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5.1 INTRODUCTION

As described in the preceding chapter IV on results obtained from statistical analysis of the data, it has been evident that the study has very clearly established the influence of major factors, viz., sex role orientation, marital locus of control and working level status of couples on marital adjustment, fulfilling the main aim of the study as indicated by the title of the problem of the study. Concomittantly, out of the other variables resulting from the characteristics of the sample, viz., length of married life, sex, socio-economic status and the family type of the couples, only the length of married life classified either in two categories or four categories, turned out to be significantly influencing the marital adjustment. Sex, SES or family type were not found to be significantly affecting marital adjustment, as measured by individual separate marriage adjustment score (MAQ) of each member of the couple or by joint common marriage adjustment score of couples together (MAQC). At the same time, a few significant interactions of some variables cast a little doubt on the independent role of these variables as pointed out above; the result obtained was not the contribution of each of these variables by themselves, but it was the outcome of a few variables involved in interacting with one another. All these results have been discussed, accounted for and com-
pared with those of other relevant studies in the following paragraphs discussing the main effects, the interaction effects, and even the simple effects of each of these variables under study, i.e., the contribution of each of these variables has been discussed below under the head of each variable.

5.2 MAIN EFFECTS OF EACH VARIABLE

5.2.1 Sex-Role Orientation

The principal aim of the study was to examine the effect on marital adjustment, a part of personality development, resulting from not simply the physiological gender identity or sex differences or from being a male or female, i.e., following from traditional functions assigned to maleness or femaleness, but also generating from psychological masculinity or femininity, both lurking in the same individual at varying extent, i.e., from sex-role standards or sex-role orientation as newly, non-traditionally conceptualised by Bem (1974, 1977) who analysed sex typing not into its conventional two types, female and male but newly first into two categories viz., masculinity (M) and femininity (F) and thereafter into four categories viz., androgynous (high in M & high in F), stereotyped (high in M & low in F if male and low in M & high in F, if female), cross-sex typed (low in M & high in F, if male and high in M & low in F if female) and undifferentiated, (low in both M & F) each including both male and female,
depending on the high or the low level of masculinity or femininity as existing simultaneously in the same individual. It was hypothesised by Bem and verified from a number of studies in the West and recently in a few studies in India also that the androgynous topped the list in adjustment and mental health characteristics, stereotyped next best, cross-sex typed still next in order and undifferentiated the least comparatively in adjustment irrespective of he or she being male or female. The present study, with its more control of other variables through more adequate experimental designs for collecting data and through more refined statistical techniques for analysing and interpreting data, has confirmed mostly the earlier results in all designs, (Tables 1a, 2a, 4a & 5a) and LSD Tables 1c-i, 2c-i, 4c-i and 5c-i that androgynous subjects were found to be most effectively adjusted maritally, next best were the stereotyped who were somehow almost equal to androgynous, while the cross-sex typed were significantly low and undifferentiated were the least maritally adjusted, but almost equal to cross-sex typed in marital adjustment as by the present study.

In this connection attention should be drawn to the studies reviewed earlier. Murstein and Williams (1983) revealed that sex-role orientation of husbands was of primary importance both for their own marital adjustment as well as for adjustment of their wives, while wives' sex-role orientation was of importance chiefly for their own
marital adjustment, but not for their husbands' marital adjustment. Further, based on these findings, the ideal husband from the woman's point of view would be a husband high on the masculinity and high on the femininity (i.e., androgynous) on Bem's SRI and at least normative on other scales. The study of Davidson and Sollie (1988) indicated that both androgynous and sex typed (stereotyped/cross-sex typed) husbands and wives were higher on marital adjustment than the undifferentiated, almost similar to the findings of the present study. The study of Trivedi (1991) similar to the present study revealed higher adjustment of androgynous working couples as well as androgynous working husbands, as analysed by Chi-Square test. Results of Saxena's (1984) study on SRO, LOC, age, sex variables analysed by both ANOVA and Chi-square test similar to the analysis in the present study revealed not a single variable as significantly contributing to marital adjustment independently. Mehta, Contractor, and Patel (1992) in their study on marriage adjustment as related to sex-role orientation and sexual satisfaction of couples found significant contribution of each of these variables. Further, sex-role orientation studies reviewed earlier in chapter two have been summarised under following five groups, which should be noted as relevant to the findings in the present study.

I. Appropriate sex typing or acquisition of masculine identity by males and feminine identity by females is associated with mental health. Connel and Johnson, 1970; Rychlak and Legerski, 1967; Sappenfield and
Harris, 1975; Tanwar and Sethi, 1986 who maintain that college females with feminine orientation i.e., stereotyped showed higher self-esteem than those with masculine orientation; i.e., female cross-sex typed; Bhogle and Murthy (1988b) who however, found feminine females i.e., stereotyped to have higher scores on neuroticism than masculine females i.e., cross-sex typed.

II. Stereotyped sex typing is associated with rather detrimental effects; feminine females have low self-esteem, low social acceptance and high anxiety (Consentino & Heilbrun, 1964; Gall, 1969; Stericker & Johnson, 1977); masculine males have low self-acceptance, high anxiety and high neuroticism (Mussen 1961, 1962; Harford et al., 1967).

III. Androgyny is strongly associated with adjustment, mental health, low anxiety, low neuroticism, high self-esteem and self-actualisation, less career indecision; (Bem, 1974; Spence et al., 1975; Alleier, 1975; Kelly & Worell, 1977; O'Conner et al., 1978; Halgund, 1978; Harris & Schwab, 1979; Puglisi & Jackson, 1980; Murstein & Williams, 1983; Millard et al., 1984; Tanwar & Sethi, 1986)

IV. Masculinity is positively related to effectiveness, self-esteem, adjustment than androgyny (Jones et al., 1978; Colten, 1978, Antill & Cunnigham, 1980.)

V. Males and females show different pattern of
association between SRO & self-esteem; among males the masculine males (stereotyped) show higher self-esteem and among females the androgynous females show higher self-esteem and self-acceptance (Kimlicka, 1978; Krugman, 1978; Tanwar & Sethi, 1986).

These five groups reveal findings that are somewhat inconsistent and different from those of the present study, but are relevant to our study for understanding. Besides these five groups of studies on sex-role orientation and its effect on varied personality characteristics, adjustment or mental health problems, there have been a few other studies some of which showed that there was no particular sex-role predominant, while others showed association with other types of personality characteristics. Thus, some revealed that feminine females (stereotyped) were significantly more reserved and detached, submissive, sober and taciturn than masculine females (cross-sex typed), that masculine female were more dominant, warm and outgoing, enthusiastic and happy-go-lucky than feminine females as well as undifferentiated women, that masculine females were more warm, outgoing, confident and free from anxiety, more self-controlled and socially precise than androgynous women who were more dominant and more prone to disregard rules than feminine women (Gupta et al., 1985), while Harris & Schwab, 1979 found higher masculine scores associated with self-assurance, aggressiveness and decisiveness in action, whereas higher feminine scores were the characteristics of
persons who were conscientious, sincere, co-operative, helpful and relatively bound by customs and traditions.

Harsh and Sethi (1989) studying inter correlations between SRO & life styles showed that masculine, feminine and androgynous subjects differed significantly from one another in the depression scores and that androgynous sex-role was more beneficial, helping women to be more adaptable, less stressed and less depressed in life situation.

However, all these studies seem equivocal or ambiguous in their findings about the effects of sex-role orientation, and such findings are sometimes inconsistent or contradictory, perhaps due to use of simpler randomised group designs to study each factor separately and thereby lack of adequate control of other extraneous variables or due to the use of basic statistical techniques like simple t-test in place of ANOVA for analysing data of higher factorial designs involving more than one variable. In contrast, the present study with use of better designs and more refined statistical analysis studied a few more variables affecting marital adjustment (MAQ & MAQC) for couples, and revealed main effects of SRO as summarised above, showing higher marital adjustment associated with androgynous group which stood highest and also with stereotyped which stood next in order and almost equal to androgynous, at the same time indicating the lower adjustment associated with cross-sex typed as well as undifferentiated groups, both of which were almost equal. This finding on the role of SRO on
marriage adjustment is very unique in the sense that all other studies revealed androgynous group to be significantly highest and different from all other three. However, the present study reveals no doubt SRO to be highest, but not significantly different from stereotyped (masculine males and feminine females), regarding which the results in other studies are inconsistent. Such findings about androgynous and stereotyped being almost same, though androgynous stands to be a little higher, lead to support the new theory of Bem, holding the androgynous to be most adjusted but does not refute the old traditional theory, holding stereotyped to be most adjusted.

These results of the present study on sex-role orientation are more reliable not only because of better control of variables and better, more scientific methodology used in the present study, but also because of the findings being a better compromise between the old and the new, the traditional and the non-traditional concepts of sex-roles and thus providing a better justification of results even from practical, common sense. The androgynous in the new sense (high on both Mas. & Fem.) and the stereotyped in the old sense (masculine males and feminine females) would naturally exhibit higher marital adjustment, whereas cross-sex typed (feminine males and masculine females) as well as undifferentiated (low on both Mas. & Fem.) would betray not only lower marital adjustment, but also lower general adjustment and less desirable personality traits, as
expected from a combination of incongruous amount of maleness and femaleness. At the same time, the present investigator in her future research work should learn from other findings summarised above and at the same time attempt to separate out the four groups of androgynous, stereotyped, cross-sex typed and undifferentiated (combining both males and females) further each into males and females, i.e., one should analyse and compare each of these eight groups (instead of four groups as done above), in view of earlier findings about male androgynous, female androgyunous, masculine females, feminine males, etc. which could have been compared with those of the present study if all the eight groups of SRO would have been studied. Moreover, the use of more refined tools and scoring procedures for measuring marital adjustment (MAQ & MAQC) would have provided to the present investigator more reliable and more specific additional information on marital adjustment as related to different variables.

5.2.2 Marital Locus of Control

The other variable equally important like Sex-role Orientation (SRO) for studying marriage adjustment has been the locus of control (Rotter, 1954 & 1966) in general adjustment and specifically and recently marital locus of control (MLOC) developed by Miller and his associates (1983) to study marital adjustment of couples. The study of MLOC has been another major aim in the present investigation. The results of statistical analysis described in the
preceding chapter have revealed that MLOC also played a far more significant role in influencing marital adjustment in all designs analysed by ANOVA (Tables 1a to 5a) as well as Chi-square test (Table No.9), and also that internal oriented locus of control group was comparatively more adjusted maritally than external oriented locus of control group, as observed from tables of means (Tables 1b to 5b) and their significance in ANOVA Tables 1a to 5a. Even the closer examination of LSD test (Tables 1c to 5c) applied to these means to study their significance of difference between any two specific means revealed and confirmed the same finding, namely, superiority of internal MLOC group over external MLOC group in marital adjustment. This was naturally expected, since the internal LOC group would have more stable personality characteristics associated with inner abilities or forces than external MLOC group that emphasises external forces and fluctuating powers, such as luck, chance, etc. over which the individual has no control.

Such finding of the present study goes well with findings from other relative studies reviewed earlier, not only with regard to general personality characteristics and general adjustment, but also relating to specific marital adjustment (Doherty & Ryder, 1979; Kawash & Scherf, 1975; Mlott & Lira, 1977; Doherty, 1981; Bugaighis et al., 1983; Constantine & Bahr, 1981; Sabattelli et al., 1983; Winkler & Doherty, 1983; Saxena, 1984 at Baroda and also studies at Aligarh by Hussain and Garg, 1985; Hussain & Gupta, 1987;
Gupta & Hussain, 1988; Ohri & Kumar, 1990 and also Mehta et al., 1992). Most of the studies have investigated MLOC and its relation to marital adjustment, besides other variables. Most of them have found superiority of internal oriented LOC subjects over external oriented LOC subjects in marital adjustment and other desirable traits, but a few have indicated even weak and inconsistent results on the role of generalised LOC in marital satisfaction. The present investigator has improved upon designs and statistical procedures adopted by others to study MLOC in relation to marital adjustment and has arrived at the consistent conclusion in all designs, regarding better marital adjustment of internal oriented MLOC group.

5.2.3 Working Conventional Status of Couples

Recent studies, especially after the advent of women liberation movement and development of new concept of sex-role orientation, researchers have started to investigate the role of work level status of married couples in influencing a number of personality traits, mental health characteristics, adjustment, achievement, etc., and more specifically the marital adjustment and satisfaction likely to be immediately affected when wives are also working outside home, paying less attention to household functions usually assigned traditionally to females. The present study while studying mainly the role of sex-role orientation and marital locus of control in marital adjustment of couples included working couples (both husband & wife working) and
conventional couples (only husband working & wife not working outside as per old convention. Hence the study enabled the investigator also to examine the role of work level status of couples in marital adjustment. Contrary to the expected, conventional view, the present systematic study revealed that this was also a significant factor influencing marital adjustment as observed from ANOVA (Tables 1a, 2a, 3a & 5a) and tables of means (Tables 1b-iii, 2b-iii, 3b-ii and 5b-iii) as well as Chi-square Table 10 and further analysis by LSD test (Table 1c-iii, 2c-iii, 3c-ii & 5c-iii). The results revealed that working couples were maritally more adjusted than conventional couples. Such finding can be accounted for perhaps by the higher level of motivation as well as education of working couples, especially working wives in face of the new challenge in their life.

This is also confirmed by findings of other related studies reviewed earlier though there are a few discrepancies, and such as higher rate of divorce in case of working women reported by Havemann and West (1952) or employed mothers showing more unhappiness or dissatisfaction as reported by Nye (1959) or Nye and Hoffman (1963) or no difference between working and non-working groups as reported by most studies (Rakhasia, 1991), have revealed better marital adjustment, close satisfactory relationship and greater approval motive of working couples and employed wives or mothers (La Follet, quoted by Kapur, 1970; Bowman,
1954; Jephcott, Seear, & Smith 1962; Kapur, 1970; Shah, 1985; Husain & Gupta, 1987; Ohri & Kumar, 1990, Mehta, 1991; Patel & Sinha, 1992). It should be noted that the present study with better control of variables as arrived the clear conclusion that working couples were more adjusted maritally than conventional couples. However, it should be noted from analysis of sub groups of working and conventional couples by sex, by only work vs. non-work, etc. on analysis of Chi-square test (Tables 11 to 15) that there were no significant differences between sexes or between work vs. non-work groups in marital adjustment, though working couples deferred significantly and favourably from conventional couples as couples on the whole, irrespective of sex or work level of individuals (ANOVA Table 1a, 2a, 3a, and 5a as well as Chi-square Table 10).

5.2.4. Length of Married Life of Couples

Along with the three major variables viz., SRO, MLOC and Work Level Status of couples, an attempt was also made to examine the effect of length of married life of couples on marital adjustment. The length of married life (ML) was varied at two levels viz., 5-15 yrs and 25-35 yrs, and again at four levels, viz., 5-10, 11-15, 25-30 and 31-35 years of duration of married life, in order to get more information if any on the basis of pilot work. ML was found to be a significant factor of marital adjustment in both cases, i.e., when varied at two levels in all five designs for the study of MAQ (Tables 1a to 5a) as well as in Design 7 for
MAQC (Table 7a), and also when varied at four levels in Design 6 for MAQC (Table 6a in ANOVA analysis) and also in analysis by Chi-Square test (Table 16 for ML at two levels and Table 17 for ML at four levels in case of MAQ and Table 25 for ML at two levels and Table 26 for ML at four levels in case of MAQC). The association between ML and MAQ or MAQC was found significant as seen also from correlation (Table 29). The r-values in case of ML and MAQ as well as ML and MAQC are negatively significant beyond 0.01 level, suggests that as the number of years of married life increases, marital adjustment decreases.

It was further noted from analysis by LSD test to study the difference between any two specific means of ML (which would be same as in case of two groups by F-test in ANOVA) and also to study difference between any two specific means for each pair of four groups of ML that younger group of 5 to 15 years was more maritally adjusted than older group of 25 to 35 years of length of married life (Table 4b & 4c); and that in case of four groups of ML, the first three groups (5-10, 11-15 & 25-30 yrs.) which were almost equal in their influence on marital adjustment were significantly higher than last oldest group (31-35). This implies that the ML should have been classified for the study only in two groups, viz., 5-30 years and 31 years and above. Anyway the classification of ML into four sub-groups did not yield any additional information.

It should be noted that younger couples were found to
be better adjusted maritally than older groups, contrary to traditional, common view which holds that there are more conflicts between spouses at younger age. This finding, in favour of younger couples can be accounted for by the fact that younger couples in their challenge to modern life of economical difficulties accepted to work hard to meet both ends meet, and thereby they were more motivated to adjust in married life and maintain closer relationship to make married life happier and more successful.

This can be compared also with findings in other related studies. There are many inconsistent findings in case of influence of ML on marital adjustment or marital happiness. Thus, Maniar (1987) and Makwana (1989) found older couples more adjusted than younger ones; Barot (1972), Shah (1985), Kapur (1970) and Mehta (1991) found no difference between the young and the old; while Chesser (1956) and Hussain and Gupta (1987) found younger couples more adjusted than the older couples as in the present study. Perhaps, the results of the present study under better control of all variables by use of better designs and more adequate statistical procedures are more reliable. It may be the impact of modern age necessitating the younger to be more adjusted.

5.2.5 Sex, Socio-Economic Status and Family Type

Sex, socio-economic status and family type of the subjects included in the sample enabled the investigator to find out also their effects on marital adjustment. The ANOVA
analysis results (Table 1a to 4a) for analysis of MAQ data as affected by sex, Table 1a, and 3a, for MAQ as affected by SES and also Table 6a and 7a for analysis of MAQC data as affected by SES and family type and also Chi-square results (Table 18 for SEX X MAQ, Table 19 for SES X MAQ, Table 27 for SES X MAQC and Table 28 for FT X MAQC) reveal clearly that all these variables of Sex, SES and FT were not significantly affecting marital adjustment, though females were tending to be somewhat more adjusted on MAQ (M = 21.86) than males (M = 21.79) as expected (Figure 12); higher SES subjects tended to be surprisingly a little more adjusted on MAQC (M = 21.94) than middleclass SES subjects (M = 21.58) as depicted in Figure 21; and subjects from joint family group tended to be little more adjusted on MAQC (M = 20.44) than subjects on nuclear family (M = 20.28) as seen from Figure 22, this being less expected owing to likely interference of elderly members in a joint family - may be elderly persons helping the couples to adjust more by taking care of the children in the family. Anyway, the findings of the present study revealed no substantial influence of Sex, SES or FT. This can be compared to the findings of other relevant studies reviewed earlier. Terman (1938) Burgess and Locke (1950) also found no relationship between family income and the degree of marital happiness. Kapur (1970) in a study of 300 working women at Delhi investigated a number of variables, such as education level, occupation status, income, socio-economic status, etc. and found none of these
to be significant. She found a high percentage (44%) of working wives living in nuclear family had one and half times higher proportion of well adjusted marriages than the wives in a joint family, as expected perhaps due to motivation from the challenge to work independently, while Shah (1985) found SES, Sex and FT to be an insignificant factor in marital adjustment. Findings of earlier studies were ambiguous, sometimes revealing significant relations, sometimes insignificant or sometimes significant negatively. The present study with all precautions for better control revealed all these variables as not affecting marital adjustment. It may be that they might not be influential independently, but may be interacting with other variables in influencing marital adjustment. The discussion of some such significant interactions in the next para would focus some light in this direction.

5.3 Interaction Effects and Simple Effects of Some Variables Significantly Interacting

The adoption of adequate factorial experimental designs (No.1 to 7) to study the effects of all these variables on MAQ as well as on MAQC facilitated the outcome of not only the main independent effects of all variables at the same time, but also their interaction effects. The first five designs revealed all these effects on MAQ and the last two designs on MAQC. It would be seen from all these tables of analysis of variance (Table 1a to 7a) that main effects of
SRO, MLOC, W-C and ML were significant, while Sex, SES and FT were insignificant factors as described in the preceding sections. So also a large number of interactions were found to be insignificant; only very few interactions were found to be significant, casting a doubt on main effects of the variables involved in interactions, in view of which the main effects have to be interpreted with care and caution, in terms of their simple effects, whenever their interactions are significant. Only significant interactions along with simple effects of such significantly interacting variables have been discussed in the following paragraphs. Such significant interactions in all the designs are:

1. SRO X SEX in designs 1, 2, and 4 for MAQ scores.
2. MLOC X W-C in designs 1, 2, 3 and 5 for MAQ scores.
3. W-C X ML2 in designs 1, 2, 3 and 5 for MAQ scores.
4. MLOC X W-C X ML2 in designs 1, 2, 3 and 5 for MAQ scores.
5. W-C X ML4 in design 6 for MAQC scores.
(WC X ML4 X FT in design No.6 for MAQC score - this interaction with $F = 2.598$ for df = 3,368 has just been missing significance at .05 level, $F$ expected to be 2.63 atleast).

The above five significant interactions have been explained below in terms of the simple effects of the variables involved, i.e., effect of one level of one variable at any one level of the other variable, rather than average effect of all levels of one variable termed as the main effect of that variable.
5.3.1 Sex-Role Orientation X SEX Interaction for MAQ Scores

This interaction between the variables of sex role orientation and sex for MAQ scores was found to be significant repeatedly and therefore confirmed in design numbers 1, 2 & 4 where this two variables have been studied together (with $F' = 5.445$ for df = 3,675 significant at .01 level in Design 1, Table 1a, $F(3,736) = 5.861$, $p < .01$ in Design 2, Table 2a, and $F(3,768) = 4.034$, $p < .01$ in Design 4, Table 4a). These $F$ & MS values show slight differences for SRO X SEX interaction inspite of same data; this has been explained earlier due to adjustment in interaction while adopting a different model for computation in ANOVA.

Closer examination of means of sub groups for SRO x SEX would reveal that mean values in Tables 1b-v or 2b-v or 4b-v for husbands and wives are not increasing or decreasing in the same order at A, S, C and U levels of SRO, and similarly mean values in the same tables for SRO (A, S, C & U) are not in the same order at each level of sex. In some cases of sex, e.g., wives show greater adjustment than husbands (at S & U levels). Similarly in case of SRO, A is highest, next is C then S and last is U among husbands, while among the wives the order for adjustment for the groups is S, A, U and C. In other words, these two variables by themselves are not effective in the same direction and the magnitude, but they change in the order of marital adjustment under influence of or in interaction with each other. Such specific pair differences in means of any two sub-groups, either
in magnitude of values or in direction or superiority of one over the other, account for the significant interaction of SRO and Sex, meaning that neither SRO nor Sex are independently significant on their own with same magnitude and in same direction, but exert significant influence on each other at different levels of each other. This is evident also from significant Chi-squared value for MAQ in Table 20 for SRO x Sex in case of MAQ groups. Even the graph Figure 14 for SRO X Sex means clearly show such interaction. Such specific differences in means of specific sub-groups can be tested by LSD test or any other gap test subsequent to ANOVA. It will be seen from the results of analysis by LSD test in Tables 1c, 2c and 4c for SRO x Sex groups that most differences (simple effects of SRO and Sex are significant, while a few are not significant, e.g. sex difference (H:W) at A and U levels are not significant and SRO differences A:C, S:C and S:U among husbands and SRO difference A:S among wives are not significant. All other pair differences or simple effects are significant. Even among the main groups of SRO, A:S pair and C : U pair were not significantly different. Stereotyped wives were most adjusted, (M = 22.58) and cross -sex wives were least adjusted (M = 20.56). All such differences in main or sub-group pairs, i.e., in simple effects account for significant interaction of SRO x Sex. Such significant interactions cast a shadow or a doubt on interpreting main effects as such. Though main effect of SRO is significant, it should not be interpreted that SRO is significant
independently by itself at all levels as observed from significant main effect of SRO; it rather means that some levels of SRO are significant at some levels of sex or that some levels of sex are significant at some levels of SRO, but not that SRO or sex are always significant at all levels in the same direction independently of each other. In simpler terms, only interaction of the two is significant rather than the main effects as such. This means that whenever an interaction of any variables is significant, one must analyse results of ANOVA by subsequent gap-test, as done here by LSD test, and then only one should draw inferences as to which effects at which level are significant, instead of drawing inferences only on the basis of main effects. It should be noted that if interaction of variables is not significant, we can draw inferences safely on the basis of main effects whether significant or not significant. Thus SRO, though significant in main effect, should not be construed as significant at all levels of other variable sex, and sex which is insignificant should not be construed necessarily as insignificant at all levels of SRO, as revealed from above discussion of tables mentioned above. This would apply to all other significant interactions discussed below.
5.3.2 Marital Locus of Control X W-C Interaction for MAQ Scores

This interaction between variables of marital locus of control (MLOC) and work level (W.C) status of couples for MAQ scores was found to be significant and repeatedly confirmed in Design Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5 where these two variables are studied together. Tables 1a, 2a, 3a and 5a revealed significant interactions of MLOC X W-C, showing $F (1,675)$ value to be 8.883 in Table 1a, $F (1,736) = 8.683$ in Table 2a, $F (1,768) = 8.448$ in Table 3a and $F (1,768) = 6.246$ in Table 5a significant at .01 level, the slight differences in MS and $F$ values for MLOC X W-C being already explained earlier due to adjustment of interaction with the use of different type of model for ANOVA.

Here too, the closer examination of results of LSD test applied to test the significance of difference between any two specific means or specific sub-groups i.e., simple effects, reveals differences in magnitude (amount) as well as in direction of mean values for sub-groups of MLOC at each level of W-C and also for sub-groups of W-C at each level of MLOC in Tables 1b-vi, 2b-vi, and 3b-iv as well as their significance or otherwise in Tables 1c-vi, 2c-vi, and 3c-iv. It would be seen that most of specific pair differences (simple effects) are significant, except one pair, namely, W-C pair difference at I(Internal) level of MLOC. All this accounts for significant interaction of MLOC X W.C These results mean that though both MLOC and W-C are
significant in their main effects, their significant interaction prevents us from inferring that each variable is significant independently. MLOC sub-group differences are significant both among working couples as well as conventional couples, but W-C differences are significant only among external MLOC subjects and not among internal MLOC subjects. In this case as seen from means in Tables 1b, 2b, 3b or 5b, working couples were more maritally adjusted (M = 21.71) than conventional couples (M = 20.53) when they were externally oriented in MLOC, but no significant difference between working and conventional couples was observed when they were internally oriented in MLOC. As far as MLOC is concerned, there were significant differences between External and Internal among working couples, Internals being more adjusted (M = 22.36) than Externals (M = 21.71) and so also Internals being more adjusted (M = 22.52) than Externals (M = 20.53) among conventional couples. Thus internal conventional group was most adjusted maritally and external conventional group was least adjusted comparatively. Such differences in magnitude or direction of mean values of sub-groups of MLOC X W-C account for their significant interaction.

5.3.3 W-C X ML Interaction for MAQ and MAQC Scores

This interaction between work level status and length of married life variables was found significant for MAQ scores repeatedly in designs No.1, 2, 3 and 5 with ML at two levels and in design No.6 with ML at four levels for MAQC.
analysis. These are the designs where W-C and ML have been studied together. The tables 1a, 2a, 3a and 5a for MAQ analysis and table 6a for MAQC analysis for data on W-C as well as ML together reveals $F(1,675) = 11.786$ in Table 1a, $F(1,736) = 11.992$ in Table 2a, $F(1,768) = 11.154$ in Table 3a and $F(1,768) = 9.724$ in Table 5a while $F(3,368) = 3.069$ in Table 6a for MAQC are all significant, slight differences being explained by different model for computation of ANOVA.

The closer examination of tables of mean values in Tables 1b-vii, 2b-vii, 3b-v, and 5b-vi for MAQ scores as well as LSD results in Tables 1c-vii, 2c-vii, 3c-v and 5c-vi for MAQ scores reveals specific pair differences in magnitude as well as direction of means of sub-groups and also in significance of mean differences i.e., in simple effects at different levels. Thus, conventional couples were slightly more adjusted ($M = 22.35$) than working couples ($M = 22.06$) in case of younger group (difference being not significant), and working couples were significantly more adjusted ($M = 22.88$) than conventional couples ($M = 20.88$) among older group. Similarly, younger couples were slightly more adjusted ($M = 22.06$) than older couples ($M = 22.00$) among working couples (though not significant), and again younger couples were significantly more adjusted ($M = 22.35$) than older couples ($M = 20.38$) among also conventional couples. Younger conventional couples were most adjusted and older conventional couples were comparatively least
adjusted maritally. Such pair differences in magnitude and direction of mean values account for significant interaction of W-C X ML2 for MAQ scores.

So also the closer examination of table of means for MAQC scores in Table 6b-ii and LSD test results for MAQC in Table 6c-ii reveals significant interaction between W-C and ML4 in Design 6. W-C differences were found significant at ML level of 31-35 years, working group being more adjusted (M = 20.77) than conventional group (M = 18.10), there being no significant differences between W and C at any other level of ML (5-10, 11-15 and 25-30yrs.) all being almost equal in marriage adjustment, i.e., simple effect of W-C variable was significant only among oldest couples. Similarly there were no significant differences between any pair means of ML, except ML group of 25-30 yrs. (M = 20.59) vs. ML group of 31-35 yrs. (M = 20.77) among working couples, whereas among the conventional couples the ML group of 5-10 yrs. (M = 21.02) was significantly more adjusted than ML group of 31-35 yrs. (M = 18.10), so also ML group of 11-15 yrs. (M = 20.33) was significantly more adjusted than ML group of 31-35 yrs. (M=18.10) and ML group of 25-30 yrs. (M = 20.10) was also significantly more adjusted than ML group of 31-35 yrs. (M = 18.10), while first three groups didn't differ from each other significantly. In short, conventional youngest couples was most adjusted and conventional oldest couple was least adjusted. Such pair differences in magnitude as well as in directions of mean values and the significance of simple effects of W-C and ML
variables accounted for significant interactions for W-C X ML4 in case of MAQC analysis.

5.3.4 Higher-Order Interaction of MLOC X W-C X ML2 for MAQ

This higher-order interaction of three factors viz., marital locus of control, work level status and length of married life at two levels was found significant for MAQ scores and so was repeated confirming the results in Designs 1, 2, 3 and 5, showing respectively $F$ values to be 8.649, 8.294, 7.897 and 7.192 all for df = 1 and significant at 0.01 level of confidence, with slight differences in MS & $F$ values as explained earlier, as revealed in Tables 1a, 2a, 3a and 5a. The closer examination of tables of means of subgroups of MLOC X W-C X ML2 in Tables 1b-viii, 2b-viii, 3b-vi and 5b-vi as well as LSD test results for significance of specific pair differences in Tables 1c-viii, 2c-viii, 3c-vi and 5c-vii reveals that internal MLOC group was always significantly more adjusted than external MLOC group at each level of W-C and ML except at Working Old group level which was not significant, but there were significant differences in magnitude, in direction as well as in significance between W-C pairs and ML pairs, only W-C pair significant at E-C level and only Y-O pair significant at E-C level, all other pair differences being insignificant as seen from LSD tables. Internal MLOC, younger, conventional couples were most adjusted ($M = 22.66$) and external MLOC, older, conventional couples were least
adjusted (M = 19.61). Such pair differences in simple effects accounted for significant interaction of MLOC x W-C x ML2 for MAQ scores.

All other interactions of all variables of SRO, MLOC, W-C, ML, SEX, SES for MAQ scores and of W-C, ML, SES, FT for MAQC scores were found to be insignificant and hence attempt is not made in these cases to test the significance of their simple effects by LSD test, assuming that whatever significance of results is observed from main effects stands true, in case interaction effects are insignificant.

At the end, it should be noted that highest six-factor factorial design shows SS error = 5203.932 which includes the variance of seventh factor viz., family type, not taken out separately for reasons of insufficient No. of subjects available in seven factor factorial design, as already noted in chapter III. However, this factor of FT has been studied in other designs No. 6 & 7 for MAQC which show SS of FT = 4.172 in Design 6 and SS of FT = 4.717 in Design 7 for MAQC. If such SS of FT whatever it may be (perhaps around 4.00) as well as its interaction with all other six variables was taken into account, the SS error of 5203.932 would have been less for df = 674 and perhaps the just significant effect of W-C in design 6 would have been significant at .05 level. In other sources of variance for MAQ or MAQC, it would not have been any substantial difference. Thus, the above all results would have remained the same even if the highest order factorial design of seven factors was used.

To put in a nutshell at the end, the investigation
using more adequate designs and more refined statistical procedures reveals that on the whole the variables of sex-role orientation (as conceptualised by Bem), marital locus of control, working level status and length of married life of couples were found to be significantly influencing or contributing to the marital adjustment, while sex, socio-economic status and family type studied along with others did not play any substantial role in affecting marital adjustment. There were very few significant interactions among all these variables and hence it can be safely said that the variables of sex role orientation, marital locus of control, work level status and length of married life influenced marital adjustment independently on their own for the most part, except in a few cases of some significant interactions; mostly in such few cases it was work level status that was interacting with length of married life. These inferences are more reliable in view of better control of variables through selection of refined designs and statistical techniques in comparison to earlier studies which while using simple randomised group designs and $t$-test or Chi-Square test have hardly studied interaction effects which are very common in any behaviour which is a complex resultant or a function of a number of interacting variables, as behavioural psychologists maintain.

The limitations of such study and suggestions based on its findings have been presented in the last chapter VI, along with the summary of the work.