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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 an 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted Couples</th>
<th>Maladjusted Couples</th>
<th>Complementary Group I Couples</th>
<th>Complementary Group II Couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 recorded 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 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:

**Distribution of Item of AMS in the Areas of Approval Motive**

<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 R 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 Zr coefficients. Partial correlations were computed for partialed 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.