacy and a one-
item measure of marital satisfaction. The correlations for husbands and wives separately were quite similar.

Sabatelli (1982) reported insignificant correlations between Rotter's I.E. scale and a measure of marital satisfaction for a sample of 48 couples, married for an average of almost 3 years. Sabatelli (1982) using the Locke Wallace scale the Ryder's Love-sickness scales, reported that the more internal husband - more external wife configuration was associated with lower satisfaction for husbands on the Love-sickness Scale; however, the same pattern was associated with higher satisfaction for wives, on the Locke-Wallace Scale. Finally, a reanalysis of McCabe's (1978) data showed a trend for high love-sickness husbands to be relatively more internal and their wives relatively more external (\( t = 1.82, P = .082 \)), whereas high lovesickness wives were not different from their husbands on locus of control.

Sabatelli et.al. (1983) employed field dependence as a potential mediator of relationship quality in married dyads. Consistent with Witkin's theory of psychological differentiation, it was predicted that spouses with relatively field development patterns and individuals from dyads with similar levels of differentiation would have fewer complaints.
Results, contrary to the predictions, showed that husbands married to field-dependent wives and wives from matched dyads had more complaints about their marital relationships. These findings suggest the need for a careful evaluation of the role of cognitive style in the domain of intimate interpersonal relationships. Apparently, it may not be sufficient to generalize about the role of personality in social relationships from the results of studies employing experimentally created dyads or groups to other more enduring and real-life types of social relationships.

Winkler and Doherty's (1983) study using Doherty's CRIE and Spanier's Dyadic Adjustment Scale show a correlation between internality and satisfaction of .33 (p=.058), with husbands and wives having a nearly identical correlation. The Israeli couples however, showed no significant associations between marital locus of control and marital satisfaction.

Marital locus of control scale was administered on the 120 couples to obtain increased precision in the prediction of behaviour among spouses and couples of working, conventional younger and older couples. The evidence obtained from this study indicated that there were no significant differences between spouses of working, conventional, younger and older couples and between working and conventional couples, and between younger and older couples. (Husain & Gupta, 1987).
(b) **Locus of Control and Marital Problem Solving**

Doherty and Ryder (1979) related individual locus of control to problem solving behaviour in a sample of 80 newlywed couples. They also used interpersonal trust as a moderating personality characteristic between locus of control and problem-solving behaviour. Hypotheses were formulated in terms of individual locus of control and interpersonal trust - internal - low trust and external - high trust. Results showed that internal husbands behaved more assertively than did externals in the problem solving interaction. Furthermore, external-high trust husbands were the least assertive of the husband group on both the interactional measure and on the win score measure, where they yielded scores to the extent of 70% disagreement to that of their wives. For wives, a significant interaction effect was found for locus of control and interpersonal trust on problem-solving behaviour, with internal low trust wives behaving most assertively in the Inventory of Marital Conflicts' discussion.

Winkler and Doherty (1983), conducted a study on the relationship between marital satisfaction and communication style in two cross-cultural samples: 34 United States couples, 26 of whom were Jewish, and 29 Israeli couples. The author
used a measure of marriage-specific locus of control, the Close Relationships I.-E. scale (CRIE) and two measures of marital communication styles during marital conflict (i.e. Conflict Tactics Scale and the Imagined Situation Inventory).

Using these measures Doherty (1983) correlated Marital Locus of Control with marital problem-solving behaviour. The Israeli couples, differed significantly from the United States couples on all the measures and showed few relationships between marital locus of control and marital problem-solving, except that internal Israeli wives were more likely to use reasoning approaches than were external wives.

The authors reported the data for the United States couples on the highest correlations between the CRIE and the conflict measures for the 34 American husbands: Greater externality was associated with higher levels of verbal aggression \( (r = -0.310, p = 0.075) \) and of physical violence \( (r = -0.427, p = 0.012) \) on the CTS, on the ISI, externality was associated with greater use of the angry response style \( (r = -0.351, p = 0.042) \). The interpretation of these correlations, indicates that internals reported less verbal and physical aggression during the past year and were less likely to respond with anger to a provocative statement from the spouse. For wives the only significant correlation
was between marital locus of control and the ISI response style of "try to kid or tease the partner" (r = -.387, p = .026). External wives were more likely to choose this indirect and deflecting response when provoked by their husbands.

These results add further empirical support to the hypothesized relationship between externality and aggression in husbands. Husbands who held generalized beliefs in external control over marital outcomes were more likely than internals to behave aggressively in marital conflict situations. The results for wives are consistent with an indirect nonassertive problem-solving style: External wives were more likely to respond by kidding or teasing when provoked by their husbands.

Miller et al. (1986) examined the relation between individuals' marital locus of control orientation and their approach to marital problem solving among 88 couples. Behavioural measures of conflict resolution style and problem solving ability were derived from video tapes of couples as they dealt with commonly encountered marital conflict situations. The investigators predicted that internals for marital satisfaction would more actively engage in problem-solving than externals. They also predicted that couples who confronted problems in a constructive rather than an avoidant or destructive style would arrive at better solutions and would be happier.
with them. The data support these hypotheses and suggest that internals for marital satisfaction are more active and direct in their problem-solving than are externals. Internals were more effective in communicating and achieving their desired goals and reported higher levels of marital satisfaction than externals. Active engagement in the discussion of marital issues by couples resulted in more effective problem-solving than styles characterised by avoidance. Destructiveness was related to poor problem solutions and lower self reported ratings of solution satisfaction.

c) **Locus of Control and Approval Motivation:**

There are few studies where the relationship between locus of control and approval motivation has been investigated.

Kawash and Scherf (1975) studied self-esteem, locus of control, and approval motivation in married couples. They feel that the two observations in this study of greatest importance to researchers and practitioners alike are the sex difference observed in homogeneity of self-perception and the significant correlation between SEI and MCSD. In the case of the former observation further research will be necessary to clarify this difference, but a good starting point would be to establish whether it can be replicated on
college students. There may be generational shift in this phenomenon and it will be necessary to establish this observation before further analysis is possible. The implications of the second observation have been discussed. Independent confirmation is necessary in order to substantiate the observation that MCSD is a measure of defensiveness.

Tripathi (1980) investigated the relationship between approval motive and locus of control. Among undergraduate students following a $2 \times 2 \times 3$ factorial design with two levels of approval motive (high and low), two sex groups (male and female) and three components of locus of control (internal control, powerful others and chance) were taken into consideration. The given responses of subjects were measured on the measure of internal-external control. The results revealed significant main effects of sex and components of locus of control. Further, the interaction of approval motive components of locus of control and sex components of locus of control yielded significant effects. Results indicated that high approval group subjects are more externally controlled while low approval group subjects are more internally controlled. Overall, girls are less externally controlled as compared to boys in samples.
Misra and Tripathi (1981) determined the relationship between approval motive and three factors of locus of control i.e. internal, chance and powerful others. Results indicated that high approval motivated subjects were significantly more external and less chance oriented as compared to low approval motivated subjects. In regard to powerful others the main effect of approval was not significant while sex yielded a significant main effect. The results showed independence of the three sub-scales of I.E. control and indicated cross-cultural generality of the measure.

Miller et. al. (1983) conducted a study on 45 students enrolled in a psychology course. Subjects were asked to complete the Miller Marital Locus of Control (MMLOC) scale and Marlowe-crowne Social Desirability (MCSD) scale, imagining how they would feel if they were married. Results showed that the MMLOC scores were significantly correlated with the MCSD scores \( r = -0.29, p < 0.05 \), indicating that those who are high in the need for approval tend to report that they, if were married, would prefer spouses with more internal locus of control for marital interaction.

Marital locus of Control Scale and Approval Motive Scale were administered on 60 younger and 60 older couples (a) to determine the relationship between marital locus of control and approval motivation among spouses (younger and older husbands, younger and older wives) and couples (younger and
older) (b) and to determine the significance of difference between younger husbands and older wives, older husbands and older wives and younger couples and older couples in two correlations. Significant positive relationships were found to exist between marital locus of control and approval motivation among younger and older wives and younger couples on the correlation between marital locus of control and approval motive, significant differences existed between younger husbands and younger wives, older husbands and older wives, and younger couples and older couples. (Gupta & Husain, 1988).

d) **Locus of control and Social Intimacy and other Social-psychological variables:**

In the last fifteen years there have been many investigations on the psychological significance of marriage on close relationships with others, life stress and bereavement which suggests that intimacy is an important prediction of healthy psychological and physiological functioning. However, we could come across only two studies where a precise measure of social intimacy developed by Miller and Lefcourt (1982) was used.

Miller et.al. (1983) used a Miller Social Intimacy Scale for determining the validity of the Miller Marital Locus of
Control scale. The total MMLOC scale correlated significantly with the MSIS (r = -.37, p \( \leq .001 \)), indicating that the more external for marital interaction, the less intimacy subjects were apt to reveal. Likewise, MMLOC correlated significantly with discrepancy scores between partners on this scale (r = .16, p \( \leq .05 \)); the more external for the marital interaction the more discrepant the intimacy the scores of spouses were. This was particularly the case for wives whose scores were significantly related to MMLOC scores (r = .12).

Miller and Lefcourt (1983) conducted two studies to determine the role of social intimacy in predicting the individuals response to stress. In the first study the experimenter reinforced the experimental subjects' verbalizations during an interview on a fixed schedule for the first 3 minutes, withdrawing reinforcement for the final four minutes. The control group received reinforcement on a fix schedule for the total seven minutes. Subjects scoring low on a measure of intimacy disclosed less personal material during the withdrawal period in the experimental contrast to high scoring subjects to maintain their level of disclosure for both parts of the interview. In the second study, previously experienced life change events were assessed. Individuals lacking a current intimacy were formed to be prone to higher levels of emotional disturbance specially when many previous negative or few positive life change events had occurred.
One of the important areas of personality and marriage studies concerns the role of personality and social characteristics in marital adjustment. Some of the important studies conducted in India are reviewed here.

Singh (1976) illustrated that marriage may be more successful in individuals whose need pattern are complementary rather than similar. The study had further suggested that personality is perhaps the most crucial factor in marital adjustment and spouses having complementary traits are likely to lead a more happy married life.

Bhatt and Surti (1979) examined marital adjustment and family adjustment of older and younger generation i.e. mother-in-law and daughter-in-law in joint and nuclear families. For this purpose two groups were selected, 25 pairs of mother-in-law and daughter-in-law from joint families and 25 pairs from nuclear families. Mehta's Marital Adjustment Scale and Family Adjustment inventory developed by the authors were administered on subjects. The results obtained by Spearman's Rank Order Correlation showed that the correlation between marital adjustment and family adjustment of the daughter-in-law in the joint and nuclear families was statistically significant.
Gupta and Nathawat (1982) examined the effect of the type of marriage, duration and sex on love and liking. The study was undertaken to provide empirical data to support or rule out the common belief in Indian society, "that love marriages at initial stage are more successful whereas arranged marriages are more successful in the long run in terms of love and liking". The data collected on 25 couples of love marriage and 25 couples of arranged marriage substantiated that 'as time passes' love and liking decreases among love marriage pairs but it increases among arranged marriage pairs. The study revealed that men tend to be more likable than women but not more lovable.

Parikh (1982) investigated the anxiety reaction variables of the divorce and the happily married. He compared two groups of divorcees (N = 150, Males = 100, Females = 50) and happily married (N = 150, Males = 100, Females = 50) with respect to nine personality traits which can be called the anxiety reaction variables. The two groups differ significantly in all the nine traits. But the divorcees are significantly high on five traits of harmavoidance, disjustivity, change impulsion and emotionality, while the happily married have scored significantly high in the opposite traits of conjuctivity, sameness, deliberation and placidity. It seems that there are two different types of reaction patterns of anxiety, exhibited by the divorcee and the happily married.
Sarkar (1984) examined 5 work related (WRVs) and 5 non-work related variables (NWRVs) in dual career nuclear families for their impact on job and life satisfaction of the couples. WRVs were career, job involvement, self esteem, time spent on work activities and income. NWRVs were multiple role stresses, integration of families and work enabling processes, self esteem and hired help. One hundred thirty dual career couples (mean age of wives 34 yrs, mean age of husbands 39 yrs) responded to a questionnaire individually. Results indicated that the objective and attitudinal WRVs considered were not significant in explaining the variance for job satisfaction. But the NWRVs were significant for explaining the variance in subjects' life satisfaction. Gender also moderated the relationship between WRVs and job and life satisfaction. Even for career oriented wives non-work aspects of life had greater impact on their experienced satisfaction than work relevant factors.

Jamuna and Ramamurti (1984) conducted a study of adjustment trends and husband-wife communication of married women between 40-55 years of age. The results of the study indicate poor adjustment in the menopausal age groups. The husband-wife communication was good in 40-45 age groups, poor in the 46-50 age groups and better in the 51-55 age groups.
Kumar and Rohatgi (1984) administered Raven’s Progressive Matrices, Ascendence- Submission Reaction Inventory and Maudsley Personality Inventory on 75 highly adjusted and 75 poorly adjusted married couples. Better adjustment was found significantly associated with higher intelligence. Extravertive interests in the couple along with higher dominance in the husbands. A slight but not significant trend for better adjustment with submissive tendency was found among better adjusted wives. They have reported a close-positive relationship between intelligence, dominance need, and extraversion and marital success. They have found the high adjusted couples to be more relaxed (lower anxiety) emotionally more stable (lower neuroticism) and a tendency to feel more secure in comparison to the low adjusted couples.

Kumar and Rohatgi (1985) determined the relationship of anxiety, neuroticism and security with adjustment in marriage. The marital adjustment questionnaire was administered on a sample of 300 married couples to identify two criterion groups—the high adjusted (top 25%) and the low adjusted (bottom 25%). Each group comprised 75 couples in the age of 21-45 yrs. The comparison of the two groups showed that the high-adjusted husbands and wives felt significantly more relaxed (anxiety score being low) and emotionally more organized (neuroticism score being low) as compared to the low adjusted husbands and
wives. In addition, the high adjusted couples tended to feel more secure though not on a statistically significant basis.

Agnihotri (1985) determined the relationship between marital adjustment and combinations of ordinal birth positions of couples. One hundred and sixty three couples, whose length of marriage ranged from 5 years over to 10 years, whose ordinal birth position stood in a specific relation to the other sex sibling, and whose family was medium sized, served as subjects. The couples belonged to either of the four categories, namely, older husband and older wife, older husband and younger wife, younger husband and older wife, younger husband and younger wife. They were administered Singh's Marital Adjustment Inventory. The analysis of the data revealed that it is not the particular ordinal birth position, in relation to the presence of older or younger other sex sibling, of other spouse alone that produces adjustment differences but the specific combinations of particular ordinal positions of both the members of a married couple that leads to differences in adjustment. The best marital adjustment has been found between those couples where husbands were the older brothers with younger sisters and wives were older sisters with younger brothers. The poorest adjustment is obtained between those couples where the husbands were younger brothers with older sisters and wives were the younger sisters with older brothers.
In case either husband or wife making a couple was older among sibling, the adjustment was better, though not significantly different.

Husain and Garg (1985) investigated the significance of internal-external control beliefs among married couples. Miller Marital Locus of Control (MMLOC) scale was administered on 68 married couples residing at Aligarh. Point-biserial correlation indicated a significant positive relationship between husbands' and wives' scores on the MMLOC scale.

Sekaran (1985) attempted to trace the links among three sets of exogenous variable (individual differences, work and non-work factors), 2 indigenous variables (job satisfaction and life satisfaction) a dependent variable (mental health) for husbands and wives in dual career families. The mean age of husbands and wives were 38 and 35 yrs. The responses were analyzed to establish the links among variables. Cross-sectional analyses showed that both the indigenous variable (job satisfaction and life satisfaction) have direct influence on the mental health of the husbands, and two of the exogenous variables, multiple role stress and number of children had significant direct link to the mental health. For both the husbands and wives age had a significant negative impact on job satisfaction. Over all there were more similarities, than differences between the husbands and wives, but it is suggested
that wives continue to be overburdened with the responsibilities of running the household.

Mathur and Lakhani (1985) 50 infertile and 50 fertile couples (out of which 33 couples belonged to urban population and 17 to rural population of both the groups). Marital Adjustment Scale, Depression Inventory, and Neurotic Scale Questionnaire were employed. Infertile couples in both samples showed poor marital adjustment, poor depression and neuroticism. However, rural infertile couples were found more neurotic as compared to urban infertile couples.

Kumar and Rohatgi (1986) identified certain personality correlates—frustration management and self disclosure associated with success in marriage among high adjusted and low adjusted couples. The results showed that the high adjusted couples depended to a lesser degree on unadaptive defensive modes in the management of frustration in comparison to the low adjusted couples. They also showed a higher tendency to self disclose among themselves than the low adjusted couples.

Patel (1987) determined the role of personality traits (emotion, counteraction, and understanding) among quarrelling couples. The trait of understanding is found lowest degree than the trait of emotion and counteraction in quarrelling couples. The trait of counteraction is found in highest degree than the traits of emotion and understanding in the
quarrelling couples. The trait of understanding has lowest total mean score in the group of male and female. The trait of counteraction is dominating on the other traits in quarrelling couples.

Bal (1988) selected 72 married couples for determining marital adjustment of dual earner couples in relation to marriage style. A comparison of working and non-working wives and husbands of working and non-working wives was done on adjustment scores of Patel's Battery of Adjustment Scale. Analysis of variance (2 x 3 factorial design) revealed that working-non-working status of wife does not affect adjustment scores for either wives or husbands on any of these scales. A significant column effect is observed for wives on the Marriage Adjustment Scale and Family Adjustment Scale indicating that adjustment scores were significantly different for working and non-working wives for different marriage span. No significant difference on scores of Sex Adjustment Scale was observed.

Husain and Sharma (1988) determined the relationship between marital adjustment scores and satisfaction with life scores among spouses of working and conventional couples. Results indicated that the significant positive relationship existed between scores of marital adjustment and satisfaction with life among subjects. Critical ratio yielded significance of difference between husbands and wives of working couples,
between husbands and wives of conventional couples, and between wives of working couples and wives of conventional couples, in the relationship scores of marital adjustment questionnaire and satisfaction with life scale.
CHAPTER - THREE

METHODOLOGY

The concept of methodology includes three aspects namely, research design, measures or data sources and analyses. Research design has to do with planning a strategy for an investigation that will permit the investigation to rule out as many as possible of the potential threads to validity of the study (Cook & Campbell, 1979), particularly those having to do with internal and construct validity. Measures have to do with the sources of the data and the types of the observations that are made. Analyses have to do with the way we go about making sense of our data, usually by application of statistical procedures. These three aspects of a overall research effort can be thought of as forming a three dimensional matrices. So that one could have a self constituted method (experiment) crossed with a data source (Behavioural observation) crossed with a mode of analysis (Regression). The methodology of the present investigation has been worked out keeping in view these considerations.
Subjects:

A randomly selected group of 200 married couples constituted the subjects for the study. These subjects were drawn from different localities of Aligarh City. Marital Adjustment Inventory (MAI) developed by Singh (1972) was administered to a group of 200 married couples. On the basis of their scores on the MAI, the subjects were classified into four groups in the following manner: On the basis of $Q_3$ and $Q_1$ scores adjusted group (score range, husband: above 69, wives: above 67 and couples: above 136), maladjusted group (score range, husband: below 45, wives: below 43 and couples: below 88) complementary Group I (score range adjusted husbands: above 69, maladjusted wives: below 43, and couples: total score of husbands and wives) and complementary Group II (score range, maladjusted husbands: below 45, adjusted wives: above 67 and couples: total score of husbands and wives). In order to equate the number of subjects in adjusted and maladjusted groups, and complementary Group I and Group II, some cases had to be dropped out so that the final sample comprised 144 married couples which was subsequently divided into four groups. (Adjusted: 48, Maladjusted: 48, Complementary Group I: 24, Complementary Group II: 24).
Distribution of Subjects

N = 144

Adjusted Couples (48)
Maladjusted couples (48)
Complementary Group I Couples (24)
Complementary Group II Couples (24)

Measures:

The Marital Adjustment Inventory (MAI; Singh, 1972) has two forms, Form - A for husbands, Form - B for wives. Each form contains 10 questions. There are two alternative response categories - 'yes' or 'no'. Each 'yes' or 'no' item is then to be answered by placing tick (✓) mark Yes/No on only one point out of 10 points on the rating scale ranging from
+ 10/-1 (most favourable) to +1/-10 (least favourable). The total score indicates the marital adjustment scores of either husband or wife.

The MAI was slightly modified for the purpose of scoring. The norms of the scale given in the manual were not used for the purpose of categorizing subjects into adjusted and maladjusted groups. The investigator calculated $Q_3$ and $Q_1$ values from the distribution of scores of husbands and wives separately. The total score of husband and wife on MAI gives an score of a couple.

*Marital Locus of Control* (MLOC-Miller, Lefcourt & Ware, 1983) scale consisting of 44-items in 6-point Likert scale format was used to assess an individual's locus of control orientation for achievement of marital satisfaction. The MLOC Scale included four attributional sub-sets-ability, effort, chance or luck and uncontrollable contextual characteristics of marriage. Items in the ability and effort sets combined to yield a set of internally-worded items and luck and context items combined to yield a set of externally-worded items. Internal items were recoded in the external direction for scoring purposes so that scores on the total scale reflected greater externality. Therefore, higher scores on internal items (ability and efforts sub-scales), because of recoding, reflect denial of these attributions.
Below are given the sub-scales and the item numbers of the SMB scales and the item numbers of the MLOC scale:

Ability : 8, 11, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38, 43.
Effort : 3, 5, 7, 9, 14, 18, 23, 29, 31, 40.
Context : 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 17, 24, 27, 28, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42.
Luck : 4, 15, 21, 22, 30, 32, 44.

The Social Intimacy Scale (SIS, Miller & Lefcourt, 1982) comprised 17 intimacy items (6-requiring frequency and 11 requiring intensity ratings on 10-point scale). Two of these items (2 and 14) are opposite-keyed. So that a rating of 10 is scored as 1 and vice-versa. This scale was designed to assess the degree of intimacy experienced with the person to whom the subject felt closest. The scale was slightly modified for the present study in that subjects were asked specifically to describe the relationship (Closeness) that they felt with their spouses. However, in the original study of Miller and Lefcourt (1982) subjects were asked to describe their relationship with their closest friend. High scores indicate a high degree of intimacy between friends. The measure is structured so as to permit an assessment of intimacy in the context of friendship or marriage. Reliability and validity data are presented in Miller and Lefcourt's (1982) study entitled 'The assessment of social intimacy'.
The Approval Motive Scale (AMS: Tripathi & Tripathi, 1980) was used to measure the approval motive among subjects. The AMS comprised 72 items out of which 37 were true and remaining 35 items have false option as indicative of approval orientation. The scale includes seven areas of approval motivation namely, normative behaviour, social conformity, positive self-presentation, defensiveness, dependency, social responsiveness and social approval.

Specific item-wise areas related to approval motive are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Approval Motive</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Normative Behaviour</td>
<td>6, 10, 25, 28, 34, 35, 38, 39, 62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Conformity</td>
<td>2, 8, 14, 16, 20, 29, 41, 50, 54, 64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive self-presentation</td>
<td>15, 44, 46, 47, 53, 55, 57, 69</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defensiveness</td>
<td>5, 7, 17, 24, 31, 32, 52, 58, 70, 71</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dependency</td>
<td>9, 11, 19, 33, 48, 49, 65, 66</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Responsiveness</td>
<td>4, 18, 27, 36, 37, 42, 60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social Approval</td>
<td>1, 3, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 26, 30, 40, 43, 51, 56, 59, 61, 63, 67, 68, 72</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A score of 1 was given to each response if it was approval indicative irrespective of its being true or false. Thus scores can range between 0-72. Higher scores are indicative of stronger approval motive.

Procedure:

This study was conducted in two stages. Initially subjects (200 couples) were administered Marital Adjustment Inventory (MAI: Singh, 1972) to identify adjusted and mal-adjusted spouses and couples. Each member of the couple filled out this questionnaire individually at home.

In the second phase of the study, the investigator established rapport with the subjects and sought their cooperation. Subjects (N = 144) completed the marital locus of control scale, social intimacy scale and approval motive scale in their spare time. Spouses were tested individually at their residence or office. Total confidentiality was assured for all responses; the subjects partner could not even see the responses.

Data Analysis:

The data were analyzed by means of Pearson Product Moment Correlation method, Z.test, Partial Correlation, significance of a partial r, Multiple Coefficient of Correlation (R), Significance of multiple R (F.test), and β Coefficient ($R^2_{1 (23)}$).
Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed to determine the relationship between Marital Locus of Control (MLOC) scores and Social Intimacy (SI) scores, MLOC scores and Approval Motivation (AM) scores, and SI scores and AM scores among husbands, wives and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II. Z-test was used to determine the significance of difference between two Z coefficients. Partial correlations were computed for partialled out or eliminating the effects of variables, that may influence the relationship between two variables whose relationship is to be considered. For example, in the present study, we have three personality variables namely, MLOC, SI and AM: $r_{12.3}$ represents the partial correlation between MLOC and SI when the third variable (AM) has been 'partialed out'. Significance of a partial r were determined at the .95 confidence interval for the husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, Complementary Group I and Complementary Group II. Multiple coefficient of correlations (R) were computed to determine the correlation between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the MLOC from the two variables - SI and AM. That is, to what extent MLOC scores are related to SI and AM scores. Significance of multiple R were computed by F-test. $\beta$ Coefficients were computed to determine the independent contribution of the variables SI and AM in determining the predicted value of the Criterion Variable-MLOC.
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**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## TABLE 1

Pearson Product Moment Correlations:

Marital Locus of Control scores with Social Intimacy scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Maladjusted</th>
<th>Complementary Group I</th>
<th>Complementary Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>-.88**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-.89**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.90**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .05$ level of significance

** $p \leq .01$ level of significance
Table: 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlations:
Marital Locus of Control Scores with Approval Motives Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Maladjusted</th>
<th>Complementary Group I</th>
<th>Complementary Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p \( \leq .05 \) level of significance
TABLE 3

Pearson Product Moment Correlations:
Social Intimacy scores with Approval Motive scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Maladjusted</th>
<th>Complementary Group I</th>
<th>Complementary Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05 level of significance
** p ≤ .01 level of significance
TABLE 14

Values of Z indicating differences between adjusted husbands and maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and maladjusted wives, and adjusted couples and maladjusted couples in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(Zr)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Husbands</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Husbands</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Wives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Wives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Couples</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Couples</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

Values of Z indicating differences between adjusted husbands and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(Zr)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Husbands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Husbands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Wives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Wives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary couples Group I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Couples Group II</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6

Values of Z indicating differences between adjusted husbands and maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and maladjusted wives and adjusted couples and maladjusted couples in the relationship scores of MLOC and AM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(Zr)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Husbands</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted husbands</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Wives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Wives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Couples</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Couples</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 7**

Values of Z indicating differences between adjusted husbands and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in the relationship scores of MLOC and AM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjeckts</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(Zr)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Husbands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Husbands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Wives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Wives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary couples Group I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Couples Group II</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

Values of Z indicating differences between adjusted husbands and maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and maladjusted wives, and adjusted couples and maladjusted couples in the relationship scores of SI and AM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(Zr)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Husbands</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>≤ .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted husbands</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Wives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Wives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Couples</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Couples</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9

Values of Z indicating differences between adjusted husbands and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted wives and adjusted wives, and complementary couples of Group I and Group II in the relationship scores of SI and AM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(Zr)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Husbands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted Husbands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladjusted wives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted wives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Couples Group I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Couples Group II</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE : 10

Indicating the values of Partial $r$ and .95 Confidence interval of adjusted group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Wives Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Couples Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{12.3}$</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87-.94</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{13.2}$</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72-.86</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23.1}$</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.60-.79</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE : 11

Indicating the values of Partial $r$ and .95 confidence interval of maladjusted group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husband5 Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Wives Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Couples Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{12.3}$</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.84-.92</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{13.2}$</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.14-.49</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23.1}$</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.23-.57</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

Indicating the values of Partial r and .95 confidence interval of complementary Group I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{12.3}$</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.21-.35</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.08-.58</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.16-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{13.2}$</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.07-.47</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.08-.58</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.10-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23.1}$</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.05-.49</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.46-.79</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.09-.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13

Indicating the values of Partial r and .95 confidence interval of complementary Group II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{12.3}$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20-.36</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.07-.47</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.06-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{13.2}$</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.22-.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06-.48</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.05-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23.1}$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21-.35</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08-.46</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24-.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14

Indicating the values of Multiple R and F of adjusted and maladjusted groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Maladjusted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>101.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>101.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>103.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 15

Indicating values of Multiple R and F of Complementary Group-I and Group-II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group-I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group-II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>235.22</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>72.07</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE : 16

Indicating values of Beta Coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2_{1(23)}$</th>
<th>Maladjusted $R^2_{1(23)}$</th>
<th>Complementary Group-I $R^2_{1(23)}$</th>
<th>Complementary Group-II $R^2_{1(23)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MLOC scores correlated positively with SI scores for adjusted husbands ($r = .83, p \leq .01$), wives ($r = .33, p \leq .05$), and couples ($r = .59, p \leq .01$) indicating that the more external locus of control for marital interaction, the more intimacy subjects were apt to reveal. That is externality and intimacy leads to the adjustment between spouses or important predictors of healthy psychological functioning. The adjusted spouses/couples who have external locus of control orientation and social intimacy are apt to feel secure in their interactions. The security may be derived from feelings of being esteemed or may have potential in facing various life stressors. The findings of the present study supports the Doherty's (1983) argument, having a sense of control over marital events and feelings that the marital relationship is going well and ought to go hand in hand. One would expect a positive relationship between marital locus of control and intimacy.

Significant negative relationships were found to exist between MLOC scores and SI scores among maladjusted husbands ($r = -.88, p \leq .01$), wives ($r = -.89, p \leq .01$), and couples ($r = -.90, p \leq .01$). The findings of the present study corroborate the findings of an earlier study (Miller, Lefcourt, Ware, 1983), where it was found that the more external for marital interaction the less intimacy scores of spouses were. Our findings suggest that spouses who have tendency of maladjusted or lacking an intimate relationship may fail to maintain interactions with others, or their interactions may be confined to the extent of maintenance of conversation due to their distress
No significant relationships were found to exist between MLOC scores and SI scores among maladjusted husbands ($r = \cdot70$, $p \geq .05$) adjusted wives ($r = \cdot16$, $p \geq .05$) and couples ($r = \cdot23$, $p \geq .05$) and adjusted husbands ($r = \cdot03$, $p \geq .05$) maladjusted wives ($r = \cdot17$, $p \geq .05$) and couples ($r = \cdot07$, $p \geq .05$). The absence of relationship between these variables may be due to the levels of adjustment and artifact of the sampling procedure. One of the striking feature of our findings is that these spouses/couples have a mastery over marital events without having marital locus of control orientation and social intimacy. These couples do not disclose their experiences and their feelings to one another and have not established a sense of intimacy.

For husbands ($r = \cdot58$, $p \leq .01$) wives ($r = \cdot71$, $p \leq .01$) of adjusted group Marital locus of control (MLOC) scores were positively correlated with Approval Motive (AM) scores, indicating that the more the external husbands/wives were, the higher was their need of approval exhibited by the spouses. This may be due to the process of marital interaction and cultural factor. The process of mate selection primarily starts with luck or context because mate selection in our society is generally made by parents or elders. That is why individual seeks approval by support, help, affection and affiliation. That MLOC and AM are positively correlated seem to be expected because of greater susceptibility to
external influences, the individuals with high degree of approval being externalizers. In other words, adjusted husbands and wives with external locus of control and high approval motivation behave in relatively more desirable ways, since they have a need to satisfy their partners. The findings of the present study are partially in consonance with the results obtained in earlier studies (Gupta & Husain, 1988) where the positive relationship existed between MLOC and AM among wives. Misra and Tripathi's (1981) study based on students sample supports the findings of the present study. They found that high approval motivated subjects were significantly more external and less chance-oriented as compared to low approval motivated subjects.

In the light of the present findings, it may be stated that individuals who are external for marital satisfaction and high need for approval are maritally adjusted. Approval motive is an associative motive and plays an important role in the formation of social relationship (Tripathi, 1978).

Marital locus of control scores were significantly negatively correlated with approval motives scores ($r = - .51$, $p < .01$) among adjusted couples, indicating that the more
external with regard to marriage individuals were, the lower was their need for approval. This findings is inconsistent with the findings of earlier studies (Gupta & Husain, 1986) where the positive relationships existed between MLOC and AM scores among younger couples and insignificant relationships existed between these variables among older couples. This finding is largely due to change of sample. The result may also be interpreted in term of adjusted couples belief that external forces (i.e., luck and context in MLOC scale) have a strong influence over their lives and are apt to seek need for approval and dependence, social support from their spouses.

MLOC scores were not significantly correlated with AM scores for maladjusted husbands (r = .12, p < .05), maladjusted wives (r = -.05, p < .05) and maladjusted couples (r = .12, p < .05), couples of complementary Group I (r = -.36, p < .05) and Group II (r = -.33 p < .05) suggesting that feelings of control over marital outcomes are not relevant to need for approval. The spouses themselves are responsible for marital maladjustment they view marital interactions as controllable the greater tendency to confront issues in a direct, open manner, to state their own views and to participate in destructive solving behaviours. In the context of a relationship with
the maladjusted spouses feelings of control and need for approval may be of limited or detrimental nature and cause individuals to overlook the needs of their partner and exert control in the service of self-interested motives.

The absence of relationship between SI and AM scores among adjusted husband (r = -0.16, p $\geq$ 0.05) wives (r = -0.15 p $\geq$ 0.05) and couples (r = -0.12, p $\geq$ 0.05), adjusted husbands (r = -0.23, p $\geq$ 0.05), maladjusted wives (r = -0.18, p $\geq$ 0.05), and couples of complementary Group I (r = -0.16, p $\geq$ 0.05), maladjusted husbands (r = -0.09, p $\geq$ 0.05), adjusted wives, (r = 0.18, p $\geq$ 0.05) and couples of complementary Group II (r = 0.03, p $\geq$ 0.05) means lower need for approval and lack of intimacy. These dimensions serve different functions in developing relationship and behaviour. The approval motive is seeking approval or avoiding other peoples. Intimacy behaviour usually function as a trust-building mechanism. It is evident from the findings that not only maladjusted spouses or couples but also adjusted spouses or couples are affected by their desire for and need for approval and healthy psychological functioning. There is reason to believe that insignificant relationship would exist between SI and AM scores among maladjusted persons, because these persons do not disclose private information
about themselves which of course leads to intimacy and trust, and do not involve themselves in saying positive things often used as a means of gaining approval from others. The adjusted persons neither have a need for approval nor interested in enhancing intimacy because they feel more secure and trusting.

Miller and Lefcourt's (1982) study of male and female unmarried students, supports the findings of the present study. They found insignificant relationship between MCSD and SI scores. This data may further substantiated by another pilot study conducted by the investigator on married couples. The investigator found significant negative relationship between SI and AM among husbands (r = - .43, p ≤ .01), wives (r = .56, p ≤ .01) and couples (r = - .54, p ≤ .01).

For maladjusted husbands (r = - .31, p ≤ .05), maladjusted wives (r = - .51, p ≤ .01) and couples (r = - .30, p ≤ .05) SI scores were correlated negatively with AM which suggested that the high the need for approval the lower the level of intimacy among spouses and couples. Marital relationship exists in these groups but because of their maladjusted they have a greater need for approval and probably social intimacy is less strong among them on this count.
Maladjusted husbands, wives and couples scored significantly higher than the adjusted husbands (Z = 12.24, p < .001), adjusted wives (Z = 8.38, p < .001) and adjusted couples (Z = 10.24, p < .001) in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI. In the marital context, the present data suggest that the combination of external control and low intimacy is associated with maladjusted husbands, wives, and couples and the combination of external control and high intimacy is associated with adjusted husbands, wives and couples. These data did not show any marked differences on locus of control dimension but rather showed significant differences on social intimacy scores between maladjusted wives and adjusted wives, maladjusted couples and adjusted couples. No explanation is readily available for the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI, but one may speculate that success on failure in marital outcomes may be more important to husbands.

No significant differences existed between adjusted and maladjusted husbands (Z = .41, p > .05), maladjusted and adjusted wives (Z = .03, p > .05), and couples of (Z = .50, p > .05) complementary Group I and Group II in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI. These findings may be accounted for in terms the failure to find significant relationship between MLOC and SI scores among husbands, wives, couples of both the groups. This line of reasoning
may shed light on the finding that locus of control orientation and social intimacy have nothing to do with spouses or couples of dissimilar marital adjustment scores in the marital relationship.

Significant differences existed between husbands, wives and couples of adjusted and maladjusted groups in the relationship scores of MLOC with AM (Husbands: $z = 2.57$, $p < .05$, wives: $z = 4.47$, $p < .01$; couples: $z = 3.24$, $p < .01$). These findings suggest that the adjusted husbands, wives and couples in comparison to maladjusted husbands, wives and couples are more susceptible to external influence (i.e. more concerned about luck and context in the marital relationship), are conformist, and have a tendency of dependence on their spouses with a greater desire for approval.

No significant differences existed between adjusted and maladjusted husbands ($z = .41$, $p > .05$), maladjusted and adjusted wives ($z = 1.19$, $p > .05$), and couples of Complementary Group I and Group II ($z = .09$, $p > .05$) in the relationship scores of MLOC with AM. These findings indicate that spouses or couples who are dissimilar in adjustment level are neither influenced by external or internal forces, nor have they higher or lower need for approval for maintaining the relationship. In other words,
locus of control and approval motive do not play any role in the lives of dissimilar adjustment level of spouses and couples. A close scrutiny of results suggests that MLOC scores were not correlated significantly with AM for either husbands or wives. The relationship between MLOC scores existed for couples. The latter finding indicates that the couples who have dissimilar marital adjustment scores may easily be influenced by external forces take little personal responsibilities for marital outcomes and may have low level of intimacy for each other.

Maladjusted husbands scored significantly higher than the adjusted husbands (z = 2.29, p < .05) in the relationship scores of SI and AM, suggesting that intimacy and need for approval - social responsiveness, dependence, social approval - are required by the maladjusted wives from their husbands for a healthy psychological functioning, whereas the adjusted wives have no need for approval and intimacy because of their adjustment to the husbands. No significant differences existed between adjusted wives and maladjusted wives (z = .05, p > .05) and adjusted couples and maladjusted couples (z = .90, p > .05) in the relationship scores of SI and AM. A close scrutiny of results reveal that in the adjusted husbands and couples significant relationship does not exist between SI and AM scores,
whereas in the maladjusted husbands and couples negative relationship exists between SI and AM. The interpretation of the results presented earlier for Table 3 holds equally well here.

Significant differences were not found to exist between adjusted and maladjusted husbands ($r = .44, p > .05$), maladjusted and adjusted wives ($r = 1.76, p > .05$) and couples of complementary Group I and Group II ($r = .59, p > .05$) in the relationship scores of SI with AM. The failure to find significance of difference between comparison group may be due to insignificant relationship between SI and AM among subjects viz-a-viz social intimacy and approval motivation does not have moderating influence in the lives of couples of dissimilar adjustment level.

The partial correlation between Marital Locus of Control (MLOC) and Social Intimacy (SI), when Approval Motivation (AM) variable was partialed out, we get a partial $r_{12.3}$ of .91 as against an $r_{12}$ of .83 among adjusted husbands. The partial correlation between MLOC and AM, when SI variable was partialed out we get an $r_{13.2}$ of .80 as against an $r_{13}$ of .58. The partial correlation between SI and AM, when MLOC was partialed out, we get a partial $r_{23.1}$ of -.71 as against an $r_{23}$ of -.16. The partial correlations existed between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM among adjusted wives, when variables of approval motivation ($r_{12.3} = .62$ against $r_{12}$ of .33), social intimacy
The partial correlations between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM among adjusted couples, when variables of AM (\( r_{12.3} = .62 \) against \( r_{12} = .59 \)) and SI (\( r_{13.2} = .55 \) against \( r_{13} = -.51 \)) were partialled out. The partial correlation between SI and AM scores were found to be (\( r_{23.1} = .25 \) against \( r_{23} = -.12 \)) among adjusted couples when the factor of MLOC was partialled out.

The partial correlations between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM and SI and AM among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples were found to be (Husbands: \( r_{12.3} = -.89, r_{12} = .88, r_{13} = -.91, r_{13} = .90 \) ) (Wives: \( r_{12.3} = -.89, r_{12} = -.88, r_{13} = -.93, r_{13} = -.37, r_{13} = -.95 \) ) (Couples: \( r_{12.3} = -.91, r_{12} = .90, r_{13} = -.35, r_{13} = .51 \) ).

The partial correlations were not found to exist between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM among adjusted husbands, when variables of AM (\( r_{12.3} = -.08, r_{12} = -.03 \) ) SI (\( r_{13.2} = -.22, r_{13} = -.21 \) ) and MLOC (\( r_{23.1} = -.24, r_{23} = -.23 \) ) were partialled out. The partial correlations
existed between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM among maladjusted wives, when variables of AM ($r_{12.3} = -.35$, $r_{12} = -.17$), SI ($r_{13.2} = -.35$, $r_{13} = -.17$) and MLOC $r_{23.1} = -.65$, $r_{23} = -.14$) were partialed out. The partial correlations between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM and SI and AM among couples of complementary Group I, were found to be $r_{12.3} = -.13$, against $r_{12} = -.07$ ($r_{13.2} = -.37$, against $r_{13} = -.36$) and ($r_{23.1} = -.20$ against $r_{23} = -.16$) when variables of AM and MLOC were partialed out.

The partial correlations between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM among maladjusted husbands, adjusted wives and couples of complementary Group II, were found to be (Husbands: $r_{12.3} = .09$, $r_{12} = .10$, Wives: $r_{12.3} = -.22$, $r_{12} = -.16$, couples: $r_{12.3} = -.23$, $r_{12} = -.23$) (Husbands: $r_{13.2} = -.07$, $r_{13} = -.08$, Wives: $r_{13.2} = .23$, $r_{13} = .20$, Couples: $r_{13.2} = -.33$, $r_{13} = -.33$) (Husbands: $r_{23.1} = .08$, $r_{23} = .09$, Wives: $r_{23.1} = .21$, $r_{23} = .18$, couples: $r_{23.1} = -.05$, $r_{23} = .03$) when variables of AM, SI and MLOC were partialed out. The partial r's ($r_{12.3}$, $r_{13.2}$ and $r_{23.1}$) among husbands, wives and couples of adjusted and maladjusted groups were found to be significant at the .95 confidence interval indicates that there were little likelihood that the populations r were zero. In other words the obtained partial r's are highly stable.
The .95 confidence interval were either quite wide or the lower limit of the confidence interval approaching zero, among husbands, wives, and couples of Complementary Group I and Group II, and therefore the coefficients must be judged to be not very stable.

Multiple coefficient of correlations indicated that the MLOC scores were correlated with SI and AM scores among adjusted husbands \( R = .94 \) adjusted wives \( R = .75 \) and adjusted couples \( R = .77 \); and maladjusted husbands \( R = .90 \) maladjusted wives \( R = .90 \) and maladjusted couples \( R = .91 \).

Multiple R existed when the MLOC scores were correlated with SI and AM scores among adjusted husbands \( R = .97 \), maladjusted wives \( R = .93 \) and couples \( R = .37 \) of complementary Group I. In complementary Group II maladjusted husbands' MLOC scores were not correlated with SI and AM scores \( R = .26 \), whereas for adjusted wives \( R = .27 \) and couples \( R = .41 \) MLOC scores were found to be correlated with SI and AM scores. In sum, these results indicated that using MLOC as the criterion variable, both SI and AM entered as significant predictors for husbands, wives and couples.

F-test was used for determining the critical value of multiple R. The values for adjusted husbands \( F = 220.9, p < .001 \), adjusted wives \( F = 31.25, p < .001 \); and adjusted couples \( F = 32.93, p < .001 \); maladjusted
husbands (F = 101.25, p \(<\ .001\), maladjusted wives (F = 101.25, p \(<\ .001\) and maladjusted couples (F = 103.51, p \(<\ .001\) were found to be significant from the zero level. The values for adjusted husbands (F = .89, p > .05), maladjusted wives (F = .91, p > .05), couples of complementary Group I (F = 2.10, p > .05) and couples of complementary Group II (F = 1.71, p > .05) were found to be insignificant from the zero level. F values were found to be significant from zero level for maladjusted husbands (F = 235.22, p \(<\ .001\) and adjusted wives (F = 72.07, p \(<\ .001\) of complementary Group II.

**B Coefficients (R^2_1 (23)**

**B** coefficients give the proportion of the variance of the criterion measure (MLOC) attributable to the joint action of the variables (SI and AM). The value of R^2_1 (23) = .87 among adjusted husbands means that MLOC can be attributed to differences in SI and AM. The independent contribution of SI and AM to the variance of MLOC were .61 or 61% and .26 or 16% of the variance of MLOC must be attributed to factors not measured in our problem. For adjusted wives, the value of R^2_1 (23) was found to be .58. The independent contribution of SI and AM to the variance of MLOC were .12 or 12% and .46 or 46%. The value of R^2_1(23) for adjusted couples was found to be - .50. .27 or 27% was the contribution of social intimacy and .22 or 22% was the contribution of approval motivation to the variable of MLOC.
For maladjusted husbands, the value of $R^2_{11}$ (23) was found to be - .82. The independent contribution of SI and AM to the variable of MLOC were - .82 or 82% and .01. The value of $R^2_{11}$ (23) among maladjusted wives was found to be .81. The independent contribution of SI and AM to the variance of MLOC were .81 or 81% and zero. The value of $R^2_{11}$ (23) among maladjusted couples was found to be - .88. The independent contribution of SI and AM to the variance of MLOC were - .88 or 88% and .01 or .01%.

For husbands, wives and couples of complementary Group I and Group II, the values of $R^2_{11}$ (23) were found to be very low. The independent contribution of SI and AM to the variance of MLOC were almost negligible.
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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Recent studies on locus of control and marital interaction have been conducted on the relationship between marital locus of control and marital interaction behaviour (Sabattelli, Buck & Dreyer, 1983; Winkler & Doherty, 1983), marital problem solving (Miller, Lefcourt, Holmes, Ware, Saleh, 1986), social intimacy and marital satisfaction (Husain & Gupta, 1987; Miller, Lefcourt & Ware, 1983, White, 1984), and approval motivation (Gupta & Husain, 1988). These studies have produced enough intriguing results that lead to further research on marital locus of control and marital interaction. The present study employed cognitive personality constructs—marital locus of control scale and social intimacy scale—and approval motive scale to assess relationship between these variables among adjusted—maladjusted married couples.

The present study precisely sought to determine:

1. the relationship between Marital Locus of Control (MLOC) and Social Intimacy (SI), Marital Locus of Control and Approval Motivation (AM), and Social Intimacy and Approval Motivation among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, complementary Group I and Group II;
2. the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted
husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives, and adjusted and maladjusted couples in two Zr coefficients (i.e. relationship between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM scores); (3) the significance of difference between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in two Zr coefficients (i.e. relationship between MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM scores); (4) the partial correlations between MLOC and SI scores (when the variable of AM is partialled out), between MLOC and AM scores (when the variable of SI is partialled out), and between SI and AM scores (when the variable of MLOC is partialled out), among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II; (5) the significance of partial r at the .95 confidence interval for husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II; (6) the multiple coefficient of correlations between scores actually earned and scores predicted on the MLOC from the two variables SI and AM scores (i.e. to what extent MLOC scores are related to SI and AM scores) among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II; (7) the critical values of multiple R for husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II; and (8) β coefficients,
of the independent contribution of the variables SI and AM in determining the predicted value of the criterion variable MLOC among husbands, wives, and couples, of adjusted, maladjusted complementary Group I and Group II.

Chapter two "Review of Relevant Studies", covered studies directly related to the variables under study. The review of studies was given under five major heads: (a) locus of control and marital satisfaction, (b) locus of control and marital problem solving, (c) locus of control and approval motivation, (d) locus of control and social intimacy and other social-psychological variables, (e) Personality and social correlates of marital adjustment.

One hundred forty four married couples of Aligarh City served as subjects for the present study. The measures employed in this study were: (1) Marital Adjustment Inventory, (2) Marital Locus of Control Scale, (3) Social Intimacy Scale, and (4) Approval Motive Scale. This study was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, Marital Adjustment Inventory was administered on 200 married couples, to identify four groups of subjects—adjusted, maladjusted, complementary Group I and Group II. In the second phase of the study, subjects
completed the marital locus of control scale, social intimacy scale and approval motive scale. The data were analyzed by means of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Method, Z-test, partial r, significance of partial r, multiple R, significance of multiple R (F-test), and β coefficients (R^21 (23)).

The data analyzed by means of several tests were presented in 16 Tables and the description and discussion of results were given in chapter four. The main findings of the study were:

(a) Significant positive relationships were found to exist between Marital Locus of Control (MLOC) and Social Intimacy (SI) scores, and marital locus of control and approval motive (AM) scores among adjusted husbands, wives and couples.

(b) Marital Locus of Control scores were negatively correlated with SI scores among maladjusted husbands, wives, and couples. Social Intimacy scores were also negatively correlated with AM scores among maladjusted husbands and couples.

(c) No significant relationships were found to exist between MLOC scores and SI scores, MLOC scores and AM scores and SI scores and AM scores among husbands, wives and couples of complementary Group I and Group II.

(d) Significant differences were found to exist between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, adjusted and maladjusted wives, and adjusted and maladjusted couples in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI and MLOC and AM.
(e) No significant differences existed between adjusted and maladjusted husbands, maladjusted and adjusted wives, and couples of complementary Group I and Group II in the relationship scores of MLOC and SI, MLOC and AM, and SI and AM.

(f) The values of partial r's were found to be significant at the .95 confidence interval among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted and maladjusted groups.

(g) The .95 confidence interval were quite wide for partial r's (\( \sqrt{12.3}, \sqrt{13.2}, \sqrt{23.1} \)) of husbands, wives and couples of complementary Group I and Group II and in some cases the lower limit of the confidence range approached zero.

(h) The values of Critical R (obtained by F-test) were found to be significant among husbands, wives, and couples of adjusted, maladjusted group and maladjusted husbands and adjusted wives of complementary Group II.

The results were discussed mainly with reference to the findings of earlier studies and in the various conceptual, theoretical and cultural context.
CONCLUSION:

General Issues:

Most of the correlation coefficients between marital locus of control scores and social intimacy and marital locus of control and approval motivation were in the .3 to .8 range among adjusted husbands, wives, and couples. The correlation coefficients between marital locus of control and social intimacy, social intimacy and approval motivation were in the .3 to .9 range among maladjusted husbands, wives and couples. Most of correlation coefficients between marital locus of control scores and social intimacy, marital locus of control and approval motivation, and social intimacy and approval motivation, were insignificant among husbands, wives, and couples of complementary Group I and II. This pattern of finding is not surprising, in the sense that marital adjustment is more crucial than general adjustment. The nature of husband-wife relationship represents a style of thinking that helps to moderate personal stress. Caution is needed in interpreting findings of no significant relationship between these variables, especially given the limited sample sizes in this study.

The results are promising enough to encourage continued pursuit of the topic of locus of control and marital adjustment.
The results led to certain conclusions and pointed out possibilities for future research.

The first task for marital researchers is to further clarify the nature of Marital locus of control, construct i.e. factors influencing external orientation must be situation or culture-specific. Development of such a measure will allow for systematic assessment of various groups formed on the basis of personality or demographic variables.

The second area for future research involves the relationship between Marital locus of control and marital adjustment in different samples of couples. In addition, research in this area might clarify the ways in which adjusted or maladjusted couples limit or constrain the type of coping behaviour they are willing or able to use.

Third, the relationship between dimensions of internal and external control and the pattern of marital adjustment, intimacy and need for approval to be examined in detail before we can specify the relationship among these variables, but a start has been made rich directions for future research which may include some other cognitive-personality and motivational correlates of marital locus of control.

Fourth, longitudinal studies are needed for clarifying the ways in which Marital Locus of control changes or remains constant with the development. Doherty's (1983) work indicates that locus of control change with age and marital status.
Similar changes probably occur with respect to marriage span, type of family, couples (working, conventional), socio-economic status etc. but these have not been investigated. Similar changes associated with social intimacy or approval motivation may affect locus of control.

In sum, research concerned with Marital Locus of Control conducted in relation to marital satisfaction and stability, problem solving behaviour, approval motivation, etc. has yielded various important findings. However, it now seems necessary to look for factors and processes that may be common to marital adjustment across a wide variety of samples. Foremost among these, is the role of the family.
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MARRITAL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (M A I)  
(Literate)  
(English Version)  
Form A and B

Constructed and Standardized by  
HAR MOHAN SINGH  
M.A., Ph.D.  
Department of Psychology  
R.B.S. College, Agra.

Name: --------------
Age: ----------- Sex----------
Education: ------------
Occupation----------------- Income------------------
Type of Marriage: ------------ Length of Marriage:----------------

Scoring Table: - Number of Children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING UP THE INVENTORY FORM A & B

Below are given ten questions which should be replied yes or no. After giving your consent for yes or no; mark yes (✓) on the right place best (fitting) explaining your opinion towards the issue. The rating scale ranges from + 10 (most favourable to + 1 (least favourable). Avoid doubtful situations.

AN EXAMPLE: Do you quarrel with your wife/husband?

Yes ✓—

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

Since I sometimes quarrel with my wife hence I have replied in yes and have marked (✓) on 4th place on the scale.

Meaning of the Terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Meaning of number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>stands for most favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; significantly favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; more than slightly favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot; slightly favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot; just favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot; favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot; definitely favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot; comparatively favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot; more than least favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot; least favourable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARITAL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (LITERATE)
QUESTIONNAIRE FORM - B
For Wives Only

Do you give your husband complete freedom in his business affairs, and do you refrain from criticizing his associates, his choice of friends or the hours he keeps?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you try your best to make home interesting and attractive?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you vary household menu so that he never quite knows what to expect when he sits down to the table?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you have an intelligent grasp of your business and you can discuss it with him?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you avoid clashes with him on financial difficulties of the family?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you not like to welcome his parents and relations to your home?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you not care in dressing about the likes and dislikes of your husband for colour and style?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you care about opinion given by him in matters of common interest?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Do you not care about the interests of your husband, so that you may be in hinderance to him in his leisure hours?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Are you a conservative and do not appreciate news of the day thereby not helpful in husband's intellectual interests?

Yes — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
MARITAL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (MAI)
(Literate)
(English Version)
Form A and B

Constructed and Standardized by
HAR MOHAN SINGH
M.A., Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
R.B.S. College, Agra.

Name: ——
Age: —
Sex: —
Education: —
Occupation: —
Type of Marriage: —
Income: —
Length of Marriage: —
Number of Children: —

Scoring Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING UP THE INVENTORY FORM A & B

Below are given ten questions which should be replied in yes or no. After giving your consent for yes or no; mark yes (✓) on the right place best (fitting) explaining your opinion towards the issue. The rating scale ranges from +10 (most favourable) to +1 (least favourable). Avoid doubtful situations.

EXAMPLE: Do you quarrel with your wife/husband?
Yes —— ✓ — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Since I sometimes quarrel with my wife hence I have replied in yes and have marked (✓) on 4th place on the scale.

Meaning of the Terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Meaning of number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>most favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>significantly favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>more than slightly favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>slightly favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>just favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>definitely favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>comparatively favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>more than least favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>least favourable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARITAL ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (LITERATE)

QUESTIONNAIRE FORM - A

For Husbands Only

Do you still offer your wife with gifts on important times of the year like birthday, marriage-day and the like or with unexpected attention?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Are you fond of criticizing your wife before others?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Have you made your wife free for spending money in household affairs?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Are you careless for her feminine moods and do not help her in periods of fatigue, nervousness and irritability?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Do you share recreational hours with your wife?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Do you compare her preparations with other women's expect in her advantage?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Do you welcome her intellectual life, her friends, the books she reads and her views on civic problems?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Do you withdraw her from moving outside home and sharing company strangers?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Do you admire her in certain cases and like to notice those times when you can appreciate her?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Do you help your wife in purchasing articles of her choice for dressing?

Yes— — — — — — — — — — — — — No
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.
12. When I want my spouse to do something she/he had not planned on, it's often difficult to bring her/him to my way of thinking.

13. Misunderstandings between my spouse and I are generally purely circumstantial.

14. Some effort on my part is all that is required in order to bring about pleasant experiences in our marriage.

15. Having a satisfactory sexual relationship with one's spouse is partly a matter of luck.

16. When we have unpleasant experiences in our marriage I can always see how I have helped to bring them about.

17. Circumstances of one sort or another play a major role in determining whether my marriage functions smoothly.

18. My spouse and I can get along happily in spite of the most trying circumstances if we decide to.

19. If parents discipline their children conscientiously they are sure to be well behaved.

20. If my spouse and I were to experience sexual difficulties we would certainly be able to overcome them.

21. Successful children rearing is a result of some good fort along the way.

22. If my marriage were a long, happy one I'd say that I must just be very lucky.

23. Even with the most loving couple a mutually satisfying emotional relationship does not just happen, it is the result of the couple working at it.

24. At times, there does not seem to be any way out of a disagreement with my spouse.

25. It seems to me that maintaining a smooth functioning marriage is simply a skill; things like luck do not come into it.

26. Good communication between spouses is simply a matter of learning and applying the skills; nothing can really interfere with good communication.

27. It's more often up to my spouse to make an argument and peaceably.
Instructions:

Listed below are a number of statements about various topics which represent the significance of internal-external control beliefs in a variety of important life areas. On each statement people may show varying intensity of agreement or disagreement. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement by putting any of the given symbols against each item:

Strongly Disagree — SD   Moderately Disagree — MD
Slightly Agree — SA   Moderately Agree — MA
Slightly disagree — SD
Strongly Agree — SA

1. I am often at a loss as to what to say or do when I am in disagreement with my spouse.
2. Sexual compatibility is something of a mystery to me, it is something that just happens.
3. Putting effort into the relationship will practically guarantee a successful marriage.
4. Difficulties with my spouse often start with chance remark.
5. If my marriage were to end in divorce, I would suspect I had not tried enough to make it work.
6. The unhappy times in our marriage just seem to happen regardless of what I am doing.
7. Circumstances play a very limited role in causing marital satisfaction, it is largely effort and concern that matter.
8. When things begin to go rough in my marriage I can see that I has a part to play in it.
9. Raising children effectively is really just a matter of trying one's best; chance has absolutely nothing to do with it.
10. I find that external circumstances like day to day events can have considerable influence on how my spouse and I get along.

I can always bring about reconciliation when my spouse and I have an argument.
42. How well I get along with my spouse depends very much on how he/she is feeling that day.

43. Happy times in our marriage don't just happen by chance; planning is usually required.

44. Something more than a couple's Intentions and abilities is needed to bring about a mutually satisfying emotional relationship; it's really a kind of special magic that is there or isn't.

Name: -

Profession & Income: -

Number of Children: -

Age: -

Type of Marriage: -

Type of Family: -

Length of Marriage: -

Physical Attractiveness: -
28. How well your kids grow up depends very much on external factors like what kind of neighbourhood you live in.

29. If my sexual relationship with my spouse was not entirely satisfactory, I would say that I was not putting enough effort into the relationship.

30. When I look over the course of my marriage I can't help but wonder if it was not destined that way.

31. Good clear communication between spouses does not depend on things like compatibility or personality but on constant practice.

32. Couples who don't run into any marital conflict at some point in their marriage have simply been very lucky.

33. A little planning can prevent most of the conflicts that occur between spouses over child-rearing.

34. Problems in our marriage never seem to sort themselves out over time; we usually end up having to do something about them.

35. I seem to have relatively little influence over when the intimate moments of our marriage will occur; they seem to happen of their own accord.

36. My spouse and I get along well because we have the interpersonal skills; not because of things like luck or temperament.

37. My spouse's moods are often mysterious to me, in that I have little idea as to what may have set them off.

38. There are always things that I can do that will help to end an argument with my spouse.

39. Some kids are unmanageable in spite of their parents' best efforts at discipline.

40. Couples who have a satisfying emotional relationship are constantly trying to improve their relationship; a good relationship does not just develop spontaneously.

41. When my spouse and I are communicating effectively we are not doing anything in particular to make it happen.
**MILLER SOCIAL INTIMACY SCALE**

**Instructions:**

Below are given certain statements relating to the intimacy in the context of marriage. You are required to describe your relationship with your husband/wife vis-a-vis these statements by encircling the numbers given against each item. You have to encircle only one of the ten numbers given under the three categories which you feel expresses more adequately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Some of the Time</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you have leisure time how often do you choose to spend it with him/her alone?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with him/her?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you show him/her affection?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you confide very personal information to him/her?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you able to understand his/her feelings?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel close to him/her?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you like to spend time with him/her?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How close do you feel to him/her most of the time?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you to listen to him/her very personal disclosures?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfying is your relationship with him/her?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How affectionate do you feel towards him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you the he/she understands your feelings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much damage is caused by a typical disagreement in your relationship with him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you that he/she be encouraging and supportive to you when you are unhappy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you the he/she show you affection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is your relationship with him/her in your life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name:--

Sex:--

Age:--

Education:--

Occupation:--

Income:--

Type of Marriage:--

Length of Marriage:--

Number of Children:--

Type of Family:--
PLEASE FILL UP THE FOLLOWINGS:

Name: 
Age: 
Occupation: 
Sex: 
Rural/Urban: 
Class: 

INSTRUCTIONS

A number of statements are given on the following page. The left hand side cell indicates that particular statement is 'True' whereas the right hand side cell is the indicative of 'False' statement. These statements are related to the thought, behaviours and characteristics of the people.

Please read each statement carefully, then think whether that statement is applicable on you or not. If it is applicable on you then encircle the left hand cell which is indicating that particular statement is 'True'. If it is not applicable on you, then encircle the right hand side cell which is indicative of 'False' item.

For example two statements are given here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* I consider it my duty to respect my parents.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I understand my reality, not others.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In above examples, someone has found first statement True on himself, therefore he has encircled left hand cell, observed second statement as False on himself therefore he has encircled right hand cell.

If you find it difficult to decide whether a statement is True or False for you, then try to think whether that statement is nearly true or nearly false, and answer accordingly. You have to answer each statement.

If you have any doubt, please ask it now. Answer quickly.

NOW START THE WORK.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am prepared to help people in trouble in all possible ways without any hesitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't consider the scenes of kissing, embracing etc. in the movies immoral.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before extending my assistance to any one, I consider his suitability for it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At times I have become stubborn so that everything is done according to my wishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I remember that several times I have feigned illness in order to be exempted from difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I behave properly with the elders of the family under any circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times I have stopped working on many tasks presuming that I do not possess the necessary ability to do those jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If, I get a chance to see a movie without paying for it, I take it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not often consider my behaviour perfect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not consider it proper to jest and make fun with my elders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am unsuccessful in a job, I do not beg help from my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always ready to serve others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do good to even those people who are by nature wicked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the times, I consider it necessary to be very particular about my style of living, conversation and dress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think, it is proper to state my opinion about anything the way I feel it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not endorse all appropriate Indian customs and styles of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter how big a crisis may be, I never lose my self-confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever I am conversing with someone I listen to him attentively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There have been several occasions when I have thought of rebelling against authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never consider it proper to hurt any body.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never think it proper to poke my nose into other people's affair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want to maintain good relations with as many people as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is alright for some people to lead a different and open life from the ordinary people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to meet new people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowingly, I never utter a sentence which may hurt others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever a task is given to me, I like to begin it at once and continue it till it is done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to be appreciated by others under all circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never hated any one too much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly investigate the capabilities of all the nominees before casting my vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that there may be other goals in life besides helping others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes if needed I take help from my Juniors/Youngers or people of lower status as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever people may say sometimes I do not consider it wrong at all to fulfill my desires by any means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always feel happy when others succeed and make progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I have doubts about my capacities to succeed in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I am always careful about my appearance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I take my meals at home in the same style as I do with my friends or relatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am always prepared to admit my mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>I expect others to show opposite to the behaviour that I myself extend towards them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I never get depressed on being unsuccessful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>On some occasions I do not think it wrong to be jealous of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I always do what I say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I often get annoyed with those people who want me to do injustice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I like repaying someone's good deed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I always show respect unhesitatingly towards my elders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sometimes I try to fulfill my needs by any means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I always want to work according to the desires and suggestions of my elders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I never think it proper to consider myself perfect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Even in tense situations, I consider it proper to maintain good relations with the members of my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I never knowingly utter a sentence which might hurt others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I do not find it difficult to work even with those who speak loudly and violently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I do not consider it improper to secure a job by any means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I do not consider it improper to be partial to my relatives sometimes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I never want others to suffer for my mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: True and False columns are not visible in the image.*

- k that people get into trouble because they deserve it.