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 override the limitations inherent in the theory and methodology adapted 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; Dohe...), 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 or 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 acquiescence 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 has 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 score \( r = -0.29, P < .05 \), 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 $Z_{Y}$ 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 $Z_{Y}$ 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 $Z_{Y}$ 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 $Z_{Y}$ 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 $Z_{Y}$ 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 (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 β 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 β 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 β 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 β 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.