

A STUDY OF MARITAL SATISFACTION IN GRADUATE
STUDENT MARRIAGES

by

DAWN M. SOKOLSKI, B.A., M.A.

A DISSERTATION

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

Accepted

Dean of the Graduate School

August, 1995

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people provided invaluable assistance and support with this project. Susan Hendrick, through her research and writing expertise as well as her willingness to foster scholarly enthusiasm in her students was an invaluable asset in this project. She was generous with her time and was willing to be flexible. My committee members Clyde Hendrick, Dick McGlynn, Tim Melchert and Steve Richards also provided insight and suggestions that made this project more fruitful than it would have been without their help.

I also wish to thank Theresa Lawson and Layne Bennion, my Air Force colleagues, who spent countless hours helping me through this project. Finally, I would like to thank my mom, my sisters, Carla Kaylor, Jerry Clemens, and especially my Dad, Edward Sokolski. Without his encouragement and at times down right pestering, I would not have finished this project and in fact would not have pursued this advanced degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTERS	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. METHOD.....	20
III. RESULTS.....	28
IV. DISCUSSION.....	71
REFERENCES.....	84
APPENDICES	
A. EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW.....	92
B. QUESTIONNAIRE.....	129
C. COVER LETTER.....	138
D. LETTER TO DEPARTMENTS.....	141
E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER.....	143
F. CORRELATION TABLE RAS WITH DEMOGRAPHICS.....	145
G. CORRELATION TABLE (FOR MALES).....	150
H. CORRELATION TABLE (FOR FEMALES).....	155
I. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS.....	160
J. CORRELATIONS AMONG PREDICTORS IN REGRESSION.....	164
K. RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTION.....	167
L. PUBLISHED MEANS FOR RAS.....	198

ABSTRACT

A number of empirical studies have examined how variables such as communication, intimacy, dissimilar expectations, financial and personal stress, social support, and the presence of children affect satisfaction in marriage. Chronic stress, like that found in graduate education, has a profound impact on marital satisfaction, and may also be related to other variables such as intimacy and financial concerns. The purpose of this study was to examine marital satisfaction in graduate student marriages and the variables that relate to marital satisfaction.

At a large southwestern university, some 161 married couples in which at least one partner was a student in medical school, law school, or other graduate program were assessed. The student and his or her spouse were asked to complete separate questionnaires which consisted of demographic information, and measures of social support, self-disclosure, marital expectations, and love styles. Satisfaction was correlated with marital commitment, physical intimacy, self-disclosure and passionate love. Greater marital satisfaction was found in marriages where both partners were students than in marriages with only one partner in school. However, no differences in marital satisfaction were found between male and female graduate

students. It had been assumed that female graduate students, in addition to school responsibilities, would have greater parental and home responsibilities than male graduate students and would feel less satisfied. However, this was not the case. Regression analyses also showed the importance of personal happiness, marital commitment, physical intimacy, and a spouse doing his or her fair share of the housework for marital satisfaction. The implications of these findings are discussed.

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Correlations between demographic variables and RAS for the total sample and for males and females separately.....	35
2.	Correlations between scales and RAS for the total sample and for males and females separately.....	38
3.	Correlations between Love Style difference scores, importance of religion difference scores, gender role difference scores and RAS for the total sample and for males and females separately.....	40
4.	ANOVA--RAS by children.....	42
5.	ANOVA--RAS by marriage type (symmetrical, asymmetrical).....	44
6.	ANOVA--Equity of household and financial responsibility (ETASK) by marriage type (symmetrical, asymmetrical)	45
7.	ANOVA--Equity of parental responsibilities (EPARENTING) by marriage type.(symmetrical, asymmetrical).....	46
8.	ANOVA--Egalitarian Gender Role (EGR) by marriage type.(symmetrical, asymmetrical).....	48
9.	ANOVA--RAS by gender for graduate students.....	49
10.	ANOVA--stress level by gender for graduate students.....	51
11.	ANOVA--department isolation by gender for graduate students.....	52
12.	ANOVA--program support by gender for graduate students.....	53
13.	ANOVA--relationship with faculty members by gender for graduate students.....	54
14.	Demographic variables regressed on RAS.....	55
15.	Demographic variables regressed on RAS.for males separately.....	57

16.	Demographic variables regressed on RAS.for females separately.....	58
17.	Measures regressed on RAS	59
18.	Measures regressed on RAS for males separately...	60
19.	Measures regressed on RAS for females separately.	61
20.	Demographic variables and measures regressed on RAS.....	63
21.	Demographic variables and measures regressed on RAS.for males separately.....	64
22.	Demographic variables and measures regressed on RAS.for females separately.....	65
23.	Demographic variables and measures regressed on RAS.excluding the marital commitment scale.....	66
24.	Demographic variables and measures regressed on RAS.excluding the marital commitment scale for males separately.....	68
25.	Demographic variables and measures regressed on RAS excluding the marital commitment scale for females separately.....	69
26.	Frequency count of the main themes from each open-ended question.response. Includes data from unpaired responses.....	70
27.	Correlation table RAS with demographics.....	146
28.	Correlation table(for males).....	151
29.	Correlation table (for females).....	156
30.	Means and standard deviations (demographic variables).....	161
31.	Means and standard deviations (scales).....	163
32.	Correlation among predictors in regression.....	165
33.	Published means for RAS.....	199

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Currently, only 10% of U.S. families fit the traditional family model, which is comprised of two parents with children, where the husband earns the money, and the wife stays at home to care for the children and run the household (Gilbert, 1993). Thus, as more women enter the work force and higher education, society, as well as individuals, has to modify what it perceives to be acceptable or "normal" for gender roles within the marital context.

Graduate student marriages represent a unique subset of marriages in our society. They generally are made up of two people striving to improve their status in society. Furthermore, graduate education can add stress to relationships, and this stress may change feelings of satisfaction. If partners hold traditional values of status and gender roles, then incongruency between what they have and what they think they should have can lead to dissatisfaction.

The concepts of marriage, love and marital satisfaction are not only variable across individuals, but they are also complex and difficult to maintain. In fact, the failure

rate of marriages in the United States is approximately 50% (Glick, 1989a). Yet despite these odds, almost 90% of the U.S. population chooses to marry at least once (Glick, 1989a, 1989b). Since it is assumed that individuals enter into matrimony because they are in love and are satisfied with their relationship, the high failure rate would indicate that perceptions of love and satisfaction change over time.

The present study explored constructs such as marital satisfaction specifically in graduate student marriages. It examined the correlates and possible predictors of marital satisfaction in the unique population of graduate student couples.

A summary of relevant research will establish the basis for this study. Please see Appendix A for an extended literature review. The sections below address the following topics: love and love styles, marital relationships, factors contributing to marital satisfaction, including intimacy, communication, sex, social networks, religious attitudes, children, and stress in graduate school.

Relationship Factors

Love

In social psychology, the study of love focuses on intimate and close relationships, and it has been an area of research which has only gained "respectability" in the past fifteen years (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). But what is love? A common answer is that love is an "emotion." We use the words "love" and "emotion" to communicate the organization of complicated constructs (Campos & Barrett, 1984). Therefore, when we define an emotion in one word (e.g., "love"), we automatically bring together a series of behaviors, cognitions and appraisals (Shaver & Hazan, 1988). While some emotions (happiness, anger, fear, surprise, disgust and sadness) are recognizable and are reliable across cultures (Brown, 1986), there can be a great deal of within-construct variability. Thus, the within-construct variability for love is also an issue researchers have to face.

The Love Styles

The trend in the theories of love has gone from the global concepts (Blau, 1964) to multidimensional concepts (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Sternberg, 1986). Hendrick and Hendrick have based their conceptualization of love on the

work of Lee (1973), who proposed multiple classifications of love. Lee identified six types of love, three primary types and three secondary types. The primary types include: Eros (romantic, passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), and Storge (friendship love). The secondary types include: Mania (possessive, dependent love), Pragma (logical, "shopping list" love), and Agape (all giving, selfless love). Lee believed that the secondary types were formed when two of the primary types were combined. Thus, Mania is a product of the combination of Eros and Ludus; Pragma is a product of Storge and Ludus; and Agape is a product of Eros and Storge. Hendrick and Hendrick pursued this typology of love because it was multidimensional and it encompassed other theories that are not comprehensive in and of themselves. Research on the Love Attitudes Scale (1986) has demonstrated that all six constructs are "primary," but it is not clear whether a person's love style is a stable personality trait or a more transient attitude (Richardson, Medvin, & Hammock, 1988).

However, by determining an individual's love style, we can begin to describe a person's behaviors, cognitions and appraisals about love. And these love styles can be used to describe all types of intimate romantic relationships, including marital relationships.

Marital Relationships

The marital relationship, according to Hendrick and Hendrick (1992), is perhaps the most complex, contradictory, and fulfilling of all human relationships. They state that in no other relationship are there such high expectations for such a long period of time. Because marriage is supposed to last forever, and because people enter into marriage with such high expectations, there can be many causes of disappointment.

There are also several constructs in the literature that have been used to express the idea of a mutually fulfilling relationship (e.g., happiness, quality, adjustment, and satisfaction). Overall, these terms are used synonymously, and thus for the sake of parsimony, this concept will hereafter be referred to as "satisfaction." For the purpose of this study, we concentrate primarily on the variables that impact satisfaction in marriage.

Factors Contributing to Satisfaction in Marriage

There have been several studies that have looked retrospectively at long lasting marriages in order to determine the reasons for their longevity. Robinson and Blanton (1993) found that the key characteristics identified by such couples included: intimacy balanced with autonomy,

commitment, communication, similar religious orientation, and congruent perceptions of the relationship. Finkel and Hansen (1992) examined 31 couples who were married thirty years or more. The results of this study indicated a curvilinear pattern of satisfaction, with the subjects remembering satisfaction as lower in the middle, child-rearing stage of the family life cycle. During this middle stage, satisfaction was directly related to length of marriage, and inversely related to number of children and number of child-rearing problems. The authors also found that these variables were more strongly correlated with satisfaction for wives than for husbands. Thus, gender differences related to marital satisfaction appear to be an important consideration.

Rhynes's (1981) findings supported the notion of a curvilinear model of satisfaction across the life cycle for women, but not for men. She also found that women were generally less satisfied with their marriages than were men, across all stages of married life. Furthermore, her research indicated that marital satisfaction was highly correlated with global happiness for women but not necessarily for men.

One possible explanation for gender differences in marital satisfaction is the disparity of sex roles in our

culture. Over the past thirty years, women have increased their presence in the work force, but their responsibilities at home have not diminished (Gilbert, 1993). Thus, some aspects of gender roles change more quickly than other aspects, and responsibilities that individuals have and those that they expect to have may not be the same. Research has demonstrated that sex role congruency is an important variable in marital satisfaction (Bowen & Orthner, 1983; Parmelee, 1987).

Dancer and Gilbert (1993) found that equity, or the perception that their spouse was doing "their fair share" (p.140), was particularly important in higher ratings of marital satisfaction in both spouses. Rachlin (1987) also found the perception of equity important for the adjustment of married couples.

Intimacy. Intimacy is another key variable contributing to longevity in marriages. Tolstedt and Stokes (1983) examined three types of intimacy (verbal, affective, and physical) in relation to marital satisfaction. They found that all three types of intimacy, but particularly verbal and affective intimacy, were highly predictive: positively for marital satisfaction and negatively for thoughts of divorce.

Moss and Schwebel (1993) proposed a formal definition of intimacy with five specific components: (1) commitment; (2) affective intimacy; (3) cognitive intimacy; (4) physical intimacy; and (5) mutuality. While the theme of communication or self-disclosure had been found in many of the definitions of intimacy, the authors stated that this theme is a "facilitator" rather than a component of intimacy (p.33).

Communication. One of the clearest and most powerful ways for married partners to communicate is through self-disclosure (Beach & Tesser, 1988; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). Self-disclosure has three basic themes: (1) it is an aspect of personality; (2) it has a role in relationship development and dissolution; and (3) it has a relationship to psychological stress (Berg & Derlega, 1987, as cited in Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). Numerous studies have been conducted involving relationships and self-disclosure (e.g., Feigenbaum, 1977; Hendrick, 1981; Morton, 1978), and there has been a significant amount of research indicating that lack of self-disclosure is related to marital dissatisfaction and a discontinuation of the relationship (Fincham & Bradbury, 1988; Hansen & Schuldt, 1984; Hendrick, 1981; Jorgensen & Gaudy, 1980; Sprecher, 1987; Merves-Okin, Amidon, & Bernt, 1991).

Sex. Cupach and Comstock (1990) explored the relationships among sexual communication, sexual satisfaction and marital adjustment. They found that satisfaction with sexual communication was significantly and positively related to sexual satisfaction and marital adjustment, satisfaction, cohesion, and affectional expression. It appears that being able to communicate with one's partner helps in many different areas of the relationship.

Social networks. There has also been a great deal of research involving marital satisfaction and the presence of social networks outside the marital relationship. Hansen, Fallon and Novotny (1991) examined the relationship between social network structure and marital satisfaction, and found that marital satisfaction related positively to network overlap (spouses sharing social network) and size (number of social contacts), but not to density (the extent to which members of the social network interact with each other independently of the focal person). Hansen et al. found that marital satisfaction was greater when spouses had larger individual networks and when there was greater overlap between their networks.

Julien and Markman (1991) found that spouse's support (especially husband's) was a critical variable in

relationship satisfaction. According to the authors, this variable has so far been neglected by researchers. Julien and Markman also found gender differences in social support. According to the authors, it takes more stress for husbands to finally seek out support from their wives than the reverse. Furthermore, when men do seek support, it does not appear to improve the quality of their relationship. Burda, Vaux and Schill (1984) also found that men have a more difficult time soliciting help from their wives.

Religious attitudes. Religiosity is one characteristic which helps to predict marital satisfaction. Wilson and Filsinger (1986) found a strong pattern of positive relationships among dimensions of religiosity and marital satisfaction for husbands and wives. A strong religious faith was shown to be correlated with greater satisfaction.

Children. Hackel and Ruble (1992) studied the changes in the marital relationship after the first baby is born. When expectations regarding the sharing of child-care and housekeeping responsibilities were not met, marital satisfaction decreased. It appears that when new factors enter into a marriage (i.e., children), the balance of equity, or what partners perceive to be fair, changes. Another factor that can affect the balance in a marriage is when one or both partners decides to enter graduate school.

Graduate Student Marriages

One of the most profound areas of change in student composition is the increasing number of female graduate students in all disciplines (Gilbert, 1993; Gilbert 1982; Houseknecht & Spanier, 1980; Scheinkman, 1988). In 1970 Heiss found that males outnumbered females in all Ph.D. programs at 10 major universities, by a ratio of 8:2. While the advent of the womens' rights movement and changing societal norms have led the way for more women to pursue graduate education, men still outnumber women in most disciplines (Scheinkman, 1988). In 1991, women represented 33% of law students, 37% of medical students, and 51% of psychology doctoral students (Gilbert, 1993). Unfortunately, most available research studies on graduate student marriages account only for marriages with the traditional roles of the male student and the female spouse (McRoy & Fisher, 1982).

The marital status of students has become an increasingly important issue in graduate training because of the growing body of literature demonstrating the negative impact of graduate school on marriages (Baker, 1993; Houseknecht & Spanier, 1980; McRoy & Fisher, 1982; Rohr, Rohr, & McKenry, 1985). In examining the marital status of graduate students, gender and program differences are

present (Gilbert, 1982). For example, Feldman (1974) found that 50% of all full-time male graduate students were married, whereas less than 20% of all full-time female graduate students were married. Mallinckrodt and Leong (1992) found that 76% of the male graduate students in their sample were married, compared to 37% of female graduate students. Heiss (1970) also found that students in the natural sciences are generally single, whereas students in the social sciences are generally married.

Unlike gender and marital status, family status and background variables have received less attention. Given financial concerns, most married graduate students do not have children, or if they do, the children are few in number (Gilbert, 1982).

Stress in Graduate School

A graduate student experiences stress from many different sources: academic/departmental, personal, and financial. And if the student is married, marital stress may also be present. The importance of graduate departments as social systems has been stressed by several authors (Hartnett, 1976; Lozoff, 1976). If students lack relationships with faculty, perceiving faculty as distant or inaccessible, if students lack a sense of community in the

department and feel powerless or isolated, or if they are poorly evaluated by the program, they will experience more stress.

Constant evaluation (an inherent aspect of education), high performance demands, and competition can all increase anxiety for and stress on students (Gilbert, 1982) and may lead to lower self-esteem. While marital partners and family units can be supportive and help bolster personal resources, a negative self-concept can impact how a person views his or her marital relationship. Furthermore, lack of sufficient marital support can also add to student stress. Clark and Rieker (1986) found that 31% of male medical and law students found their spouses to be supportive or very supportive, whereas only 19% of female medical or law students rated their spouses to be supportive or very supportive.

Other research has found gender differences in perceived academic stress. Hite (1985) found that the perceptions of female doctoral students differed from those of their male colleagues regarding role congruence and support from faculty and peers. Women perceived less support and more role conflict. Mallinckrodt, Leong, and Kralj (1989) found that compared to male graduate students, female graduate students reported significantly more

negative life changes and significantly more psychological symptoms of stress. And in at least one study, marriage was shown to have a more negative effect on women's graduate work than on men's (Feldman, 1974).

Gruver and Labadie (1975) found five major sources of dissatisfaction among a population of married college students. In order of importance they were: sexual dissatisfaction (especially frequency and time of day), lack of communication, lack of recreation time, not enough money, and a need for more friends. The authors did not examine whether age, religion, number of children or other variables contributed to reported marital satisfaction (Gilbert, 1982). McRoy and Fisher (1982) also examined marital adjustment of graduate student marriages. The authors primarily investigated the impact of student status (who was the student: husband, wife, or both) on marital satisfaction. Their findings indicated lower levels of marital adjustment (consensus and affection) for couples where only the husband was a student. They also found more preschool children in the husband-only-student group. However, when the wife was the student, the couple tended to be older, were married for a longer period of time, and had higher family income (presumably the husband was already established in his career). The authors determined that

variables other than student status of the couple may impact satisfaction.

Scheinkman (1988) reported that symmetry in graduate student marriage may be one of the most important factors in predicting satisfaction. She stated that there are two types of marriages: symmetrical and asymmetrical marriages. In symmetrical marriages, both partners are students. In asymmetrical marriages, one partner is a student while the other spouse is not, and the non-student partner generally provides financial support through employment. Scheinkman also stated that due to differences in daily routines, asymmetrical marriages are generally more stressful.

Conclusion

Marriage is not a stagnant institution. It is a bond between two people who bring together different backgrounds, personalities, beliefs, experiences and hopes. As external and internal forces act on this bond, it will either become pliable and adapt or it will inevitably break.

The approach to love presented in this research attempts to explore the complex nature of love. Because love is generally the basis of marriage, understanding of this phenomenon is necessary for understanding the nature of marriage. Likewise, the concept of satisfaction in marriage

can be related to many things, including the emotion of love. The focus of this research project was to look at a number of tangible and measurable variables to gain a better understanding of love and marriage, particularly the things that may make love and marriage better and the things that may make them worse. In focusing on graduate student marriages, additional variables such as academic stress, support from faculty and peers, and constant evaluation also need to be considered as contributors to marital satisfaction.

Based on previous research, many factors were determined to be important. Intimacy, commitment, communication, similar religious orientation, the presence of children, social networks, spousal support, and congruent perceptions of the relationship have all been found to be important and related to marital satisfaction. Gender differences have also been found, with men appearing to be more satisfied in marriage than women, especially when the couple has children.

Finally, the concept of equity has been discussed in different ways, and it is also an important concept in marriage. Dancer and Gilbert (1993) noted that equity does not mean exact equality but rather entails a perception of what is fair and what should be expected. As society

changes (e.g., more women enter into the work force), gender roles and expectations also change. Graduate student marriages are subject to all the typical aspects of marriage (e.g., love, intimacy) and are particularly susceptible to changing gender roles.

Goals of Present Study

Love, marital satisfaction, and graduate school experiences are complex life dimensions that affect a significant number of individual who pursue higher education. Only in recent years has the impact of graduate school been examined in relation to marital satisfaction. The purpose of the current research was to conduct a cross-sectional study of married graduate students by examining gender/marital roles and incongruencies in marital expectations. Specifically, this study looked at love, intimacy (self-disclosure, communication, commitment, investment), social support, and marital/sex role expectations as they impact marital satisfaction in graduate student marriages. Based on previous research, the following findings were anticipated:

Research Hypotheses

Correlates of Satisfaction

1. Perceived equity, sexual satisfaction, self-disclosure, and commitment will be positively correlated with marital satisfaction.

2.(a) Endorsement of egalitarian gender roles will be positively related to marital satisfaction. (b) Also, partner incongruence in beliefs about gender roles will be negatively correlated with marital satisfaction.

3. Partner incongruence or dissimilarity in love styles will be negatively correlated with marital satisfaction.

4. Partner incongruence in levels of religiosity will be negatively correlated with marital satisfaction.

Group Comparisons on Satisfaction

5. Couples with children will be less satisfied with their marriages than will couples without children, and the difference will be greater for women than for men.

6. Symmetrical graduate student couples will report more satisfaction than asymmetrical couples.

7. Asymmetrical graduate student couples will indicate more inequalities in household, financial, (and child) responsibilities than will symmetrical couples.

Graduate Students and Gender Issues

8. Female graduate students, regardless of their discipline, will generally be less satisfied with their marriages than will male graduate students.

9. Female graduate students will report more stress, more isolation, and less support from their programs than will male graduate students.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Some 930 married graduate students (Medical, Law, MS, MA, PhD) at Texas Tech University were asked to participate in this study. Further, the spouse of each student was also asked to participate. The only limitation in soliciting the married graduate population was whether the student had his or her records sealed and thus whether information regarding marital status could be obtained. Data for couples in which both partners participated (322 participants) were kept separate from data where only one partner responded (33 participants). Data from the single responders are not reported in this document except for the information from the open-ended question. Please see Appendix B for the complete questionnaire that was distributed to the participants.

Instruments

Background inventory (Appendix B: questions 1-39, 93-96 and 106-113)

The background inventory examined specific demographic information. Questions elicited personal, family of origin,

relationship, and graduate school information. Personal information included age, gender, number of times married, ethnicity, and U.S. citizenship. Additional items looked at extroversion, self-concept, life satisfaction, religion/religious importance, current stress level, amount of leisure time. Several questions asked about the person's family of origin, specifically about the quality and status of his or her parents' marriage, and his or her parents' education level.

Relationship variables or variables of mutual concern for both partners included about presence of children, years married, income, income source, financial stress, employment. Several items were included from Lund (1985) to examine relationship permanence (items 24-25), commitment (items 26-27), and investment (items 28-29). The commitment, permanence and investment items were taken together and analyzed as a marriage commitment scale (MARCOM). The alpha coefficient of MARCOM for the current study was .78. Other questions examined the perceptions of gender equity (items 31-33) and current and future household and financial responsibility (items 34-37). These seven items were then coded and analyzed together as an egalitarian gender role scale (EGR), and the alpha

calculated for this scale was .61. Physical intimacy in the marriage was assessed by items 38-39.

Items 95-96 and 106-111 elicited information regarding the impact graduate school had on the subject's marriage, whether the spouse held or is pursuing a professional degree, the type of program (area and degree) the person was studying, his or her grade point average, and their perception of their program. Items 93 and 94 queried about the subject and the spouse doing his or her fair share of the house work, and items 112 and 113 asked about fairness in parenting responsibilities. Some of the demographic items were developed by the author, and some were drawn from items developed by the Hendricks.

The Love Attitudes Scale Short Form
(LAS) (Appendix B: questions 40-63)

The is a 24-item scale based on Lee's (1973) love theory typology and scored on a Likert basis (A [or 1] = strongly agree, E [or 5] = strongly disagree). These items were then reversed for purposes of data analysis. The scale, drawn from the 42-item version of the Love Attitudes Scale, is composed of six 4-item subscales: Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Agape. The rationale for using the short form of the Love Attitude Scale was that these 4

items had the highest loadings for each of the subscales. Thus we could still obtain the needed data while trying to limit the length of the questionnaire. For five of the original subscales, alpha coefficients have been consistently reported above .70 (with Storge at .62) (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Test-retest reliabilities for the original subscales ranged from .70 to .82 (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Alpha coefficients for the LAS subscales in this study were: .68 for Eros, .64 for Ludus, .53 for Storge, .71 for Pragma, .59 for Mania, and .71 for Agape.

Self-Disclosure Index (SDI)
(Appendix B: questions 64-73)

The Self-Disclosure Index is a 10-item Likert instrument that assesses a person's willingness to disclose personal information to a particular person and was scored in a Likert basis (A [or 1] = strongly agree with the statement, E [or 5] = strongly disagree with the statement). These items were then reversed for purposes of data analysis. In this study, the target of self-disclosure was the person's spouse. Reported alpha coefficients for the SDI varied from .86 to .93, depending on target of disclosure (Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983). The alpha coefficient for the SDI in this study was .89.

Relationship Assessment Scale
(RAS) (Appendix B: questions 74-80)

This measure is a single factor scale measuring relationship satisfaction. It consists of seven Likert items scored from one to five. Lower scores indicate lower satisfaction. It correlates .80 with Spanier's widely used (1976) Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and has a reported alpha coefficient of .86 (Hendrick, 1981, 1988). For the current study, the RAS generated an alpha coefficient of .88.

Social Support Questionnaire-Six Item
Brief Measure (Revised) (SSQ-6R)
(Appendix B: questions 81-92)

The SSQ-6 was adapted from the full-scale SSQ (Sarason, Sarason, Shearin, & Pierce, 1987). Sarason et al. (1987) have demonstrated that the SSQ-6 is a psychometrically sound instrument which correlates highly with the SSQ. The authors found internal reliabilities for the SSQ-6 that ranged from .90 to .93.

This brief measure was modified for the current study so that it could be scored in a Likert type fashion. Because the original SSQ-6 collected data in an open-ended fashion (participants wrote down initials and their relationship to that person, e.g., "J.T., husband"), we directly ascertained the number of people who would meet the

criteria for a particular item, and then after each of the six items added the question "Is one of them your spouse?" to examine spousal support. Two separate alpha coefficient were calculated for the current study. The alpha for the six original questions was .85 and that for the spousal questions was .84.

Household (ETASK) and Parenting
Activity(EPARENTING) Questionnaire
(Appendix B: questions 97-105 and 114-121)

This questionnaire has 17 items; 9 asking about involvement in specific household activities, and 8 asking about parenting responsibility. This questionnaire was developed by Dancer and Gilbert (1993), however, one item (Attending a Parent training course) which was specific to their study was not used. Response categories for coding level of involvement range from 1=husband almost entirely to 5=wife almost entirely. Original alpha coefficients from the 1993 study were not available, however, alpha coefficients from the current study were calculated separately for participants who had children and those who did not. These scales were scored to measure egalitarian behaviors so that responses indicating shared responsibilities received a higher score (husband/wife entirely =0, husband/wife more=1, husband/wife about the

same=2). The alpha coefficient for ETASK was .64 and for EPARENTING (calculated on 119 participants) was .71.

Design and Procedure

Packets were mailed to each married graduate student. Medical and Law students were sent packets via U.S. mail, while students from the remaining disciplines were sent packets via campus mail. Each packet contained a cover letter explaining the study (see Appendix C), including approximate time involved to complete the questionnaire, the potential importance of the findings to the university, and information on how to contact the researcher if general feedback on the study's findings was desired. The packet contained two questionnaires, two scantron sheets, and two return envelopes. The participants and their spouses were asked to complete the questionnaire on scantrons and return questionnaires and scantrons via U.S. or campus mail in the return envelopes provided. If subjects chose not to participate, they were asked to return the unused questionnaires in the return envelopes. If a married couple with both partners in school had different last names, it is possible that received two packets. It is not known how many of these duplications occurred, but two duplicate packets from two couples were returned indicating that they had

received two packets. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) was sent to each graduate student. In addition, a letter was sent to each department informing them that packets were being sent to their married graduate students, and eliciting their help in delivering or returning the packets (see Appendix D).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Overview

Chapter III begins by describing the characteristics of the sample and proceeds to review the results of the proposed hypotheses concerning: (1) the correlates of marital satisfaction, (2) group comparisons on satisfaction including differences between asymmetrical and symmetrical marriages, (3) gender issues for graduate students, and (4) predictors of marital satisfaction. The chapter concludes with a frequency count for answers to the open-ended question "What do you think is the most important aspect in a successful marriage?"

Some 1031 questionnaire packets containing two questionnaires were sent to married medical (150 students), law (75 students) and graduate students (806 students). One hundred and one were returned by the departments as "undeliverable." Some 161 couples completed the survey, with another 33 questionnaires returned completed but without spousal data. Thus, of the 1,860 questionnaires delivered, 355 were returned completed for a total response rate of 19%. The usable data of 322 paired questionnaires represented a response rate of 17% (28% response rate from

medical students, 25% from law students, and 7% from Ph.D., master level, and non-degree students). Again only paired data were used in the following analyses.

The returned questionnaires had a total of only 9 missing data points that were not due to the fact that the subject was not in graduate school or did not have children (e.g., a spouse of a graduate student without children would only answer 105 of the 121 questions). Tabachnick and Fidell's (1989) suggestion for handling missing data points was considered, however, due to the low levels of missing data it was not pursued.

Description of the Sample

Of the 161 couples responding, 114 had only one partner in graduate school, while the remaining 47 couples had both partners in graduate school. The modal age range for the total sample was 25-29 (38.5%), with 17.4% 20-24, 19.9% 30-34, 12.4% 35-39, and 11.8% over 40. Most of the sample had been married only once (90.7%), while 6.8% of the sample had been married twice, and 2.5% of the sample had been married three or more times. In the sample, 55.6% of the couples had children while 44.4% did not. The modal range for the number of years married was 1-4 years (48.8%), with 5.6% less than one year, 19.3% 5-8 years, 12.7% 9-12 years and

13.7% 13 years or more. Most of the sample was Caucasian (86.0%), with .6% African American, 3.7% Oriental/Asian American, 5.9% Hispanic/Latino, and 3.7 % describing themselves as "Other." In the sample, 90.1% reported that they were U.S. citizens by birth, with 1.6% naturalized citizens, and 8.3% non-resident aliens.

Several questions inquired about the subjects' parents. For the sample, 28.3% had at least one parent graduate from college, while 25.2% had one or both parents with graduate degrees, 21.1% had one or both parents with some college, 18.6% had one or both parents graduate from high school, and 6.8% stated that neither parent completed high school. Most participants had parents who were still married or remained married until death (79.8%), with 19.3% stating their parents were divorced and .9% stating that their parents never married. The modal rating for the quality of parents' relationship was "very good" (33.9%), 25.2% rated it as "good," 20.8% rated it as "average," 14.3% rated it as "poor," and 5.9% rated it as "very poor."

Personally, most subjects stated that they felt positive about themselves (57.1%), with 22.7% feeling very positive, 17.1% feeling average about how they felt about themselves, 3.1% reported feeling negative, and no one endorsing feeling very negative about themselves. The modal

description about interpersonal style was "outgoing" (36.0%), with .6% describing themselves as "very quiet," 18.6% stating they were "quiet," 32.3% stating they were "average," and 12.4% describing themselves as "very outgoing." Most of the participants described their lives as "happy" (52.5%), with 2.5% stating they were "unhappy," 17.1% stating they were "okay," 28% stating their life was "very happy." No one endorsed that their life was "very unhappy." The modal response about leisure time was that it had "decreased a great deal" since starting graduate school (40.4%), with 38.2% stating that it had "decreased," 14.3% said it "remained the same," 5% said it "increased," and 2.2% said it "increased a great deal." Most participants stated that they did not live together prior to marriage (72.4%), with 27.6% endorsing that they did. Most of the participants reported that they had to relocate to come to graduate school (74.8%), with 25.2% stating that they did not. In the sample, 18% stated that they or their spouse were in their first year of graduate school, 26.7% were in their second, 24.5% were in their third, 20.5% were in their fourth or beyond, and 10.2% had just graduated.

Most of the participants were Protestant (60.6%), 15.5% described their faith as Catholic, 1.9% as Jewish, and 22% described themselves as "other." The modal importance

rating for their religion was "extremely important" (33.2%), with 25.8% stating that their religion was "very important," 19.3% stating that it was "moderately important," 10.2% stating that it was slightly important, and 11.5% stating that it was not important.

Finally, most participants stated that they were under a "moderate" level of stress (51.2%), with 22.4% stating that they were under "extreme stress", 18.6% that their stress level was "average", 6.5% that it was "slight", and 1.2% that they had "none". The modal response to the question about financial stress was "average" (37.3%), with 17.7% stating that it was "very stressful," 26.4% stating it was between "very stressful" and "average" 12.1% stating it was "not stressful," and 6.5% stating it was between "average" and "not stressful." The modal income range was between \$20,000-\$35,000 (33.5%), with 30.1% \$35,000-\$50,000, 14.9% \$10,000-\$20,000, 11.8% 10,000 or less, and 9.6% \$50,000 and up. The modal response for the primary source of income was self-employment (41.3%), with 38.5% endorsing spousal employment, 14.6% endorsing loans, 3.7% endorsing grants, fellowships, scholarships, and 1.9% endorsing parental support.

Simple statistics

The number of questions asked of the participants and the subsequent variables and scales gleaned from the data was very large. The means and standard deviations for demographic items and scales can be found in Appendix I.

Analyses of the Data

Several types of analyses were conducted on the data collected on paired marital subjects. Pearson correlations examined relationships between the demographic variables, measures, and selected difference scores from each married couple, and the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS). To examine group differences ANOVAS were calculated. ANOVAS include: marital satisfaction by children, marital satisfaction by marriage type (symmetrical/asymmetrical), equity of household and financial responsibility by marriage type, equity of parenting responsibility by marriage type, and egalitarian gender role by marriage type. To examine gender issues in graduate students, ANOVAS were calculated employing graduate student gender as the independent variable and marital satisfaction, stress level, department isolation, program support, and relationship with faculty members as dependent variables. Finally, stepwise multiple regressions examined predictors of marital satisfaction.

Correlates of satisfaction

The first area of interest was what variables correlated with marital satisfaction. These correlates fall into two categories: (1) demographic or single item measures and (2) summed or scaled measures.

Table 1 lists single item variables which were primarily found at the beginning of the questionnaire and shows their correlations with the Relationship Assessment Scale. All variables in the survey were recoded (if needed) to reflect the proper direction for the correlations. For example, the variable addressing how the person perceived his or her life satisfaction was recoded so that 0 = very unhappy and 4 = very happy. Thus, high levels were always in the positive direction. Binary variables were coded as follows: children (0= no children, 1= children), cohabitation (0= yes, 1= no), and relocation (0= no and 1= yes). In acknowledgment of the familywise error rate introduced through the numerous comparisons, a .01 level of significance was used for the correlations in Table 1.

Significant results found in Table 1 included a relationship between how positive a person feels about him/herself and how satisfied the person is in his or her marriage ($r=.29$, $p < .001$). Also a significant relationship was found between how happy the person describes his or her

Table 1: Correlations between demographic variables and the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) for the total sample and for males and females separately

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>MALES</u>	<u>FEMALES</u>
VARIABLE	RAS	RAS	RAS
AGE	-.06	-.11	-.02
TIMES MARRIED	-.00	-.02	.01
CHILDREN	-.12	-.17	-.06
YEARS MARRIED	-.03	-.07	.00
PARENTS EDUCATION	.16*	.13	.18
QUALITY OF PARENT'S MARRIAGE	.12	.17	.08
EXTROVERSION	.10	.09	.11
SELF CONCEPT	.29**	.24*	.34**
LIFE SATISFACTION	.55**	.45**	.65**
COHABITATION	-.06	-.01	-.12
RELOCATION	-.08	-.06	-.11
YEAR IN GRADUATE SCHOOL	.03	.07	.01
RELIGION	.16*	.21*	.11
STRESS LEVEL	.17*	.11	.23*
LEISURE TIME	.10	.07	.14
INCOME	-.03	-.10	.03
FINANCIAL STRESS	.15*	.12	.18
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.03	.10	-.04
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK(SPOUSE)	.34**	.33**	.40**
FAIR SHARE PARENTING (SELF)	-.04	-.13	.04
FAIR SHARE PARENTING(SPOUSE)	.27*	.38**	.19*
IMPACT OF GRADUATE SCHOOL	.32**	.29**	.34**
CHANGE IN INTIMACY	.28**	.29**	.28**
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.52**	.46**	.59**

*Significant at $p < .01$ **Significant at $p < .001$

life to be with how satisfied the person is in his or her marriage ($r=.55$, $p<.001$). The positive correlation for stress level ($r=.17$, $p<.01$) and financial stress ($r=.15$, $p<.01$) indicate that as personal and financial stress is rated as more positive, it is related to more positive ratings on marital satisfaction. This means lower stress is correlated with higher satisfaction. Higher parental education ($r=.16$, $p<.01$) and higher importance placed on religion ($r=.16$, $p<.01$) were also found to be significantly and positively related to marital satisfaction. Finally, a spouse doing his or her "fair share" of the housework ($r=.34$, $p<.001$), a spouse doing his or her "fair share of the parenting" ($r=.27$, $p<.01$), a person's perception of the positive impact of graduate school on his or her marriage ($r=.32$, $p<.001$), a positive change in the quality and quantity of intimacy since graduate school ($r=.28$, $p<.001$), and sexual satisfaction ($r=.52$, $p<.001$) were all correlated with marital satisfaction. Correlations between the RAS and sexual satisfaction as well as "fair share" of the housework and parenting support Hypothesis 1.

The correlations for men and women in Table 1 were examined to see if there were significant differences between the genders. A significant difference was found for life satisfaction, with the correlation between life

satisfaction and relationship satisfaction stronger for women than for men.

Table 2 shows correlations between several measures and the Relationship Assessment Scale. Marital commitment ($r=.63$, $p<.001$), self-disclosure ($r=.43$, $p<.001$), social support from others ($r=.22$, $p<.001$), and support from spouse ($r=.55$, $p<.001$) were significantly related to marital satisfaction. These results conclude support for Hypothesis 1. Also found in Table 2 were measures assessing egalitarian gender roles and how household tasks were divided between partners. While the direction of the correlation for egalitarian gender roles was in the predicted direction, it was not significant at .01. Thus Hypothesis 2a was not supported. Finally, Table 2 also shows correlations between the Love Styles and the Relationship Assessment Scale. Eros ($r=.62$, $p<.001$), Agape ($r=.28$, $p<.001$), and Storge ($r=.20$, $p<.001$) were significantly related to marital satisfaction, while Ludus ($r=-.47$, $p<.001$) was negatively correlated with marital satisfaction. The correlations in columns 2 and 3 of Table 2 did not differ by gender. (These correlations are consistent with existing research.)

Congruency or similarity between partners was hypothesized to be an important correlate of marital

Table 2: Correlations between scales and Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) for the total sample and for males and females separately

	TOTAL	MALES	FEMALES
SCALE	RAS	RAS	RAS
EROS	.62**	.59**	.65**
LUDUS	-.47**	-.50**	-.46**
STORGE	.20**	.23*	.15
PRAGMA	.05	-.03	.13
MANIA	.05	.06	.03
AGAPE	.28**	.29**	.28**
MARRIAGE COMMITMENT	.63**	.62**	.62**
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.43**	.51**	.36**
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	.22**	.20*	.25**
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.55**	.48**	.62**
EQUITABLE TASK (HOUSE)	-.00	-.09	.08
EGALITARIAN GENDER ROLE	.12	.13	.11

*Significant at $p < .01$ **Significant at $p < .001$

satisfaction. Specifically, dissimilarity of partners' love styles was thought to be related to lower marital satisfaction (Hypothesis 3). Absolute difference scores for spouses were calculated for each of the love styles. Table 3 shows correlations of love style difference scores with RAS for the total sample and for men and women separately. Significant correlations were found in the expected direction for Pragma ($r = -.09$, $p < .05$) for the total sample, for Ludus ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$) for males, and for Eros ($r = -.26$, $P < .001$) for females. Thus Hypothesis 3 was only minimally supported.

Table 3 also shows the difference scores calculated for each couple for importance of religion (single item) and for the Egalitarian Gender Role Scale (EGR). As proposed in Hypothesis 4, differences in the partners attitudes toward of religion was thought to be negatively related to marital satisfaction. However, a significant positive correlation was found ($r = .15$, $p < .01$), and thus Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Hypothesis 2b proposed that incongruence in a couple's beliefs about gender roles would be negatively related to marital satisfaction. A significant negative correlation was found ($r = -.16$, $p < .05$) for females. Thus, Hypothesis 2b was minimally supported.

Table 3: Correlations between Love Style difference scores, importance of religion difference scores, traditional gender role difference scores and the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) for the total sample and for males and females separately

	TOTAL	MALES	FEMALES
DIFFERENCE SCORE	RAS	RAS	RAS
AGAPE	-.06	-.04	-.08
EROS	-.07	.12	-.26***
LUDUS	-.08	-.20**	.03
MANIA	-.04	.06	.02
PRAGMA	-.09*	-.07	-.11
STORGE	-.03	-.03	-.04
RELIGION IMPORTANCE	.15**	.14*	.16*
GENDER ROLE	-.13	-.08	-.16*

*Significant at $p < .05$ **Significant at $p < .01$

***Significant at $p < .001$

Finally, a full correlation matrix was calculated for RAS with most demographic variables for the entire population (Appendix F), and for males and females, respectively (Appendices G and H). Significant differences between men and women occurred rarely.

Group comparisons on marital satisfaction

The next set of analyses examined group differences. Of specific interest was whether couples with children were less satisfied than were couples without children (Hypothesis 5), whether partners in symmetrical graduate student marriages (both partner in school) were more satisfied than those in asymmetrical marriages (Hypothesis 6), and whether partners in asymmetrical graduate student marriages would report more inequalities in household, financial, (and child) responsibilities than those in symmetrical marriages.

An ANOVA was calculated to determine if there was a difference in relationship satisfaction for people with or without children (see Table 4). Persons without children reported higher levels of satisfaction ($\bar{M} = 4.39$) than marriages with children ($\bar{M} = 4.23$). This finding partially supports Hypothesis 5. However, there was no difference between the genders as proposed in Hypothesis 5.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance--Relationship Assessment
Scale (RAS) BY CHILDREN

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Group	1	2.0835	2.0835	4.7534	.0300
Within Groups	319	139.8254	.4383		
Total	320	141.9090			

An ANOVA was calculated to examine whether there was a difference in relationship satisfaction (RAS) between symmetrical and asymmetrical marriages (see Table 5). Forty-seven couples or 29.2% of the sample were in symmetrical (both in school) marriages, and 114 couples were in asymmetrical marriages. There was a significant difference between the groups, with persons in symmetrical marriages reporting higher levels of satisfaction ($\bar{M} = 4.44$) than those in asymmetrical marriages ($\bar{M} = 4.27$). This finding supports Hypothesis 6.

ANOVAs were conducted to examine whether asymmetrical marriages had more differences in household and financial tasks (see Table 6) and parental responsibilities (see Table 7) than symmetrical marriages. As previously stated ETASK was a composite score for items 97-105 in the questionnaire, coded so that equitable responses received a higher score (husband/wife entirely =0, husband/wife more=1, husband/wife about the same=2), and EPARENTING was a composite score for items 114-121 in the questionnaire, and coded so that equitable responses received a higher score (husband/wife entirely =0, husband/wife more=1, husband/wife about the same=2). There was a significant difference between asymmetrical and symmetrical graduate student marriages on household tasks, with persons in symmetrical marriages

Table 5: Analysis of Variance--Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) BY MARRIAGE TYPE (symmetrical, asymmetrical)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	1.8533	1.8533	4.2211	.0407
Within Groups	319	140.0557	.4390		
Total	320	141.9090			

Table 6: Analysis of Variance--equity of household and financial responsibility (ETASK) BY MARRIAGE TYPE (symmetrical, asymmetrical)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	2.1799	2.1799	13.2723	.0003
Within Groups	320	52.5596	.1642		
Total	321	54.7395			

Table 7: Analysis of Variance--equity of parental responsibilities (EPARENTING) BY MARRIAGE TYPE (symmetrical, asymmetrical)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	.0076	.0076	.0348	.8524
Within Groups	117	25.4423	.2175		
Total	118	25.4498			

reporting higher levels of equality ($\bar{M} = 1.03$) than those in asymmetrical marriages ($\bar{M} = .85$), $F(1,320) = 13.27$, $p < .01$. The groups did not differ for parenting responsibilities. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was only partially supported.

Finally, we examined whether persons in asymmetrical and symmetrical marriages differed in their beliefs about gender roles (see Table 8), as defined by the egalitarian gender role scale. Persons in symmetrical marriages (both partners in graduate school) reported higher egalitarian gender roles ($\bar{M} = .73$) than persons in asymmetrical marriages ($\bar{M} = .60$, $F(1,320) = 21.71$, $p < .0001$).

Gender issues for graduate students

The next set of analyses investigated gender differences specifically in graduate students. Of particular interest was whether female graduate students were less satisfied in their marriages than were male graduate students (Hypothesis 8), and whether female graduate students would report more stress, more isolation, and less support than would male graduate students (Hypothesis 9).

ANOVAs were employed to test both hypotheses (see Table 9). No significant differences were found in relationship satisfaction between male and female graduate students. In

Table 8: Analysis of Variance--Egalitarian Gender Role
(EGR) BY MARRIAGE TYPE (symmetrical, asymmetrical)

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	1.0947	1.0947	21.7072	.0000
Within Groups	320	16.1377	.0504		
Total	321	17.2324			

Table 9: Analysis of Variance--Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) by gender for graduate students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	.1159	.1159	.3165	.5743
Within Groups	205	75.0390	.3660		
Total	206	75.1549			

examining whether men and women differed on stress level, departmental isolation, program support and quality of relationship with faculty members, as shown in Tables 10-13, no significant differences were found. Thus Hypotheses 8 and 9 were not supported.

Multiple Regression

A series of multiple regression analyses was conducted to examine which variables could be used to predict marital satisfaction. These analyses were not tied to any specific hypothesis, and stepwise regression was used. The first analysis used demographic or single item variables which had been found to be significantly related to marital satisfaction (see Table 1). One item in Table 1 which was correlated with marital satisfaction was excluded. This item, asking about whether the participant's spouse was doing his or her fair share of the parenting, was excluded because approximately half of the participants did not have children. Table 14 shows that of the 10 variables entered, four were found to predict marital satisfaction, producing a Multiple R of .674 and an R Square of .455. The variable/question with the highest beta weight (Beta =.33) was "I would describe my life right now as: very happy/ happy/ okay/ unhappy/ very unhappy." The second most

Table 10: Analysis of Variance--Stress level by gender for graduate students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	.0626	.0626	.0844	.7718
Within Groups	206	152.8941	.7422		
Total	207	152.9567			

Table 11: Analysis of Variance--Department isolation by gender for graduate students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	.1842	.1842	.1191	.7304
Within Groups	196	303.2349	1.5471		
Total	197	303.4192			

Table 12: Analysis of Variance--Program support by gender
for graduate students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	.1987	.1987	.1381	.7105
Within Groups	196	281.9629	1.4386		
Total	197	282.1616			

Table 13: Analysis of Variance--Relationship with faculty members by gender for graduate students

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	Signif of F
Between Groups	1	.8593	.8593	.8774	.3501
Within Groups	196	191.9538	.9794		
Total	197	192.8131			

Table 14: Demographic Variables Regressed on RAS

Variable	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
LIFE SATISFACTION	.33**	.30	139.68
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.32**	(.09)	(36.18)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.22**	(.05)	(17.86)
IMPACT OF GRADUATE SCHOOL	.09*	(.01)	(19.75)
FINANCIAL STRESS	.03		
PARENTS EDUCATION	.06		
CHANGE IN INTIMACY	-.07		
RELIGION	.07		
SELF CONCEPT	.08		
STRESS	-.04		
R Square	.46		
Overall F(4,316)	65.88**		

*Significant at $p < .05$

**Significant at $p < .00001$

weighted variable ($Beta = .32$) queried about satisfaction "regarding the sexual aspects of (his or her) marriage." The third most weighted variable ($Beta = .23$) examined the participant's spouse doing his or her fair share of the housework. Finally, the last variable examined the impact of graduate school on the participant's marriage ($Beta = .09$). Table 15 and Table 16 show the same analysis for males and females, respectively. The factor with the highest beta weight for both men ($Beta = .30$) and women ($Beta = .38$) was satisfaction in physical intimacy.

A second stepwise regression used measures which had been found to be significantly correlated with marital satisfaction (see Table 2). Table 17 shows that the Marital Commitment Scale generated the largest beta weight ($Beta = .291$), followed by Eros ($Beta = .289$), Social Support (spouse) ($Beta = .17$), Ludus ($Beta = -.16$), and finally the Self-Disclosure Index ($Beta = .08$). These scales generated a Multiple R of .753 and an R Square of .566. Table 18 and Table 19 show the same analysis for males and females respectively. The factor with the highest beta weight for both men and women was marital commitment ($Beta = .35$ for men and $.38$ for women).

A third stepwise multiple regression analysis examined the 18 previously noted demographic variables and measures

Table 15: Demographic Variables Regressed on RAS for males separately

Variable	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.30**	.21	42.12
LIFE SATISFACTION	.28*	(.08)	(10.45)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.24*	(.05)	(04.49)
IMPACT OF GRADUATE SCHOOL	.13		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.04		
PARENTS EDUCATION	.04		
CHANGE IN INTIMACY	.03		
RELIGION	.11		
SELF CONCEPT	.06		
STRESS	-.03		
R Square	.34		
Overall F(3,157)	27.18**		
*Significant at $p < .001$		**Significant at $p < .0001$	

Table 16: Demographic Variables Regressed on RAS for females separately

Variable	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
LIFE SATISFACTION	.35**	.42	114.35
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.38**	(.10)	(29.56)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.23**	(.05)	(15.54)
SELF CONCEPT	.12*	(.01)	(14.95)
IMPACT OF GRADUATE SCHOOL	.04		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.05		
PARENTS EDUCATION	.05		
CHANGE IN INTIMACY	-.09		
RELIGION	.03		
STRESS	-.01		
R Square	.58		
Overall F(4,155)	54.30**		
*Significant at $p < .05$		**Significant at $p < .00001$	

Table 17: Measures Regressed on RAS

Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
MARITAL COMMITMENT	.29****	.38	192.90
EROS	.29****	(.13)	(29.39)
LUDUS	-.16***	(.03)	(40.71)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.17**	(.02)	(22.00)
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.08*	(.01)	(18.49)
AGAPE	.06		
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHERS)	-.06		
STORGE	.04		
R Square	.57		
Overall F(5,315)	82.31		
<hr/> *Significant at p<.05 **Significant at p<.001 ***Significant at p<.0001 ****Significant at p<.00001			

Table 18: Measures Regressed on RAS for males separately

Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
MARITAL COMMITMENT	.35****	.37	95.25
LUDUS	-.26****	(.09)	(27.39)
EROS	.22***	(.06)	(11.57)
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.18**	(.02)	(10.20)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.13		
AGAPE	.07		
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHERS)	-.03		
STORGE	.08		
R Square	.54		
Overall F(4,156)	46.09		
*Significant at p<.01 ***Significant at p<.001 ****Significant at p<.00001			

Table 19: Measures Regressed on RAS for females separately

Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
MARITAL COMMITMENT	.38****	.38	97.01
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.28***	(.12)	(17.11)
EROS	.26***	(.04)	(17.28)
LUDUS	-.10		
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.06		
AGAPE	.04		
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHERS)	-.01		
STORGE	.01		
R Square	.55		
Overall F(5,315)	62.62		
*Significant at $p < .01$ **Significant at $p < .001$ ****Significant at $p < .00001$			

which significantly correlated with RAS. As shown in Table 20, eleven variables produced a Multiple R of .811 and a R Squared of .659. The factor with the highest beta weight was the Marital Commitment Scale ($Beta = .24$), followed by Eros ($Beta = .20$), satisfaction in the sexual aspects of the marriage ($Beta = .16$), Ludus ($Beta = -.15$), Social Support(spouse) ($Beta = .14$), whether the participant perceived his or her spouse doing their "fair share of the housework" ($Beta = .13$), life satisfaction ($Beta = .11$), self concept ($Beta = .10$), Social Support (others) ($Beta = -.09$), Self-Disclosure Index ($Beta = .09$), and finally financial stress ($Beta = .08$). Table 21 and Table 22 show the same analysis for males and females respectively. The factor with the highest beta weight for men was satisfaction in marital commitment ($Beta = .32$), and the factor with the highest beta weight for women was satisfaction in physical intimacy ($Beta = .24$). Appendix J has the correlations among these variables.

Finally, a fourth analysis was conducted with 17 demographic variables and the measures which significantly correlated with RAS excluding the marital commitment scale. As shown in Table 23, ten variables produced a Multiple R of .768 and a R Squared of .589. The factors with the highest beta weights were Social Support (spouse) ($Beta = .21$),

Table 20: Demographic Variables and Measures Regressed on RAS

Variable/Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
MARITAL COMMITMENT	.24*****	.38	192.44
EROS	.20*****	(.13)	(28.97)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.16****	(.01)	(11.14)
LUDUS	-.15****	(.02)	(15.30)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.14**	(.01)	(8.67)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.13***	(.02)	(25.20)
LIFE SATISFACTION	.11*	(.06)	(25.33)
SELF CONCEPT	.10*	(.01)	(7.81)
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.09*	(.01)	(4.16)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	-.09*	(.01)	(5.27)
FINANCIAL STRESS	.08*	(.01)	(6.43)

R Square .66
Overall F(11,308) 54.15

*Significant at $p < .05$ **Significant at $p < .01$
 Significant at $p < .001$ *Significant at $p < .0001$
 *****Significant at $p < .00001$

Table 21: Demographic Variables and Measures Regressed on RAS for men separately

Variable/Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
MARITAL COMMITMENT	.32***	.37	95.25
LUDUS	-.25***	(.08)	(27.39)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.23***	(.08)	(8.46)
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.17**	(.03)	(9.58)
SELF CONCEPT	.16**	(.02)	(6.81)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.16*	(.01)	(5.70)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	-.12*	(.01)	(4.12)
EROS	.09		
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.10		
LIFE SATISFACTION	.07		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.06		
R Square	.60		
Overall F(7,153)	33.19		
*Significant at $p < .05$ **Significant at $p < .01$ ***Significant at $p < .00001$			

Table 22: Demographic Variables and Measures Regressed on RAS for females separately

Variable/Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
LIFE SATISFACTION	.23**	.42	111.74
MARITAL COMMITMENT	.23***	(.13)	(15.03)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.24****	(.06)	(16.60)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.24****	(.03)	(11.46)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.16**	(.03)	(7.50)
SELF CONCEPT	.11*	(.01)	(8.31)
EROS	.07		
LUDUS	-.05		
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.03		
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	-.05		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.07		
R Square	.68		
Overall F(6,152)	52.85		
*Significant at p<.05 **Significant at p<.001 ***Significant at p<.0001 ****Significant at p<.00001			

Table 23: Demographic Variables and Measures Regressed on RAS excluding the marital commitment scale

Variable/Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.21***	.30	138.63
LIFE SATISFACTION	.20***	(.14)	(15.90)
LUDUS	-.21***	(.05)	(21.51)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.21***	(.05)	(9.41)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.17***	(.03)	(8.90)
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.12**	(.01)	(10.01)
EROS	.11*	(.01)	(8.96)
SELF CONCEPT	.07		
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	-.08		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.07		
R Square	.59		
Overall F(7,312)	63.92		
*Significant at $p < .05$ **Significant at $p < .01$ ***Significant at $p < .00001$			

Ludus ($Beta = -.21$), satisfaction in the sexual aspects of the marriage ($Beta = .21$), life satisfaction ($Beta = .20$), whether the participant perceived his or her spouse doing their "fair share of the housework" ($Beta = .17$), Self-Disclosure Index ($Beta = .12$), and finally Eros ($Beta = .11$). Table 24 and Table 25 show the same analysis for males and females respectively. The factor with the highest beta weight for men was the Ludus ($Beta = -.28$), and the factor with the highest beta weight for women was spousal support ($Beta = .32$).

Open-ended Question

Responses from the open-ended question are found in Appendix I. Two hundred and four subjects out of the 322 wrote a response to the question "What do you think is the most important aspect of a successful marriage?" This question was at the end of the questionnaire and may not have been seen by subjects who did not answer all 121 questions. However, the information is still considered to be valuable. Table 26 shows the frequency count for areas people found "important." Included in this table are open-ended responses from 14 of the 33 unpaired subjects.

Table 24: Demographic Variables and Measures Regressed on RAS excluding marital commitment for males separately

Variable/Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.21**	.26	56.33
LIFE SATISFACTION	.17**	(.12)	(7.13)
LUDUS	-.28***	(.08)	(5.02)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.18**	(.05)	(3.79)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.16*	(.03)	(4.38)
EROS	.14*	(.01)	(4.64)
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	-.08		
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.10		
SELF CONCEPT	.05		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.03		

R Square .55
Overall F(6,154) 31.37

*Significant at $p < .05$ **Significant at $p < .01$
***Significant at $p < .00001$

Table 25: Demographic Variables and Measures Regressed on
RAS excluding marital commitment scale for females
separately

Variable/Measure	STANDARD BETA	R SQUARE (CHANGE)	F (CHANGE)
LIFE SATISFACTION	.26**	.42	111.75
SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)	.32***	(.12)	(19.14)
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	.28***	(.05)	(17.96)
FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.20**	(.04)	(8.85)
SELF CONCEPT	.12*	(.01)	(10.76)
EROS	.08		
LUDUS	-.11		
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.05		
SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)	-.06		
FINANCIAL STRESS	.06		

R Square .64
Overall F(5,153) 55.03

*Significant at $p < .05$

**Significant at $p < .0001$

***Significant at $p < .00001$

Table 26: Frequency count of the main themes from each open-ended question response. Includes data from unpaired responses.

THEME	FREQUENCY
COMMUNICATION	94
SPIRITUAL/RELIGION	36
TRUST	34
COMMITMENT	30
LOVE	27
RESPECT	24
FRIENDSHIP	17
UNDERSTANDING	15
INTIMACY/PHYSICAL	12
SHARING/CARING	11
HONESTY	11
SENSE OF HUMOR	10
RESPONSIBILITY	8
MUTUAL INTEREST/ SIMILAR VALUES	7
FUN	6
COMPROMISE	6
HARD WORK	5
TIME	5
SPACE/ SELF SATISFACTION	4
FORGIVING	4
SUPPORTIVENESS	3
FIDELITY	3
FLEXIBILITY	3
COOPERATION	2
SELFLESSNESS	1
COMPANIONSHIP	1
NO PMS/NO CREDIT CARDS	1

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study explored marital satisfaction in graduate student marriages, and examined factors which may contribute to marital satisfaction. Specific areas of interest included (1) correlates of satisfaction, with a focus on perceived equity, self-disclosure, commitment, gender roles, partners' love style congruence, and religious congruence; (2) exploring satisfaction by examining differences between couples with children and without children, and differences between symmetrical and asymmetrical couples; and (3) exploring gender differences in the graduate school experience by examining differences between male and female graduate students on marital satisfaction and academic variables. Regression analyses were also conducted, although they were not tied to specific hypotheses. This chapter further discusses the results of the analyses and provides suggestions for additional research.

Correlates of Marital Satisfaction

Perceived Equity, Self-Disclosure, Commitment, Sexual Satisfaction and Marital Satisfaction

Congruent with Dancer and Gilbert's (1993) finding, a significant correlation was found between relationship satisfaction (RAS) and perception of equity questions, "Do you think your spouse is doing his/her fair share of the household work/parenting?" This was the case for both men and women (higher satisfaction correlated with higher perception of equity). This result supports Hypothesis 1, and speaks to the participant's belief about what the spouse "should" do and whether he or she "is" doing it. This finding may demonstrate the importance of perceived equity or what is "fair," and its relationship with marital satisfaction.

Also consistent with previous research was the finding that greater self-disclosure, commitment, and sexual satisfaction would be correlated with higher satisfaction. The results of this research again support the importance of these factors in marriage.

Gender Roles and Marital Satisfaction

The changing makeup of students in graduate programs (Gilbert, 1993; Scheinkman, 1988) is an illustration of

changing roles for men and women in our society. The more traditional model of a two-parent family with children, where the husband earns the money, and the wife stays at home to run the household and to care for the children may be becoming less common as women pursue careers. As stated in Hypothesis 2, the presence of egalitarian gender roles (EGR) in graduate student marriages was expected to be positively related to marital satisfaction. The idea behind this hypothesis was that beliefs about responsibilities and opportunities that were more "democratic" and less steeped in traditional or rigid guidelines would be more congruent with the realities of today's family, especially families in which a member (or members) is pursuing a graduate degree. While the results show a relationship in the expected direction, it was not significant.

One factor that may contribute to the lack of significance of the relationship between egalitarian gender role and relationship satisfaction is that an established gender role scale was not used in this analysis. When selecting the components of the full questionnaire, brevity was an important consideration in order to maximize return rates. Reliability and validity of the EGR should be considered in future research.

Another factor that may have depressed the expected significant correlation between egalitarian gender roles and marital satisfaction was that the sample was overall highly satisfied with their marriages ($M = 4.32$) and endorsed very egalitarian gender roles. As compared to other published research on the RAS, the mean for relationship satisfaction in this sample tended to be higher (see Appendix L). Perhaps more differences could be detected with a more heterogeneous sample.

The second part of Hypothesis 2 proposed that greater incongruence in gender role beliefs would be related to lower relationship satisfaction. The essence of the Egalitarian Gender Role Scale was the person's perception of what "should be" and what "would be" (beliefs and expectations) in their marriage and not necessarily "what is" (behaviors). The results of the analysis were not significant but were in the expected direction. Again, this was a very homogenous sample with relatively high endorsement of Egalitarian Gender roles and marital satisfaction, and small difference scores between partners. Perhaps with a more heterogeneous sample a stronger relationship could be detected.

Partner Congruence in Love Styles and Marital Satisfaction

As proposed in Hypothesis 3, it was expected that incongruency in partners' love style would be negatively related to marital satisfaction. The proposed hypothesis did not specify which love style would impact satisfaction. Thus higher incongruency in all love styles were expected to be related to lower satisfaction. This hypothesis was essentially unsupported. Possible limitations for these finding are that the sample were very satisfied with their marriages and difference scores were low. In addition, it may be that partners' perceived congruence on love styles (as well as attitudes and values) is more important than actual congruence.

Although not related to a specific hypothesis, significant positive relationships were found between the Relationship Assessment Scale and Eros, Agape and Storge. A significant negative relationship was found between RAS and Ludus. This finding supports previous research on the Love Attitudes Scale (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988).

Partner Congruence in Religious Importance and Marital Satisfaction

As proposed in Hypothesis 4, partner congruence in the importance of religion was thought to be related to marital

satisfaction. While it was found that the greater the partners' valuing of religion, the greater the satisfaction, partner congruence on this variable was not related to satisfaction. In fact, the opposite relationship was found. Because the sample was on average both maritally satisfied and very religious, and difference scores were small, restriction of range may have impacted the correlations.

Group Comparisons on Marital Satisfaction

Children and Marital Satisfaction

When comparing couples with children to those without children, the couples without children reported higher levels of satisfaction, though this finding was significant only at the .05 level. The presence of children increases responsibility, adds to financial demands, and changes the parameters of the family unit. Specifically in graduate student marriages, parenting responsibilities do not ebb and flow with semester requirements and final examinations. Thus having children could impact overall stress and overall life satisfaction, both of which were related to marital satisfaction.

Asymmetrical and Symmetrical Marriages and Marital Satisfaction

Significant differences were found between asymmetrical (one partner a student) and symmetrical marriages (both partners were students), with symmetrical marriages showing higher satisfaction. This finding supports previous research by Scheinkman (1988) proposing that shared experiences and empathy for a situation may impact partners' expectations of each other. In other words, people going through similar experiences know what to (and what not to) expect from one another.

Because of the responsibilities of graduate school, partners in asymmetrical marriages were proposed to be less equitable in the tasks/chores of the household, finances, and parenting (Hypothesis 7). The rationale was that the spouse not in school would be under less stress and could take on more of the home responsibilities. Differences between couple types were found for household tasks and finances but not for parenting. A limitation for the parenting issue was the smaller number of participants who were parents. In summary, symmetrical marriage partners were more satisfied in their marriages, and asymmetrical marriage partners had more differences in household responsibilities than did symmetrical marriage partners.

Graduate Students and Gender Issues

Hypotheses 8 proposed that female graduate students would be less satisfied with their marriages than male graduate students. It was expected that women would have more obligations (roles) and therefore more stress, and this stress could lead to less satisfaction in their marriages. However, women and men did not differ in marital satisfaction. Nor did men and women differ in perceived department isolation, faculty member support, or stress level as proposed by Hypothesis 9. One possible explanation is that the sample was a self-selected, positive, and satisfied group of individuals who were too homogeneous for differences to be detected. Another plausible explanation is that academic departments do not treat men and women differently. Much of the previous research cited on this topic was over ten years old, and perhaps there has been a shift in gender sensitivity in academic institutions.

Predictors of Marital Satisfaction

An interesting finding of this study concerns the prediction of marital satisfaction. In predicting marital satisfaction, aspects of self (e.g., presence of Eros Love Style, absence of Ludus Love Style, current happiness, self concept, relationship commitment, self-disclosure) were

important, as well as beliefs about one's spouse (e.g., spouse's commitment, doing household chores, spousal support). Mutual issues (e.g., sexual satisfaction and financial stress) were also found to be predictive. The results of these analyses demonstrate the complex nature of love and marital satisfaction. For individuals and practitioners wanting to improve marital satisfaction, each of these categories (self issues, other's behavior, and areas of mutual concern) need to be addressed. For example, it may be difficult to help a person improve his or her marriage if he or she is unwilling to examine his or her own issues and expects the therapist to only "fix" the other person's issues or mutual concerns.

The results also demonstrate the importance of behavior. For scientist-practitioners, these specific independent variables may be a basis of behavioral change in improving the quality of relationships. For example, an individual can be made cognizant that his or her spouse does not feel that the individual is doing his or her fair share of the housework. Thus by increasing their own household responsibility, they may be able to improve their marriage. This can be a specific and measurable intervention in therapy.

Open-ended Question

The open-ended question "What is the most important aspect of a successful marriage?" was added to the questionnaire with the hopes that it could add insight to this large and imposing issue. By examining the frequency of the themes, it was clear that the most common response was "communication." However, the individual responses offered fruitful information:

I think that having a solid foundation is a key to maintaining a successful marriage during graduate school. My wife and I were married almost two years before I started, and we were both thankful that we didn't have the additional stress of getting adjusted to living together before starting school. The key is to communicate with one another and keep all of your problems current and out in the open. (participant #58)

By giving the participants a space to write their feelings, intense emotions were noted, and ideas transcended mere categories:

Laughter and fun, communication, active participation by both, initiative by both partners, supportiveness, dreams and goals, to genuinely like the essence of each others being, being able to trust your partner independently, to know what to do when and how in given situations, compatible attitudes, approaches, and passions for life, understanding and tolerance, chemistry, bringing out the best in each other naturally through a positive mode (not competitive), fostering spiritual growth in each other, enhancing each others human spirit, friendship (commitment, energy, attitude, kindness, ceremony and pageantry), scorepad mentality has no place in marriage, concentrate on personal integrity, goals, commitments and enrichment and long term

wellness, enjoy the journey, make it good as it goes along.(participant #161)

These examples, as well as others found in Appendix J, also highlight the importance of self, others, and mutual issues. Upon reading the responses and examining the themes, it is also apparent the not all themes were assessed (e.g., trust).

Limitations of This Study and Suggestions for Future Research

There are limitations to this research. The sample appeared to be self-selected, as respondents were on average very satisfied with their marriages. Perhaps future research could include graduate student couples receiving marital therapy from a university counseling center. Or perhaps extending the participant pool to other universities would help to increase heterogeneity in the sample. A better sampling strategy could also produce a larger sample so that more comparisons could be made. Generalizability of this study is limited because most of the participant were white, middle class, and U.S. residents. Thus cross-cultural comparisons could not be made.

Again, there were many variables that we did not assess (e.g., trust, fidelity, respect). Also the way some variables were assessed could be improved. Perhaps a more

well established gender role scale could be used, and given the importance of religion in the open-ended responses a better way of assessing religiosity could be used. An additional problems is that the final regression analysis had 18 variables entered in a stepwise fashion.

Unfortunately, the high number of variables in the analysis is a cause for concern. There were only 17 times more cases than independent variables instead of the 20 suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (1989). Thus the results should be interpreted with caution.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to gain insight into factors that contribute to marital satisfaction in graduate student marriages. Many factors were examined and found to be important including: personal stress, relationship commitment, self-disclosure, social support, importance of religion, symmetry of marriage, physical intimacy, "fair" division of responsibility, academic stress, financial stress, specific love styles, aspects of gender roles, and personal happiness.

The goal of any research is to gain information to benefit people. This research was undertaken to improve the data base for scientists and practitioners who are

interested in marriage in general and graduate student marriages in particular. While this study had significant limitations, it is hoped that the findings can benefit man and womankind.

REFERENCES

- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Baker, H. K. (1993). Counseling needs and graduate student characteristics. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 74-75.
- Beach, S. R., & Tesser, A. (1988). Love in marriage: A cognitive account. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love (pp. 330-358). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bergen, G. R., & Bergen, M. B. (1978). Quality of marriage of university students in relation to sources of financial support and demographic characteristics. The Family Coordinator, 3, 245-250.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- Bowen, G. L., & Orthner, D. K. (1983). Sex-role congruency and marital quality. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 2, 223-230.
- Brown, R. (1986). Social psychology the second edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Burda, P. C., Vaux, A., & Schill, T. (1984). Social support resources: Variation across sex and sex role. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10, 119-126.
- Byrne, D., & Murnen, S. K. (1988). Maintaining loving relationships. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), The psychology of love (pp. 293-310). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Campos, J. J., & Barrett, K. C. (1984). Toward a new understanding of emotions and their development. In C. E. Izard, J. Kagan & R. B. Zajonc (Eds.), Emotions, cognitions and behavior (pp. 229-363). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Clark, E. J., & Rieker, P. P. (1986). Gender differences in relationships and stress of medical and law students. Journal of Medical Education, 61, 32-40.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 12-24.
- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. Violence and Victims, 1, 141-157.
- Contreras, R., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (in press). Perspectives on marital love and satisfaction in Mexican American and Anglo couples. Journal of Counseling and Development.
- Cupach, W. R., & Comstock, J. (1990). Satisfaction with sexual communication in marriage: Links to sexual satisfaction and dyadic adjustment. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 179-186.
- Dancer, L. S., & Gilbert, L. A. (1993). Spouses' family work participation and its relation to wives' occupational level. Sex Roles, 28, 127-145.
- Duvall, E. M. (1977). Marriage and family development (5th ed.) New York: Lippincott.
- Deal, J. E., Wampler, K. S., & Halverson, C. F. (1992). The importance of similarity in the marital relationship. Family Process, 31, 369-382.
- Feigenbaum, W. M. (1977). Reciprocity in self-disclosure within the psychological interview. Psychological Reports, 40, 15-26.
- Feldman, S. D. (1974). Escape from the doll's house: Women in graduate and professional school education. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fincham, F. D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1988). The impact of attributions in marriage: Empirical and conceptual foundations. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 27, 77-90.

- Finkel, J. S., & Hansen, F. J. (1992). Correlates of retrospective marital satisfaction in long-lived marriages: A social constructivist perspective. Family Therapy, 19, 1-16.
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). Societal structures of the mind. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Gilbert, L. A. (1993). Two careers/one family. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Gilbert, M. G. (1982). The impact of graduate school on the family: A systems view. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 128-135.
- Glick, P. C. (1989a). Remarried families, stepfamilies and stepchildren: A brief demographic profile. Family Relations, 38, 24-27.
- Glick, P. C. (1989b). The family cycle and social change. Family Relations, 38, 123-129.
- Gottman, J. M. (1993). The roles of conflict engagement, escalation, and avoidance in marital interaction: A longitudinal view of five types of couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61, 6-15.
- Gruver, G. G., & Labadie, S. K. (1975). Marital dissatisfaction among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 4, 454-458.
- Hackel, L. S., & Ruble, D. N. (1992). Changes in the marital relationship after the first baby is born: Predicting the impact of expectancy disconfirmation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 944-957.
- Hansen, F. J., Fallon, A. E., & Novotny, S. L. (1991). The relationship between social network structure and marital satisfaction in distressed and nondistressed couples: A pilot study. Family Therapy, 18, 101-114.
- Hansen, J. E., & Schuldt, W. J. (1984). Marital self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 923-926.
- Hartnett, R. T. (1976). Environments for advanced learning. In J. Katz & R. T. Harnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making (pp.49-84). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1986). A theory and method of love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 392-402.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick S. S. (1989). Research on love: Does it measure up? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 784-794.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 1150-1159.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 93-98.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Love and sexual attitudes, self-disclosure and sensation seeking. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 281-297.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1992). Liking, loving, & relating. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1995). Gender differences and similarities in sex and love. Personal Relationships, 2, 55-65.
- Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 980-988.
- Heiss, A. M. (1970). Challenges to graduate schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hite, L. M. (1985). Female doctoral students: Their perceptions and concerns. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1, 18-22.
- Houseknecht, S. K., & Spanier, G. B. (1980). Marital disruption and higher education among women in the United States. The Sociological Quarterly, 21, 375-389.
- Inman-Amos, J., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1994). Love attitudes: Similarities between parents and children. Family Relations, 43, 456-461.

- Jorgensen, S. R., & Gaudy, J. C. (1980). Self-disclosure and satisfaction in marriage: The relation examined. Family Relations, 29, 281-287.
- Julien, D., & Markman, H. J. (1991). Social support and social networks as determinants of individual and marital outcome. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 549-568.
- Lee, J. A. (1973). The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press.
- Lloyd, S., Cate, R., & Henton, J. (1982). Equity and rewards as predictors of satisfaction in casual and intimate relationships. The Journal of Psychology, 110, 43-48.
- Lozoff, M. M. (1976). Interpersonal relations and autonomy. In J. Katz & R. T. Harnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making (pp. 141-159). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Lund, M. (1985). The development of investment and commitment scales for predicting continuity of personal relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 3-23.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Leong, F. T. L., (1992). Social support in academic programs and family environment: Sex differences and role conflicts for graduate students. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 716-723.
- Mallinckrodt, B., Leong, F. T. L., & Kralj, M. M. (1989). Sex differences in graduate student life-change and stress symptoms. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 332-338.
- McRoy, S., & Fisher, V. L. (1982). Marital adjustment of graduate student couples. Family Relations, 31, 37-41.
- Merves-Okin, L., Amidon, E., & Bernt, F. (1991). Perceptions of intimacy in marriage: A study of married couples. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 19, 110-118.
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1234-1244.

- Mitchell, M. E. (1969). The concept and use of social networks. In J. C. Mitchell (Ed.), Social networks in urban situations (pp. 1-58). Manchester, England: University of Manchester Press.
- Morton, T. L. (1978). Intimacy and reciprocity of exchange: A comparison of spouses and strangers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 72-81.
- Moss, B. F., & Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Marriage and romantic relationships: Defining intimacy in romantic relationships. Family Relations, 42, 31-37.
- Murstein, B. I., & MacDonald, M. G. (1983). The relationship of "exchange-orientation" and "commitment" scales to marriage adjustment. International Journal of Psychology, 18, 297-311.
- Noller, P. (1985). Negative communications in marriage. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 1135-1148.
- Parmelee, P. A. (1987). Sex role identity, role performance and marital satisfaction of newly-wed couples. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 429-444.
- Pike, G. R., & Sillars, A. L. (1985). Reciprocity of marital communication. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 303-324.
- Rachlin, V. C. (1987). Fair vs. equal role relations in dual-career and dual-earner families: Implications for family intervention. Family Relations, 36, 187-192.
- Rhyme, D. (1981). Bases of marital satisfaction among men and women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 941-955.
- Richardson, D. R., Medvin, N., & Hammock, G. (1988). Love styles, relationship experience, and sensation seeking: A test of validity. Personality and Individual Differences, 9, 645-651.
- Robinson, L. C., & Blanton, P. W. (1993). Marital strengths in enduring marriage. Family Relations, 42, 38-45.

- Rohr, E. G., Rohr, K. G., & McKenry, A. C. (1985). Role of conflict in marriage of law and medical students. Journal of Legal Education, 35, 56-64.
- Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., Shearin, E. N., & Pierce, G. R. (1987). A brief measure of social support: Practical and theoretical implications. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 497-510.
- Scheinkman, M. (1988). Graduate student marriages: An organizational/interactional view. Family Process, 27, 351-368.
- Shaver, P. R., & Hazan, C. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 473-501.
- Spanier, G. B., & Lewis, R. A. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 825-839.
- Sprecher, S. (1987). The effects of self-disclosure given and received on affection for an intimate partner and stability of relationship. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 115-127.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. Psychological Review, 93, 119-135.
- Swensen, C. H., Eskew, R. W., & Kohlhepp, K. A. (1981). Stage of family life cycle, ego development, and the marriage relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 841-853.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). Using multivariate statistics, second edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Tolstedt, B., E., & Stokes, J. P. (1983). Relation of verbal, affective, and physical intimacy to marital satisfaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 573-580.
- Walster, E., & Walster, G. W. (1978). A new look at love. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wilson, M. R., & Filsinger, E. E., (1986). Religiosity and marital adjustment: Multidimensional interrelationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 147-151.

Yogev, S. (1987). Marital satisfaction and sex role perceptions among dual-earner couples. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 35-45.

APPENDIX A
EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

Today's Family

Currently, only 10% of US families fit the traditional model of a two-parent family with children, where the husband earns the money, and the wife stays at home to care for the children and to run the household (Gilbert, 1993). Thus, what we label as "traditional" is no longer "standard" in our society. Because the majority of the families and marriages do not fit the traditional or standard concept, expectations and perceptions of what a marriage and a family should be may not be congruent with what people are experiencing. Incongruence may cause stress and may also cause people to feel dissatisfied with their situation at home.

Thus, as more women enter the work force and higher education, society, as well as individuals, has to modify what it perceives to be acceptable, correct and equitable for gender roles within the marital context. By assessing individual married couples, we can perhaps determine whether perceptions and expectations are changing to reflect the current realities of the American family.

Graduate student marriages represent a unique subset of marriages in our society. They generally are made up of two

people striving to improve their status in society. In the past, the status of couples was generally based on the educational and career achievement of the husbands. Today as more and more women pursue higher education (Gilbert, 1993), the perception of status and gender roles will need to change. If partners hold traditional values of status and gender roles, then incongruence between what they have and what they think they should have can lead to dissatisfaction. Furthermore, graduate education can add additional stress to relationships, and this stress can exacerbate feelings of dissatisfaction.

In marriage, love and marital satisfaction are not only variable across individuals, but they are also complex and difficult to maintain. In fact, the failure rate of marriages in the United States is approximately 50% (Glick, 1989a). Yet despite these odds, almost 90% of the US population chooses to marry at least once (Glick, 1989a, 1989b). Since it is assumed that individuals enter into matrimony because they are in love and are satisfied with their relationship, the high failure rate would indicate that perceptions of love and satisfaction change over time.

We will examine love, marriage, and marital satisfaction, in general, and then specifically in graduate student marriages. It is important to understand how the

institution of marriage changes in response to personal and societal demands.

Love, Marriage, and Satisfaction

The human emotion of love has been written about for centuries. It has been the theme for songs, poems, and even wars. The scientific construct of love, however, is difficult to define and even harder to measure. It is a construct which is complex and multidimensional, and can be used to describe feelings and thoughts toward a favorite ice cream flavor or toward a sexual partner. In social psychology, the study of love focuses on intimate and close relationships, and it has been an area of research which has only gained "respectability" in the past fifteen years (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

While limiting the focus of love research to intimate relationships may appear to eliminate many issues, researchers are still left to struggle with topics such as affiliation, attraction, intimacy, passion, and changing attitudes towards sex, marriage, and gender roles. In earlier times, when marriages were arranged and divorce was rare, individual satisfaction and issues involving love were of little concern to science. Today, however, individuals are responsible for attracting, obtaining, and sustaining

love partners, and they are also responsible for their own happiness or lack of it. Therefore, the construct of love in marriage, and the issue of what variables impact satisfaction in the marital relationship, have become of interest to scientists.

What is Love?

Love is an emotion. We use the words "love" and "emotion" to communicate the organization of complicated constructs (Campos & Barrett, 1984). Therefore, when we define an emotion in one word (e.g. "love"), we automatically bring together a series of behaviors, cognitions and appraisals (Shaver & Hazan, 1988). While some emotions (happiness, anger, fear, surprise, disgust and sadness) are recognizable and are reliable across cultures (Brown, 1986), there can be a great deal of within-construct variability. For example, different people can behave very differently when in love, have different thoughts regarding what love should be, and judge the quality of love differently. Breaking down the behaviors, the cognitions and the appraisals of love and examining the organization of the construct is the basis for developing a theory of love.

Exchange Theories

There are many theories of love. In 1964, Blau formally proposed an exchange theory of love. This theory postulates that all human interactions depend upon equivalent giving and receiving of benefits and costs. In social psychology, exchange theory is part of a larger theory of social equity in which individuals are said to be selfish and try to maximize their profits (Brown, 1986).

While describing love in psuedoeconomic terms may be simple and precise, many people are uncomfortable with such a cold, calculating, and global theory. Clark and Mills (1979) further differentiated types of intimate relationships into two categories: exchange-oriented or communally-oriented. Whereas a "tit for tat" approach is expected in an exchange relationship, it is actually counter-productive in a communal one.

Regardless of how one may feel toward exchange theories of love, the principle of exchange exists in most intimate relationships. Foa and Foa (1974) have suggested that interpersonal resources or "commodities" can be classified into six groups: love, status, information, money, goods, and services. These are the resources that individuals have to offer to or gain from a mate. It is further hypothesized that equity exists to the extent that the partners perceive

the value of each partner's outcomes to be proportional to each partner's investments.

Passionate and Companionate Love

Walster and Walster (1978) split the construct of love by proposing two types of love: passionate and companionate. Passionate love is intense physiological arousal which is associated with a sexual partner. Companionate love is intense affection based on common experience and is found in more enduring relationships. Walster and Walster hypothesized that intimate relationships may start out as passionate and then possibly evolve into companionate relationships. While some people view companionate love as secure, predictable, and satisfying, others may view it as boring. Thus, the secret of long term relationships may be the ability to develop companionate love while still evoking passion from time to time.

Love as Multidimensional

A problem that faces all theories in this area of research is the volatile nature of love and relationships. Love and relationships change over time (Byrne & Murnen, 1988; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1989; Rhyne, 1981; Swensen, Eskew, & Kohlhepp, 1981) and are affected by external

demands such as socioeconomic factors, environmental stressors, family, age, children, illness, drugs, and alcohol. Relationships and love also have personal and psychological demands that interact with each other: how you feel (low self-esteem, depression) affects your relationship; what relationship you are in affects how you feel.

Since stress, personal variables, and environmental factors are rarely stagnant, perhaps it is the variability of these multiple factors that makes it difficult to describe, to measure, and to develop a theory of love. We can begin to see that love and relationships do not change over time in simple ways but rather are changed actively by factors that are themselves variable over time.

If love is affected by these changing variables, then time, duration of a relationship, or position in a family cycle would be important for describing the construct of love. We could visualize the emotion of love as a graph with duration of the relationship as the x-axis and the intensity of the feeling of what we call love as the y-axis. We can use this image or graph to question the versatility of a theory. Can we really say that theories that hold for one end of the graph (low intensity, short duration) hold for the other end (high intensity, long duration)? Lloyd,

Cate, and Henton (1982) examined equity and rewards as predictors of satisfaction in casual and intimate relationships. They evaluated 325 college students and found that equity in casual relationships, particularly in status, was the best predictor of satisfaction. They also found that in intimate relationships, information and love as a resource/reward replaced equity in predicting satisfaction, although equity was still important. In this study, intimacy was defined by "going steady, engaged or living together" (p. 44), however, length of the relationship was not considered. The mean age was not reported, although given that they were college students it can be assumed that they were relatively young (18-23 years-old). Therefore, Lloyd et al. (1982) looked at only one end of the duration axis (duration cannot be long in young and short-term relationships), and given their definition of intimate, they also appeared to look at the beginning end of the intensity/love axis.

Given the impact of different variables on love in a relationship, perhaps a multidimensional theory could help to incorporate these ideas and explain a construct that changes over time. Sternberg (1986) provided a Triangular Theory of Love, which states that love has three components: intimacy, passion and decision/commitment. He defined

intimacy as the "feelings of closeness, connectedness and bondedness in loving relationships" (p. 119). Passion refers to the "drives that lead to romance, physical attraction, sexual consummation, and related phenomena in loving relationships" (p. 119). And finally, decision/commitment is influenced by time and has cognition as its underlying premise. In the short term, this component refers to the decision to love someone else, and in the long term, it refers to the commitment to maintain that love. Sternberg recognized changes in these components (or changes in perceived importance of the components) as a result of the duration of the relationship. For example, the passion component tends to play a large part in short-term romantic relationships, while it has only a moderate impact on long-term relationships. Unfortunately, these findings are correlational and do not demonstrate causation. We do not know if long-term relationships start out high on passion and then the passion is quelled by time, or if relationships which start off solely based on passion can stand the test of time.

Sternberg (1986) also described eight different "kinds of love," based on the absence or presence of the three components. The "kinds of love" include: nonlove, liking, infatuated love, empty love, romantic love, companionate

love, fatuous love and consummate love. While nonlove is the absence of all three components (no intimacy, no passion and no decision/commitment), consummate love involves the presence of all three. He also stated that consummate love is generally the kind of love that most of us strive for, but once it is achieved there are no guarantees that it will be maintained.

The Love Styles

The trend in the theories of love has gone from the global concepts (Blau, 1964) to multidimensional concepts (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Sternberg, 1986). Hendrick and Hendrick have based their conceptualization of love on the work of Lee (1973), who proposed multiple classifications of love. Lee identified six types of love, three primary types and three secondary types. The primary types include: Eros (romantic, passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), and Storge (friendship love). The secondary types include: Mania (possessive, dependent love), Pragma (logical, "shopping list" love), and Agape (all giving, selfless love). Lee believed that the secondary types were formed when two of the primary types were combined. Thus, Mania is a product of the combination of Eros and Ludus; Pragma is a product of Storge and Ludus; and Agape is a product of Eros

and Storge. Hendrick and Hendrick pursued this typology of love because it was multidimensional, and it encompassed other theories that are not comprehensive in and of themselves. For example, the Pragma love style incorporates the logical exchange theory of love, while Agape captures the essence of Clark and Mills' communal love. The Hendricks, through their research on the Love Attitudes Scale (1986), have demonstrated that all six constructs are "primary," but like Sternberg's "kinds of love," it is not clear whether a person's love style is a stable personality trait or a more transient attitude (Richardson, Medvin & Hammock, 1988). Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) addressed this issue by stating:

Love is to some extent transient, situational and a product of a unique time and place. Phenomena such as present love status, past love relationships and cultural upbringing may influence one's love styles. Yet love can also be constant, relatively untouched by temporary adversity and amazingly consistent throughout a person's lifetime. In addition, love is experienced both in the content of the self and in conjunction with a beloved other. (p. 293)

However, by determining an individual's love style, we can begin to describe a person's behaviors, cognitions and appraisals toward love. And these love styles can be used to describe behavior in all types of intimate relationships including marital relationships.

Marital Relationships

The marital relationship, according to Hendrick and Hendrick (1992), is perhaps the most complex, contradictory, and fulfilling of all human relationships. They state that in no other relationship are there such high expectations for such a long period of time. Because marriage is supposed to last forever, and because people enter into marriage with such high expectations, there can be many causes of disappointment.

Marital Satisfaction

Unfortunately, like the conceptualization of love, satisfaction in marriage is difficult to qualify and quantify. To further complicate matters, there are also several constructs in the literature that have been used to express the idea of a mutually fulfilling relationship (e.g., happiness, quality, adjustment, and satisfaction). Overall, these terms are used synonymously, and thus for the sake of parsimony, this concept will hereafter be referred to as "satisfaction."

Satisfaction, according to Spanier and Lewis (1980), is a multidimensional phenomenon and is represented on a continuum reflecting "numerous characteristics of marital interactions and marital functioning" (p. 826). Furthermore,

there are variables, that when present in a relationship, directly lead to dissatisfaction (Coleman & Straus, 1986; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992), but their absence does not directly lead to satisfaction. For example, if violence and conflict are present in a relationship, then the partners will generally be less satisfied with the relationship (Coleman & Straus, 1986). However, if violence and conflict are absent, it does not mean that the partners will necessarily be satisfied, suggesting that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not polar opposites. For the purpose of this study, we will concentrate primarily on the variables that impact satisfaction in marriage.

Enduring Relationships

There have been several studies that have looked retrospectively at long lasting marriages in order to determine the reasons for their longevity. Robinson and Blanton (1993) examined 15 couples described as "happily married" by themselves and others, who had been married for at least 30 years. These couples were primarily white, middle class, and had children. Each person was asked to describe what he or she thought were the most important variables that sustained their marriage in both good and bad times. The key characteristics identified by the couples

included: intimacy balanced with autonomy, commitment, communication, similar religious orientation, and congruent perceptions of the relationship. These characteristics were gleaned from unstructured interviews with each spouse, coded and categorized with interrater reliability of .95.

Clearly, these couples are at the far end of the duration/love continuum, as their relationships were long in duration and were rated high in satisfaction. An interesting question derived from this study is: if a married couple possessed these key characteristics from early on in their relationship, would their level of satisfaction remain constant? If not, what outside (or inside) factors could be impacting satisfaction?

Finkel and Hansen (1992) examined 31 couples that were married thirty years or more. They asked the couples to rate their marital satisfaction retrospectively during each stage of their marital life. Based on Duvall's (1977) conceptualization of marriage, eight stages of married life were represented, from courtship and beginning of marriage (stage 1) to "the empty nest syndrome" and retirement (stage 8). The results of this study indicated a curvilinear pattern of satisfaction, with the subjects remembering satisfaction as lower in the middle, child-rearing stage of the family life cycle. During this middle stage,

satisfaction was directly related to length of marriage, number of children and number of child-rearing problems. The authors also found that these variables were more strongly correlated with satisfaction for wives than for husbands. Thus, gender differences in marital satisfaction appear to be an important consideration.

Gender Differences

Rhynes (1981) surveyed 2,190 couples and examined possible gender differences in bases of marital satisfaction. Her findings supported the notion of a curvilinear model of satisfaction across the life cycle for women, but not for men. She also found that women were generally less satisfied with their marriages than were men, across all stages of married life. Furthermore, her research indicated that marital satisfaction was highly correlated with global happiness for women but not necessarily for men.

One possible explanation for gender differences in the perception of marital satisfaction is the disparity of sex roles in our culture. Over the past thirty years women have increased their presence in the work force, but their responsibilities at home have not diminished (Gilbert, 1993). If expected roles or responsibilities in marriage

are not congruent with actual responsibilities, then satisfaction in marriage is expected to be lower than if they were congruent. Bowen and Orthner (1983) examined sex-role congruency and marital satisfaction in 331 military couples. They found that couples with incongruent sex-role attitudes had lower satisfaction than couples with congruent attitudes. They also found that the couples with the lowest satisfaction were those with a traditional husband and a non-traditional wife. Parmelee (1987) also found sex-role congruence to be important in marital satisfaction. She studied 110 newly-wed couples and reported that sex-role identity predicted marital satisfaction in both spouses. She also discussed how "feminine" men and "masculine" women were generally more satisfied in their marriages. Since marital sex roles have been described in the traditional division of responsibilities (e.g., husbands providing income, wives taking care of children and the home), "feminine" men and "masculine" women may represent a crossing of traditional responsibilities.

Dancer and Gilbert (1993) examined spouses' family work participation specifically in relation to wives' occupational level. They looked at nine household responsibilities (e.g., washing clothes, paying bills, food shopping) and nine parental activities (e.g., disciplining

child, helping child with homework). They found that men were more willing to share household and family responsibilities (traditionally female roles) when their wives were employed, and this trend was seen particularly when the wives had specific careers (e.g., accountant, lawyer). The authors found that equity or the perception that their spouse was doing "their fair share" (p. 140) was particularly important in higher ratings of marital satisfaction in both spouses. Rachlin (1987) examined dual-career and dual-earner families and also found the perception of equity important for the adjustment of families. She noted that equity does not mean equality, and that flexibility and compromise in the division of responsibility were important in non-traditional families.

Interestingly, in the midst of the sexual revolution, traditional expectations still exist. Yogev (1987) asked partners in dual-earner couples to compare themselves to their spouse on intelligence, competence, professional success, and income and then to estimate their marital satisfaction. She found that wives showed significant correlations between marital satisfaction and perceiving their husbands as superior to themselves on all four variables. For men, marital satisfaction was related to their wives' inferiority on income and professional success.

However, there was a significant positive correlation between marital satisfaction and perceiving themselves as less intelligent than their wives. Clearly, these issues need to be examined further, especially in the light of the changing perceptions of women in our society. However, one idea regarding sex-roles and marital satisfaction that appears to be constant is the importance of congruency in the approach to marital roles (e.g., Bowen & Orthner, 1983; Parmelee, 1987). This supports Robinson and Blanton's (1993) finding that congruent perceptions about relationships is a key variable in enduring relationships.

Intimacy

Intimacy is another key variable contributing to longevity in marriages. Tolstedt and Stokes (1983) examined three types of intimacy (verbal, affective, and physical) in relation to marital satisfaction. Forty-three couples filled out questionnaires and were also audiotaped during a discussion of their relationship. The authors found that all three types of intimacy, but particularly verbal and affective intimacy, were highly predictive of both marital satisfaction and thoughts of divorce.

Moss and Schwebel (1993) attempted to define intimacy in marriage and romantic relationships. They found 61

unique definitions in scholarly publications. After reviewing the literature, they proposed a formal definition with five specific components: (1) commitment; (2) affective intimacy; (3) cognitive intimacy; (4) physical intimacy; and (5) mutuality. They proposed this formal definition:

Intimacy in enduring romantic relationships is determined by the level of commitment and positive affective, cognitive and physical closeness one experiences with a partner in a reciprocal (although not necessarily symmetrical) relationship.(p. 33)

While the theme of communication or self-disclosure had been found in many of the definitions of intimacy, the authors stated that this theme is a "facilitator" rather than a component of intimacy. Whether it is included in the definition of intimacy or not, communication and self-disclosure are important variables in enduring relationships.

Communication

Communication has both verbal and nonverbal channels (Brown, 1986). Although verbal communication is most reliable, nonverbal communication cannot be ignored and is considered particularly valuable when one is receiving mixed messages. Noller (1985) studied videotapes of couples talking about their relationships, and rated the messages sent by each partner on visual, verbal, and vocal channels.

She found that the verbal and vocal channels generally agreed, however, discrepancies (when they occurred) were found in the visual channel. This outcome was significant because spouses used the visual channel to soften negative messages, and sometimes discrepant facial-verbal messages communicated negative affect.

Reciprocating a message (nonverbal or verbal) is important in the communication process. Reciprocation was studied by Pike and Sillars (1985), who found that couples who responded to highly relevant conflict topics with nonverbal negative responses were more dissatisfied with their marriages than were couples who did not respond in a negative nonverbal way. The authors also found that satisfied couples did more "avoiding" than less satisfied couples.

The ability to avoid stressful relationship topics (for an extended period of time) should not be considered healthy or a skill one would wish to acquire. On the contrary, communication is an important variable in long lasting relationships (Robinson & Blanton, 1993). Gottman (1993) examined the roles of conflict engagement, escalation, and avoidance in marital interaction. He examined 73 couples initially and again four years later. By grouping these couples at time 1 into five groups: hostile,

hostile/detached, validators, volatiles and avoiders, he found significant differences in the groups in serious consideration of divorce and in actual frequency of divorce. The most unstable couples were in the hostile and hostile/detached groups. In the stable groups (validators, volatiles and avoiders), avoiders were the least likely to reciprocate both positive and negative affect. Thus, the interactional style of avoiding the bad aspects of marriage also makes it difficult to share positive aspects.

One of the clearest and most powerful ways for married partners to communicate is through self-disclosure (Beach & Tesser, 1988; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). This concept was first discussed in research by Jourard in 1964, and it implies a cognitive component of trust or willingness to take a risk with the other person in hopes that open communication will follow (Beach & Tesser, 1988). Self-disclosure has three basic themes: (1) it is an aspect of personality; (2) it has a role in relationship development and dissolution; and (3) it has a relationship to psychological stress (Berg & Derlega, 1987, as cited in Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). Numerous studies have been conducted involving relationships and self-disclosure (Feigenbaum, 1977; Hendrick, 1981; Morton, 1978), and there has been a significant amount of research indicating that

lack of self-disclosure is related to marital dissatisfaction and a discontinuation of the relationship (Fincham & Bradbury, 1988; Hansen & Schuldt, 1984; Hendrick, 1981; Jorgensen & Gaudy, 1980; Sprecher, 1987). Merves-Okin, Amidon, and Bernt (1991) studied 75 married couples and their perceptions of intimacy and self-disclosure in their marriages. They found that partners' perceptions of intimacy and self-disclosure were congruent and were positively related to marital satisfaction.

Altman and Taylor (1973) stated that self-disclosure varies through the chronological development of a relationship, meaning different things to different people at different times. However, although it can change across the love/duration continuum, it has been shown to be a valuable tool in effective communication and increasing satisfaction in marriages.

Sex

Sexual intercourse is an important aspect of any intimate relationship. Traditionally, sex and reproduction were the primary reasons why individuals married. Passion, romance, and physical attraction can also be components of sexual activity and can vary from couple to couple. Likewise, expectations regarding physical intimacy can vary.

Cupach and Comstock (1990) explored the relationships among sexual communication, sexual satisfaction and marital adjustment. They surveyed 402 married individuals and found that satisfaction with sexual communication was significantly and positively related to sexual satisfaction and marital adjustment, satisfaction, cohesion, and affectional expression. It appears that being able to communicate with one's partner helps in many different areas of the relationship.

Social Networks

There has also been a great deal of research involving marital satisfaction and the presence of social networks outside the marital relationship. A social network can be defined as "a specific set of linkages among a defined set of persons...[which]...may be used to interpret the social behavior of the persons involved" (Mitchell, 1969, p.2), and they can be characterized along structural dimensions, particularly size and density. Hansen, Fallon and Novotny (1991) examined the relationship between social network structure and marital satisfaction in eight distressed couples (couples seeking marital therapy) and ten non-distressed couples. They found that marital satisfaction related positively to network overlap (spouses sharing

social network) and size (number of social contacts), but not to density (the extent to which members of the social network interact with each other independently of the focal person). Hansen et al. found that marital satisfaction was greater when spouses had greater individual networks and when there was greater overlap between their networks.

Julien and Markman (1991) discussed the importance of the support that spouses get from and give to each other, especially when faced with major life difficulties. With regard to marital outcome, their findings point to spouses' support (especially husband's) as a critical variable in relationship satisfaction. According to the authors, this variable has so far been neglected by researchers. Julien and Markman also found gender differences in social support as it related to marital distress. Husbands were able to ask their wives for support, but their stress level was higher than wives before they elicited spousal support. Also for males, seeking spousal support was correlated with less with marital adjustment. Thus, it appears it takes more stress for husbands to finally seek out support from their wives. Furthermore, when they do seek support, it does not appear to impact the quality of their relationship positively. However, this may be the impact of stress on the relationship not the impact of spousal support. Burda, Vaux

and Schill (1984) examined social support resources as they varied across sex and sex role and found that females reported higher levels of the following social support resources than did males: network characteristics, availability of support, and perceived supportiveness of family and friends. For whatever reason, it appears that men have a more difficult time soliciting help from others, even from their wives.

Personal Qualities and Characteristics

There are many ways to describe a person (e.g., extrovert, catholic, neurotic), and individuals bring their personal qualities to a marriage. Religiosity is one characteristic which helps to predict marital satisfaction. Wilson and Filsinger (1986) examined how religiosity affected marital adjustment, by sampling 190 married couples. After controlling for SES, number of children, and length of marriage, the researchers found a strong pattern of positive relationships among dimensions of religiosity and marital adjustment for husbands and wives.

Deal, Wampler and Halverson (1992) examined couples' views of family and marriage. The authors found that those couples who were satisfied with their marriages, who communicated openly, who felt their spouses understood their

feelings and held them in high regard, were those who were most likely to have similar perceptions on what family and marriage should be like. However, the authors did not find that dissatisfied partners had similar perception on how bad their marriages were, but rather that these partners had different perceptions of their marriage and family life. Thus, similarity in perception discriminated between functional and dysfunctional couples in the Deal et al. (1992) study.

Children

As discussed previously, during the child rearing years of the family life cycle, marital satisfaction tends to decrease, especially for women (Finkel & Hansen, 1992; Rhyne, 1981). Hackel and Ruble (1992) studied the changes in the marital relationship after the first baby is born by following 50 couples from a baby birthing class to post-delivery. When expectations regarding the sharing of child-care and housekeeping responsibilities were not met, marital satisfaction decreased. It appears that when new factors enter into a marriage (e.g., children) the balance of equity, or what partners perceive to be fair, changes. Another factor that can affect the balance in a marriage is when one or both partners decide to enter graduate school.

Graduate Student Marriages

Graduate education is generally defined as continuing education beyond the baccalaureate. Thus, it encompasses part-time and full-time students in every discipline, including medical and law school. Student composition in graduate programs varies, and has changed over the years (Gilbert, 1982). One of the most profound areas of change in student composition is the increasing number of female graduate students in all disciplines (Gilbert, 1993; Gilbert, 1982; Houseknecht & Spanier, 1980; Scheinkman, 1988).

Characteristics of graduate students have generally been studied by placement into four groups: sex, marital status, family status, and various background variables (Gilbert, 1982). Heiss (1970) found that males outnumbered females in all Ph.D. programs at 10 major universities, by a ratio of 8:2. While the advent of the womens' rights movement and changing societal norms have led the way for more women to pursue graduate education, men still outnumber women in most disciplines (Scheinkman, 1988). In 1991, women represented 33% of law students, 37% of medical students, and 51% of psychology doctoral students (Gilbert, 1993). Unfortunately, most available research studies account only

for marriages with the traditional roles of the male student and the female spouse (McRoy & Fisher, 1982).

The marital status of students has become an increasingly important issue in graduate training because of the growing body of literature demonstrating the negative impact of graduate school on marriages (Baker, 1993; Houseknecht & Spanier, 1980; McRoy & Fisher, 1982; Rohr, Rohr, & McKenry, 1985). In examining the marital status of graduate students, gender and program differences are present (Gilbert, 1982). For example, Feldman (1974) found that 50% of all full-time male graduate students were married, whereas less than 20% of all full-time female graduate students were married. Mallinckrodt and Leong (1992) found that 76% of the male graduate students in their sample were married, compared to 37% of female graduate students. Heiss (1970) also found that students in the natural sciences are generally single, while students in the social sciences are generally married.

Unlike gender and marital status, family status and background variables have received less attention. Given financial concerns, most married graduate students do not have children, or if they do, the children are few in number (Gilbert, 1982).

Stress in Graduate School

A graduate student experiences stress from many different sources: departmental, personal, and financial. And if the student is married, marital stress may also be present. The importance of graduate departments as social systems has been stressed by several authors (Hartnett, 1976; Lozoff, 1976). If students lack relationships with faculty, perceiving them as distant or inaccessible, if students lack a sense of community in the department and feel powerless or isolated, or if they are poorly evaluated in the program, they will experience more stress.

Constant evaluation (an inherent aspect of education), high performance demands, and competition can all increase anxiety for and stress on students (Gilbert, 1982) and may lead to lower self-esteem. While marital partners and family units can be supportive and help bolster personal resources, a negative self-concept can impact the way in which a person views his or her marital relationship. Furthermore, lack of sufficient marital support can also add to student stress. Clark and Rieker (1986) found that 31% of male medical and law students found their spouses to be supportive or very supportive, whereas only 19% of female medical or law students rated their spouses to be supportive or very supportive.

Other research has found gender differences in perceived academic stress. Hite (1985) found that the perceptions of female doctoral students differed from those of their male colleagues regarding role congruence and support from faculty and peers. Women perceived less support and more role conflict. Mallinckrodt, Leong, and Kralj (1989) found that compared to male graduate students, female graduate students reported significantly more negative life changes and significantly more psychological symptoms of stress. And overall, marriage has been shown to have a more negative effect on women's graduate work than on men's (Feldman, 1974).

Financial stress has generally been found to be less of a stressor than many other variables (Gilbert, 1982). There are many financial resources for graduate students, including stipends, scholarships, part-time work, full-time work, spousal income, loans, veterans benefits, and parental support. What has been seen as a more significant stressor in graduate school marriages is financial support which goes against traditional societal sex roles, especially if these traditional roles are held by the couple themselves (Scheinkman, 1988). For example, if a wife is supporting the family while the husband pursues a degree, the wife may feel resentful or the husband may feel guilty about the wife

having to work (Bergen & Bergen, 1978). These issues are compounded if the partners lose sight of the temporary nature of graduate school (Scheinkman, 1988), or if the prospects of employment after attaining the degree are low (Gilbert, 1982).

Sources of Stress in Graduate Student Marriages

Gruver and Labadie (1975) found five major sources of dissatisfaction among a population of married college students. In order of importance they were: sexual dissatisfaction (especially frequency and time of day), lack of communication, lack of recreation time, not enough money, and a need for more friends. The authors did not examine whether age, religion, number of children or other variables differentiated the levels of reported marital satisfaction (Gilbert, 1982). McRoy and Fisher (1982) also examined marital adjustment of graduate student marriages. The authors primarily investigated the impact of student status (who was the student: husband, wife, or both) on marital satisfaction. Their findings indicated lower levels of marital adjustment (consensus and affection) for couples where only the husband was a student. They also found more preschool children in the husband-only-student group. However, when the wife was the student, the couple tended to

be older, were married for a longer period of time, and had higher family income (presumably the husband was already established in his career). The authors determined that variables other than student status of the couple may impact satisfaction.

Scheinkman (1988) reported that symmetry of graduate student marriage may be one of the most important factors in predicting satisfaction. She stated that there are two types of marriages: symmetrical and asymmetrical marriages. In symmetrical marriages, both partners are students. In asymmetrical marriages, one partner is a student while the other spouse is not, and the non-student partner generally provides financial support through employment. Scheinkman also stated that due to differences in daily routines, asymmetrical marriages are generally more stressful.

According to Scheinkman, there are four major assumptions in graduate student marriages. The first assumption deals with marital organization (e.g., how to deal with money, time, affection, disagreement). It is assumed that this organization becomes stable over time, but if it does not meet the individuals' needs, the organization must change. If it does not change or if it changes in the wrong way, partners will experience stress and/or tension in the relationship.

The second assumption in marriages deals with interactional sequences. Scheinkman described this as "misconstruing the nature of their difficulties and consequently mishandling their situation" (p.352). This assumption speaks to the ability to communicate correctly, and having the time needed to do so.

The third assumption revolves around the family life cycle framework and how the family works through stress and environmental pressures. The issues include how long the couple has been together, what has gone before in their relationship and in their families of origin, whether they have children or not, and where they are in their family cycle. (Scheinkman stated that new marriages are especially vulnerable to marital stress.) Finally, the fourth assumption deals with family of origin issues, particularly the assumptions and expectations people bring to marriage. These assumptions and expectations can act to magnify the perceived stress in a situation.

Contextual and Organizational Stressors

Scheinkman (1988) organized marital stress into two categories: Contextual and organizational stressors. Contextual pressures speak to variables that can easily be seen to have a direct impact. These include but are not

limited to financial pressures, the act of relocating, major changes in scheduling recreation and social life, lack of time, readjustment to student role, student academic-stress, and loneliness of the nonacademic spouse.

Organizational stressors speak to specific environmental changes and incongruencies between partners in their environments. For example, one spouse spends their entire day at work while the other spouse is in school. This leads to other organizational stressors -- irregular verses regular schedules; inequalities in financial contributions; and inequalities in parental and household responsibilities. Thus, differences in the daily lives of spouses may increase stress and thus impact satisfaction.

Conclusion

Marriage is not a stagnant institution. It is a bond between two people who bring together different backgrounds, personalities, beliefs, experiences and hopes. As external and internal forces act on this bond, it will either become pliable and adapt or it will inevitably break.

The approach to love presented in this paper attempts to explain the complex nature of love. Because love is generally the basis of marriage, understanding of this phenomenon is necessary for understanding the nature of

marriage. Likewise, the concept of satisfaction in marriage can be related to many things including the emotion of love. The focus of this research project was to look at a number of tangible and measurable variables to gain a better understanding of love and marriage, particularly the things that may make love and marriage better and the things that may make them worse. By focusing on graduate student marriages, additional variables such as academic stress, support from faculty and peers, and constant evaluation also need to be considered as contributors to marital satisfaction.

Based on previous research many, factors were determined to be important. Intimacy, commitment, communication, similar religious orientation, the presence of children, social networks, spousal support, and congruent perceptions of the relationship have all been found to be important and related to marital satisfaction. Gender differences have also been found, with men appearing to be more satisfied in marriage than women, especially when the couple has children.

Finally, the concept of equity has been discussed in different ways, and it is also an important concept in marriage. Dancer and Gilbert (1993) noted that equity does not mean exact equality but rather entails a perception of

what is fair and what should be expected. As society changes (i.e., more women enter into the work force), gender roles and expectations also change. Graduate student marriages are subject to all the typical aspects of marriage (e.g., love, intimacy) and are particularly susceptible to changing gender roles.

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. I am a: A) male B) female
2. My age is:
A) 20-24 B) 25-29 C) 30-34 D) 35-39 E) over 40
3. I have been married: A) once B) twice C) three or more times.
4. I have children/step-children:
A) Yes B) No
5. I have been married to my current spouse for:
A) less than one year B) 1-4 years C) 5-8 years
D) 9-12 years E) 13 or more years
6. I consider my ethnic heritage to be:
A) African American B) Oriental/Asian American
C) Hispanic/Latino D) Caucasian E) Other
7. I am a:
A) US citizen by birth B) naturalized citizen
C) non-resident alien
8. My parents' educational level is:
A) one or both have graduate degrees
B) one or both graduated from college
C) one or both had some college
D) one or both graduated from high school
E) neither parent completed high school
9. My parents : A) are still married or remained married until death B) are divorced C) never married
10. The quality of my parents' marriage/relationship is(was) (if deceased or divorced):
A) very good B) good C) average D) poor E) very poor
11. I would describe myself as:
A) very outgoing B) outgoing C) average D) quiet
E) very quiet
12. The way I feel about myself generally is :
A) very positive B) positive C) average D) negative
E) very negative
13. I would describe my life right now as :
A) very happy B) happy C) okay D) unhappy E) very unhappy

Questions about your current situation:

14. Did you and your spouse live together before you were married?

A) Yes B) No

15. Did you and/or your spouse have to relocate for graduate/medical/law school? A) Yes B) No

16. How long have you (or your spouse) been in graduate/medical/law school at Texas Tech?

A) first year B) second year C) third year
D) fourth or beyond E) have just graduated

17. What religious denomination are you?

A) Protestant B) Catholic C) Jewish D) Other

18. How important is your religion to you?

A) not important
B) slightly important
C) moderately important
D) very important
E) extremely important- one of the most important things in my life

19. How much stress or pressure do you feel you are currently under?

A) extreme B) moderate C) average D) slight E) none

20. Since beginning graduate/medical/law school, leisure time for you and your spouse has:

A) increased a great deal B) increased C) remained the same D) decreased E) decreased a great deal

21. What was your family's total income last year?

A) \$10,000 or less B) \$10,000 to \$20,000 C) \$20,000 to \$35,000 D) \$35,000 to \$50,000 E) \$50,000 - up

22. What was the major source of your family's income:

A) your employment B) spouse employment C) loans
D) grants, fellowships, scholarships E) parental support

23. How stressful is your financial situation?

A not stressful B average C very stressful
D E

24. How likely is it that your marriage will be permanent?

A very unlikely B uncertain C very likely
D E

25. How likely is it that you and your spouse will be together after graduate/medical/law school?

A very unlikely B uncertain C very likely
D E

26. In your opinion, how committed is your spouse to this relationship?

A not much B average C very committed
D E

27. How committed are you to this relationship?
 A B C D E
 not much average very committed
28. All things considered, how much effort (time, resources, emotion, etc.,) have you put into your relationship?
 A B C D E
 not much average very much
29. All things considered, how much effort (time, resources, emotion, etc.,) has your spouse put into your relationship?
 A B C D E
 not much average very much
30. Do you consider your employment:
 A) a career B) a job which may lead to a career C) a job which you could just as easily leave for another job
 D) not employed

How do you feel about the following statements?

31. Women should have the same opportunity to work outside the home as men:
 A) strongly agree B) moderately agree C) neutral
 D) moderately disagree E) strongly disagree
32. Men and women should get equal pay for equal work:
 A) strongly agree B) moderately agree C) neutral D) moderately disagree E) strongly disagree
33. Both men and women should be equally involved in rearing children:
 A) strongly agree B) moderately agree C) neutral
 D) moderately disagree E) strongly disagree
34. Currently, responsibility for household chores and children in your marriage falls:
 A) primarily on the wife B) about equally on both
 C) primarily on the husband
35. After graduate/medical/law school, responsibility for household chores and children in your marriage will fall:
 A) primarily on the wife B) about equally on both
 C) primarily on the husband
36. Currently, responsibility for financial resources in your marriage falls:
 A) primarily on the wife B) about equally on both
 C) primarily on the husband
37. After graduate/medical/law school, responsibility for financial resources in your marriage will fall:
 A) primarily on the wife B) about equally on both C) primarily on the husband
38. Compared to before graduate/medical/law school the quantity and quality of physical intimacy between you and your spouse has:
 A) increased a great deal B) increased C) remained the same D) decreased E) decreased a great deal

39. How satisfied are you regarding the sexual aspects of your marriage?:
A) very satisfied B) satisfied C) neutral
D) dissatisfied E) very dissatisfied

Listed below are several statements that reflect different attitudes about love. For each statement fill in the response that indicates how much you agree or disagree with that statement. The items refer to a specific love relationship.

For each statement :

- A = Strongly agree with the statement
B = Moderately agree with the statement
C = Neutral - neither agree or disagree
D = Moderately disagree with the statement
E = Strongly disagree with the statement

40. My spouse and I were attracted to each other immediately after we first met.

41. My spouse and I have the right physical "chemistry" between us.

42. Our love making is very intense and satisfying.

43. I feel that my spouse and I were meant for each other.

44. I try to keep my spouse a little uncertain about my commitment to him/her.

45. I believe that what my spouse doesn't know about me won't hurt him/her.

46. I have sometimes had to keep my spouse from finding out about other partners.

47. I could get over my marriage with my spouse pretty easily and quickly.

48. It is hard for me to say exactly when our friendship turned into love.

49. To be genuine, our love first required caring for a while.

50. I expect to always be friends with my spouse.

51. Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship.

52. I considered what my spouse was going to become in life before I committed myself to him/her.

53. I tried to plan my life carefully before choosing my spouse.

54. In choosing my spouse, I believed it was best to love someone with a similar background.

55. A main consideration in choosing my spouse was how he/she would reflect on my family.

56. When things aren't right with my spouse and me, my stomach gets upset.

57. If my spouse and I divorce, I would get so depressed that I would even think of suicide.

58. Sometimes I get so excited about being in love with my spouse that I can't sleep.

59. When my spouse doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.

60. I try to always help my spouse through difficult times.

61. I would rather suffer myself than let my spouse suffer.

62. I cannot be happy unless I place my spouse's happiness before my own.

63. I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my spouse achieve his/hers

Listed below are several statements that reflect different approaches to interpersonal communication. For each fill in the response on the answer sheet that indicates how much you agree or disagree with that statement as it applies to your own behavior. For each statement:

A = strongly agree with the statement

B = moderately agree with the statement

C = neutral neither agree or disagree

D = moderately disagree with statement

E = strongly disagree with statement

I HAVE TALKED ABOUT THE FOLLOWING SUBJECTS WITH MY SPOUSE:

64. My personal habits.

65. Things I have done which I feel guilty about.

66. Things I wouldn't do in public.

67. My deepest feelings.

68. What I like and dislike about myself.

69. What is important to me in life.

70. What makes me the person I am.

71. My worst fears.

72. Things I have done which I am proud of.

73. My close relationships with other people.

Please respond to the following questions based on the scale provided for each:

74. How well does your partner meet your needs?

A B C D E
poorly average extremely well

75. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

A B C D E
unsatisfied average extremely satisfied

76. How good is your relationship compared to most?

A B C D E
poor average excellent

77. How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?
 A never B C average D E very often
78. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?
 A hardly at all B C average D E completely
79. How much do you love your partner?
 A not much B C average D E very much
80. How many problems are there in your relationship?
 A very few B C average D E very many
81. How many people can you really count on to distract you from your worries when you feel under stress?
 A) none B) one C) two D) three E) four or more
82. Is one of them your spouse? A) yes B) no
83. How many people can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or tense?
 A) none B) one C) two D) three E) four or more
84. Is one of them your spouse? A) yes B) no
85. How many people accept you totally, including both your worst and best points?
 A) none B) one C) two D) three E) four or more
86. Is one of them your spouse? A) yes b) no
87. How many people can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?
 A) none B) one C) two D) three E) four or more
88. Is one of them your spouse? A) yes B) no
89. How many people can you really count on to help you feel better when you are feeling generally down-in-the dumps?
 A) none B) one C) two D) three E) four or more
90. Is one of them your spouse? A) yes B) no
91. How many people can you count on to console you when you are very upset?
 A) none B) one C) two D) three E) four or more
92. Is one of them your spouse? A) yes B) no
93. Do you think that you are doing your fair share of the household work?
 A strongly agree B C neutral D E strongly disagree
94. Do you think that your spouse is doing his\her fair share of the household work.
 A strongly agree B C neutral D E strongly disagree

95. How do you feel graduate, medical or law school has impacted your marriage?
A negatively B C D E
neutral positively

96. Is your spouse pursuing or currently holding a professional degree?
A) yes B) no

Please respond to who in your marriage is most responsible for the following activities by using the following criteria

A = husband almost entirely
B = husband more
C = husband-wife about the same
D = wife more
E = wife almost entirely

- 97. Food shopping
- 98. Yard Maintenance
- 99. Household repair
- 100. General handling of household tasks
- 101. Housecleaning
- 102. Preparing meals
- 103. Washing clothes
- 104. Making investments
- 105. Paying bills

**PLEASE ANSWER 106-111 IF YOU ARE IN GRADUATE, MEDICAL OR LAW SCHOOL
(OR HAVE JUST GRADUATED IN MAY, 1993)**

PLEASE ANSWER 112-121 IF YOU HAVE CHILDREN

106. What type of graduate program are you in? A) Medical B) Law C) Ph.D. D) MA/MS E) non degree program

107. For MA/MS and Ph.D. students, what is your discipline?
A) Agricultural Sciences
B) Business (Accounting, Marketing, Business Law, Management)
C) Arts and Sciences (Anthropology, Art, Biology, Chemistry, Languages/Communication, Mathematics, Physics, Pol. Sci., Psychology, Sociology, or related fields)
D) Education
E) Architecture/ Home Economics

108. If you are in school what is your current GPA:
A)4.0 B)3.99-3.5 C)3.49-3.0 D)2.99-2.5 E)below 2.5

109. How supportive is your academic program?
A B C D E
not much average very much

110. How good is your relationship with faculty members?
A B C D E
not good average very good

111. How isolated do you feel in your department?
A B C D E
not isolated average very isolated

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING IF YOU HAVE CHILDREN (112-121)

112. Do you think that you are doing your fair share of the parenting.

A	B	C	D	E
strongly agree		neutral		strongly disagree

113. Do you think that your spouse is doing his/her fair share of the parenting?

A	B	C	D	E
strongly agree		neutral		strongly disagree

Please respond to who in your marriage is most responsible for the following activities by using the following criteria:

A = husband almost entirely
B = husband more
C = husband-wife about the same
D = wife more
E = wife almost entirely

- 114. General handling of parental responsibility
- 115. Making decision about dating (if children are currently too young who will make this decision in the future)
- 116. Helping child(ren) with homework
- 117. Attending child's (children's) activities
- 118. Talking with child(ren) about concerns
- 119. Spending leisure time with child(ren)
- 120. Taking child(ren) to doctor
- 121. Disciplining child(ren)

In the space below, please indicate what you think is the most important aspect of a successful marriage.

APPENDIX C
COVER LETTER

June 4, 1993

Dear Texas Tech Graduate Student and Spouse:

As you know graduate school can be very stressful. For my dissertation I am examining how graduate school impacts marriage, and I would like to ask you and your spouse to participate in my study. The questionnaire consists of 121 multiple choice questions, which should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Enclosed are two questionnaires, two scantrons and two return envelopes (one for you and one for your spouse). Your responses are completely confidential and anonymous. Please do not put any identifying information on either the scantron or on the questionnaire. The scantrons are numbered in order to keep couple data together, but this number has been assigned randomly and is not associated with your name in any way. Please answer the questions on the scantrons with a pencil, seal the questionnaires and scantrons in separate envelopes (one scantron and one questionnaire per envelope), and return the envelopes via campus mail. If you choose not to participate, please return the materials in the envelopes provided.

The potential benefits of this study include data leading to a greater understanding of the impact of graduate school on marriage and the family, and there are no potential risks anticipated from participating in this study. We hope to provide information that will help aid Texas Tech University and other universities in better

understanding and supporting graduate students and their families.

If you have any question regarding the procedures of this study you may contact the Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects by writing them in care of the Office of Research Services, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409, or by calling 742-3884.

If you wish to learn more about this study, you may contact my faculty supervisor, Dr. Susan Hendrick, at 742-3737. Your participation is voluntary, but please let me thank you in advance for your time and help in this important project.

Sincerely,

Dawn M. Sokolski, M.A.
Doctoral Student

Susan S. Hendrick, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

APPENDIX D
LETTER TO DEPARTMENTS

Dear Department

I am working on my dissertation in Psychology examining the effects of graduate school on marriage. Thus, I have mailed surveys to married graduate students at TTU. Mr. Wickard at the Registrar's Office gave me the list of these married students' names. Your Department will be receiving several manila envelopes. Please distribute the surveys to the students. If, however, the student is no longer in the program, does not have a mail box, or has graduated, please return the undeliverable packets to me at MS 2051, Psychology. Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,

Dawn M. Sokolski, M.A.
Psychology
M.S. 2051

PS If you have any questions please contact my chair, Dr. Susan Hendrick @ 2-3737.

APPENDIX E
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

June 29, 1993

Dear Texas Tech Student and Spouse:

About three weeks ago, I mailed two marital satisfaction questionnaires to your home/mailstop. If you and your spouse have already filled them out, let me take this opportunity to thank you. If not, would you please consider responding, as this information is very important for my dissertation. If you chose not to participate and have not returned the blank questionnaire and scantrons, I ask you to please do so at this time. Thank you very much for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Dawn M. Sokolski, M.A.
Doctoral Student

Susan S. Hendrick, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

APPENDIX F
CORRELATION TABLE RAS
WITH DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 27: Correlations for RAS with demographics for the entire sample

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. GENDER	1.00	-.10	-.01	.01	.05	.02
2. TIMES MARRIED	-.10	1.00	-.10	-.07	.17*	.09
3. CHILDREN	-.01	-.10	1.00	.54**	-.17**	.01
4. YEARS MARRIED	.01	-.07	.54**	1.00	-.29**	-.05
5. PARENT EDUCATION	.05	.17*	-.17**	-.29**	1.00	.10
6. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.02	.09	.01	-.05	.10	1.00
7. EXTROVERSION	.07	-.02	.03	.05	.01	-.02
8. SELF CONCEPT	-.15*	.09	-.07	-.03	.06	.14*
9. LIFE SATISFACTION	.00	.08	-.10	-.07	.08	.14*
10. COHABITATION	-.02	-.15*	-.12	-.10	.00	-.10
11. RELOCATION	-.01	.03	.12	.11	-.04	-.00
12. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	-.02	-.06	.13*	.10	-.10	-.05
13. RELIGION	.07	.14*	.06	.07	.03	.05
14. STRESS LEVEL	.04	.06	-.03	.08	-.09	.15*
15. LEISURE TIME	-.02	.02	.02	.07	.02	.07
16. INCOME LEVEL	-.01	-.11	.20**	.36**	-.15*	-.07
17. FINANCIAL STRESS	-.08	.01	.02	.17*	-.19**	.08
18. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.32**	.00	-.03	-.01	-.03	.10
19. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	-.35**	-.07	-.04	-.03	.10	.04
20. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.01	.08	-.03	.11	.02	.09
21. RAS	.01	.00	-.12	-.03	.16*	.12

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 27. Continued

	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. GENDER	.07	-.15*	.00	-.02	-.01	-.02
2. TIMES MARRIED	-.02	.09	.08	-.15*	.03	-.06
3. CHILDREN	.03	-.07	-.10	-.12	.12	.13*
4. YEARS MARRIED	.05	-.03	-.07	-.10	.11	.10
5. PARENT EDUCATION	.01	.06	.08	.00	-.04	-.10
6. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	-.02	.14*	.14*	-.10	-.00	-.05
7. EXTROVERSION	1.00	.28**	.18**	-.05	.01	.03
8. SELF CONCEPT	.28**	1.00	.44**	-.07	-.07	.02
9. LIFE SATISFACTION	.18**	.44**	1.00	-.09	-.08	.11
10. COHABITATION	-.05	-.07	-.09	1.00	-.17*	-.07
11. RELOCATION	.01	-.07	-.08	-.17*	1.00	.05
12. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	.03	.02	.11	-.07	.05	1.00
13. RELIGION	.04	.07	.18**	-.42**	.10	.09
14. STRESS LEVEL	-.01	.08	.33**	.02	.00	-.07
15. LEISURE TIME	-.05	-.07	.08	.03	-.02	-.08
16. INCOME LEVEL	.10	.04	-.04	.04	.08	-.03
17. FINANCIAL STRESS	.04	.15*	.19**	-.12	.05	.00
18. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	-.05	-.10	.09	.04	-.11	.02
19. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.00	.17*	.21**	.04	-.08	-.01
20. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.06	.13*	.30**	.01	-.05	.03
21. RAS	.10	.29**	.55**	-.06	-.08	.03

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 27. Continued

	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. GENDER	.07	.04	-.02	-.01	-.08	.32**
2. TIMES MARRIED	.14*	.06	.02	-.11	.01	.00
3. CHILDREN	.06	-.03	.02	.20**	.02	-.03
4. YEARS MARRIED	.07	.08	.07	.36**	.17*	-.01
5. PARENTS EDUCATION	.03	-.09	.02	-.15*	-.19*	-.03
6. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.05	.15*	.07	-.07	.08	.10
7. EXTROVERSION	.04	-.01	-.05	.10	.04	-.05
8. SELF CONCEPT	.07	.08	-.07	.04	.15*	-.10
9. LIFE SATISFACTION	.18**	.33**	.08	-.04	.19**	.09
10. COHABITATION	-.42**	.02	.03	.04	-.11	.04
11. RELOCATION	.10	.00	-.02	.08	.04	-.11
12. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	.09	-.07	-.08	-.03	.00	.02
13. RELIGION	1.00	-.06	-.09	.02	.02	.04
14. STRESS LEVEL	-.06	1.00	.33**	.05	.27**	.18**
15. LEISURE TIME	-.09	.33**	1.00	.00	.07	-.11
16. INCOME LEVEL	.02	.05	.00	1.00	.32**	.01
17. FINANCIAL STRESS	.02	.27**	.07	.32**	1.00	.01
18. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.04	.18**	-.11	.01	.01	1.00
19. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	-.04	.03	.09	.02	.08	-.14*
20. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.08	.17**	.27**	-.05	.09	.04
21. RAS	.16*	.17*	.10	-.03	.15*	.03

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 27. Continued

	19	20	21
1. GENDER	-.35**	.01	.01
2. TIMES MARRIED	-.07	.08	.00
3. CHILDREN	-.04	-.03	-.12
4. YEARS MARRIED	-.03	.11	-.03
5. PARENT EDUCATION	.10	.02	.16*
6. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.04	.09	.12
7. EXTROVERSION	.00	.06	.10
8. SELF CONCEPT	.17*	.13*	.29**
9. LIFE SATISFACTION	.21**	.30**	.55**
10. COHABITATION	.04	.01	-.06
11. RELOCATION	-.08	-.05	-.08
12. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	-.01	.03	.03
13. RELIGION	-.04	.08	.16*
14. STRESS LEVEL	.03	.17**	.17*
15. LEISURE TIME	.09	.27**	.10
16. INCOME LEVEL	.02	-.05	-.03
17. FINANCIAL STRESS	.08	.09	.15*
18. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	-.14*	.04	.03
19. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	1.00	.15*	.34**
20. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.15*	1.00	.32**
21. RAS	.34**	.32**	1.00

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

APPENDIX G
CORRELATION TABLE FOR MALES

Table 28: Correlations for RAS with demographics
(for males)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. TIMES MARRIED	1.00	-.04	-.01	.14	.05
2. CHILDREN	-.04	1.00	.54**	-.13	-.01
3. YEARS MARRIED	-.01	.54**	1.00	-.31**	-.04
4. PARENTS EDUCATION	.14	-.13	-.31**	1.00	.07
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.05	-.01	-.04	.07	1.00
6. EXTROVERSION	-.07	.13	.12	-.09	-.08
7. SELF CONCEPT	-.05	-.02	.00	-.07	.18
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.02	-.10	-.08	.07	.20*
9. COHABITATION	-.09	-.10	-.09	.02	-.10
10. RELOCATION	.06	.14	.13	.03	.01
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	-.04	.13	.12	-.10	-.05
12. RELIGION	.10	.01	.03	-.01	.03
13. STRESS LEVEL	.01	-.08	.09	-.09	.21*
14. LEISURE TIME	.02	-.03	.01	.07	.09
15. INCOME LEVEL	-.07	.23*	.37**	-.22*	-.05
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	-.03	.00	.17	-.22*	.08
17. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.05	-.02	.04	-.06	.11
18. FAIR SHARE HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	-.11	-.07	-.13	.15	.07
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.06	-.01	.08	-.04	.02
20. RAS	-.02	-.18	-.07	.13	.17

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 28. Continued

	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. TIMES MARRIED	-.07	-.05	.02	-.09	.06	-.04
2. CHILDREN	.13	-.02	-.10	-.10	.13	.13
3. YEARS MARRIED	.12	.00	-.08	-.09	.13	.12
4. PARENT EDUCATION	-.09	-.07	.07	.02	.03	-.10
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS						
MARRIAGE	-.08	.18	.20*	-.10	.01	-.05
6. EXTROVERSION	1.00	.24*	.20*	-.06	.03	.15
7. SELF CONCEPT	.24*	1.00	.49**	-.11	-.08	.12
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.20*	.49**	1.00	-.07	-.03	.10
9. COHABITATION	-.06	-.11	-.07	1.00	-.15	-.04
10. RELOCATION	.03	-.08	-.03	-.15	1.00	.04
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	.15	.12	.10	-.04	.04	1.00
12. RELIGION	.01	.10	.21*	-.36**	.15	.08
13. STRESS LEVEL	.01	.21*	.36**	.02	.06	-.08
14. LEISURE TIME	-.15	-.05	.06	.06	.05	-.14
15. INCOME LEVEL	.18	.05	-.03	.04	.06	-.05
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	.07	.18	.23*	-.10	.00	.05
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK						
(SELF)	-.07	-.10	.10	.05	-.07	-.03
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK						
(SPOUSE)	.05	.10	.16	.05	-.12	.04
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.01	.00	.21*	.06	.04	.08
20. RAS	.09	.24**	.45**	-.01	-.06	.06

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 28. Continued

	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. TIMES MARRIED	.10	.01	.02	-.07	-.03	.05
2. CHILDREN	.01	-.07	-.03	.23*	-.00	-.02
3. YEARS MARRIED	.03	.09	.01	.37**	.17	.04
4. PARENT EDUCATION	-.01	-.09	.07	-.22*	-.22*	-.05
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.03	.21*	.09	-.05	.08	.11
6. EXTROVERSION	.01	.01	-.15	.18	.07	-.07
7. SELF CONCEPT	.10	.21*	-.05	.05	.18	-.09
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.21*	.36**	.06	-.03	.23*	.10
9. COHABITATION	-.36**	.02	.06	.04	-.10	.05
10. RELOCATION	.15	.06	.05	.06	.00	-.07
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	.08	-.08	-.14	-.05	.05	-.03
12. RELIGION	1.00	.02	-.01	-.02	.01	-.04
13. STRESS LEVEL	.02	1.00	.30**	.15	.36**	.21*
14. LEISURE TIME	-.01	.30**	1.00	-.06	.08	-.13
15. INCOME LEVEL	-.02	.15	-.06	1.00	.30**	.02
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	.01	.36**	.08	.30**	1.00	.03
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SELF)	-.04	.21*	-.13	.02	.03	1.00
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.02	-.03	-.03	-.13	-.06	-.05
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.08	.16	.22*	-.10	.09	.07
20. RAS	.21*	.11	.06	-.10	.12	.10

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 28. Continued

	18	19	20
1. TIMES MARRIED	-.11	.06	-.02
2. CHILDREN	-.07	-.01	-.17
3. YEARS MARRIED	-.13	.08	-.07
4. PARENT EDUCATION	.15	-.04	.13
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.07	.02	.17
6. EXTROVERSION	.05	.01	.09
7. SELF CONCEPT	.10	.00	.24**
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.16	.21*	.45**
9. COHABITATION	.05	.06	-.01
10. RELOCATION	-.11	.04	-.06
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	.04	.08	.06
12. RELIGION	.02	.08	.21*
13. STRESS LEVEL	-.03	.16	.11
14. LEISURE TIME	-.03	.22*	.06
15. INCOME LEVEL	-.13	-.10	-.10
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	-.06	.09	.12
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SELF)	-.05	.07	.10
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	1.00	.09	.33**
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.09	1.00	.29**
20. RAS	.33**	.29**	1.00

*Significant at $p < .01$ **Significant at $p < .001$

APPENDIX H
CORRELATION TABLE FOR FEMALES

Table 29: Correlations for RAS with demographics for females

	1	2	3	4	5
1. TIMES MARRIED	1.00	-.14	-.11	.21*	.12
2. CHILDREN	-.14	1.00	.55**	-.22*	.03
3. YEARS MARRIED	-.11	.55**	1.00	-.28**	-.06
4. PARENTS EDUCATION	.21*	-.22*	-.28**	1.00	.13
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.12	.03	-.06	.13	1.00
6. EXTROVERSION	.03	-.08	-.03	.13	.02
7. SELF CONCEPT	.16	-.12	-.06	.22*	.11
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.12	-.09	-.07	.09	.09
9. COHABITATION	-.20*	-.14	-.12	-.02	-.09
10. RELOCATION	.01	.10	.10	-.12	-.01
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	-.08	.13	.09	-.10	-.05
12. RELIGION	.19*	.12	.10	.07	.08
13. STRESS LEVEL	.11	.01	.07	-.10	.08
14. LEISURE TIME	.02	.07	.12	-.02	.06
15. INCOME LEVEL	-.14	.17	.34**	-.08	-.09
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	.02	.05	.17	-.16	.09
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.01	-.04	-.06	-.04	.09
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	-.11	-.03	.05	.11	.04
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.09	-.06	.14	.07	.16
20. RAS	.01	-.06	.00	.18	.08

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 29. Continued

	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. TIMES MARRIED	.03	.16	.12	-.20*	.01	-.08
2. CHILDREN	-.08	-.12	-.09	-.14	.10	.13
3. YEARS MARRIED	-.03	-.06	-.07	-.12	.10	.09
4. PARENT EDUCATION	.13	.22*	.10	-.02	-.12	-.10
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.02	.11	.09	-.09	-.01	-.05
6. EXTROVERSION	1.00	.34**	.16	-.05	-.01	-.09
7. SELF CONCEPT	.34**	1.00	.41**	-.04	-.07	-.08
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.16	.41**	1.00	-.11	-.12	.11
9. COHABITATION	-.05	-.04	-.11	1.00	-.18*	-.10
10. RELOCATION	-.01	-.07	-.12	-.18*	1.00	.06
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	-.09	-.08	.11	-.10	.06	1.00
12. RELIGION	.06	.06	.16	-.49**	.06	.10
13. STRESS LEVEL	-.03	-.03	.31**	.02	-.07	-.06
14. LEISURE TIME	.06	-.10	.10	.00	-.08	-.04
15. INCOME LEVEL	.01	.03	-.06	.04	.10	-.02
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	.01	.10	.16	-.13	.09	-.05
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SELF)	-.07	-.03	.08	.05	-.16	.08
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.00	.15	.28**	.03	-.08	-.06
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.13	.24**	.38**	-.03	-.14	-.02
20. RAS	.11	.34**	.65**	-.11	-.11	.01

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 29. Continued

	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. TIMES MAARIED	.19*	.11	.02	-.14	.02	.01
2. CHILDREN	.12	.01	.07	.17	.05	-.04
3. YEARS MARRIED	.10	.07	.12	.34**	.17	-.06
4. PARENTS EDUCATION	.07	-.10	-.02	-.08	-.16	-.04
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.08	.08	.06	-.09	.09	.09
6. EXTROVERSION	.06	-.03	.06	.01	.01	-.07
7. SELF CONCEPT	.06	-.03	-.10	.03	.10	-.03
8. LEF SATISFACTION	.16	.31**	.10	-.06	.16	.08
9. COHABITATION	-.49**	.02	.00	.04	-.13	.05
10. RELOCATION	.06	-.07	-.08	.10	.09	-.16
11. YEAR IN GRAD SCHOOL	.10	-.06	-.04	-.02	-.05	.08
12. RELIGION	1.00	-.14	-.17	.07	.05	.08
13. STRESS LEVEL	-.14	1.00	.35**	-.05	.18*	.15
14. LEISURE TIME	-.17	.35**	1.00	.05	.06	-.07
15. INCOME LEVEL	.07	-.05	.05	1.00	.35**	.01
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	.05	.18*	.06	.35**	1.00	.03
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SELF)	.08	.15	-.07	.01	.03	1.00
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	-.05	.10	.19*	.15	.16	-.02
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.07	.19*	.32**	-.01	.09	.01
20. RAS	.11	.23*	.13	.03	.18	-.04

*Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 29. Continued

	18	19	20
1. TIMES MARRIED	-.11	.09	.01
2. CHILDREN	-.03	-.06	-.06
3. YEARS MARRIED	.05	.14	.00
4. PARENT EDUCATION	.11	.07	.18
5. QUALITY OF PARENTS MARRIAGE	.04	.16	.08
6. EXTROVERISON	.00	.13	.11
7. SELF CONCEPT	.15	.24**	.34**
8. LIFE SATISFACTION	.28**	.38**	.65**
9. COHABITATION	.03	-.03	-.11
10. RELOCATION	-.08	-.14	-.11
11. YEAR OF GRAD SCHOOL	-.06	-.02	.01
12. RELIGION	-.05	.07	.11
13. STRESS LEVEL	.10	.19*	.23*
14. LEISURE TIME	.19*	.32**	.13
15. INCOME LEVEL	.15	-.01	.03
16. FINANCIAL STRESS	.16	.09	.18
17. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SELF)	-.02	.01	-.04
18. FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	1.00	.22*	.40**
19. IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	.22*	1.00	.34**
20. RAS	.40**	.34**	1.00

*Significant at $p < .01$ **Significant at $p < .001$

APPENDIX I
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Table 30: Means and Standard Deviations (demographic variables)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max	N
AGE	1.63	1.24	0	4	322
TIMES MARRIED	3.76	.79	0	4	322
CHILDREN	.56	.50	0	1	322
YEARS MARRIED	1.80	1.16	0	4	322
PARENTS EDUCATION	2.46	1.24	0	4	322
QUALITY PAR\MARR	2.67	1.24	0	4	322
EXTROVERSION	2.41	.95	0	4	322
SELF CONCEPT	2.99	.72	1	4	322
LIFE SATISFACTION	3.06	.74	1	4	322
COHABITAION	.72	.45	0	1	322
RELOCATION	.25	.43	0	1	322
YEAR IN GRAD SCH	1.78	1.25	0	4	322
IMPORTANCE OF REL	2.59	1.34	0	4	322
STRESS LEVEL	1.13	.88	0	4	322
LEISURE TIME	.90	.97	0	4	322
INCOME	1.89	1.14	0	4	322
FINANCIAL STRESS	1.69	1.20	0	4	322

Table 30. Continued

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max	N
EMPLOYMENT	1.34	1.22	0	3	322
CHANGE IN INTIMACY	1.57	.97	0	4	322
SATISFACTION/INTIMACY	2.66	1.07	0	4	321
IMPACT OF GRAD SCHOOL	2.30	1.18	0	4	322
PROGRAM SUPPORT	2.17	1.20	0	4	208
FACULTY MEMBER SUPPORT	2.73	.99	0	4	208
DEPARTMENT ISOLATION	2.52	1.24	0	4	208

Table 31: Means and Standard Deviations (scales)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max	N
EROS	4.14	.70	2.00	5.00	322
LUDUS	1.47	.66	1.00	4.00	322
STORGE	3.66	.76	1.25	5.00	322
PRAGMA	2.67	1.01	1.00	5.00	322
MANIA	2.56	.83	1.00	5.00	322
AGAPE	3.93	.69	1.75	5.00	322
RAS	4.32	.67	1.43	5.00	322
MARRIAGE COMMITMENT					
SCALE	4.64	.53	2.50	5.00	322
SELF-DISCLOSURE					
SCALE	4.37	.60	1.90	5.00	322
SOCIAL SUPPORT					
(OTHERS)	3.77	.93	1.00	5.00	322
SOCIAL SUPPORT					
(SPOUSE)	1.92	.20	1.00	2.00	322
EQUITABLE PARENTING					
SCALE	1.29	.23	.88	1.88	119
EQUITABLE HOUSEHOLD TASK					
SCALE	.90	.41	0	2.00	322
EGALITARIAN GENDER ROLE					
SCALE	.64	.23	-.14	1.00	322

APPENDIX J
CORRELATIONS AMONG PREDICTORS
IN REGRESSION

Table 32: Correlations among predictors in regression

Correlations:	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 SELF CONCEPT	1.00	.44**	.15*	.10	.17*	.17*
2 LIFE SATISFACTION		1.00	.20**	.45**	.21**	.41**
3 FINANCIAL STRESS			1.00	.11	.08	.01
4 SATISFACTION IN INTIMACY				1.00	.08	.54**
5 FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)					1.00	.15*
6 EROS						1.00
7 MARITAL COMMITMENT SCALE						
8 LUDUS						
9 SELF-DISCLOSURE INDEX						
10 SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)						
11 SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)						
12 RAS						

* Significant at $p < .01$ ** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 32. Continued

Correlations:	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 SELF CONCEPT	.12	-.09	.18**	.18**	.24**	.29**
2 LIFE SATISFACTION	.39**	-.31**	.25**	.38**	.23**	.55**
3 FINANCIAL STRESS	.01	-.07	-.04	.08	.04	.17*
4 SATISFACTION IN INTIMACY	.37**	-.18**	.26**	.34**	.25**	.51**
5 FAIR SHARE OF HOUSEWORK (SPOUSE)	.20**	-.13	.16*	.21**	.02	.33**
6 EROS	.41**	-.25**	.37**	.50**	.30**	.52**
7 MARITAL COMMITMENT SCALE	1.00	-.40**	.38**	.47**	.22**	.61**
8 LUDUS		1.00	-.35**	-.31**	-.24**	-.46**
9 SELF-DISCLOSURE INDEX			1.00	.39**	.30**	.44**
10 SOCIAL SUPPORT (SPOUSE)				1.00	.37**	.55**
11 SOCIAL SUPPORT (OTHER)					1.00	.24**
12 RAS						1.00

* Significant at $p < .01$ **Significant at $p < .001$

APPENDIX K
RESPONSES FOR THE
OPEN-ENDED QUESTION

Responses to Open-ended Questions

These responses have not been copy edited in anyway. The Number in front of each response is the case number assigned to the participant

1)Working together for common goals. To do this requires constant communication and openness

5)communication

6)communication

7)A strong spiritual foundation that emphasizes commitment to marriage and family. A limited degree of self-centeredness on the part of both partners.

8)A strong relationship with God. Having a true friendship with your spouse - having fun together.

9)Respect of the other persons feelings, values, etc. You must respect your spouse and he/she must respect you in return to get past even the most basic difficulties. Good open communication and similar values also play large, important parts in the success of any marriage partnership.

11)commitment and understanding, willingness to keep working at it.

12)communication, intimacy, shared responsibility, support for one another in all aspects of lives, mutual respect, trust, all are equally important.

18)spiritual focus

19)communication and trust

20) Understanding of one another's need to solitude on occasion. Time together is important to build family relations but every member of the family has desires, whether they acknowledge them or not, to get away with their thoughts and refresh their drive and motivations. Too many partners, both men and women, confine and restrict the other partner which inhibits that individualism which probably attracted the one to the other in the first place.

21) Christ as the center. Always realizing that one's spouse has just as many concerns about the relationship.

22) Having God at the center of the relationship!

23) My husband and I do not live together - he recently obtained his Ph.D. and had a job in College Station and was unable to find decent work in his field (Physics) in Lubbock. So, we've been apart for the 1 year and 1 month of our marriage. I honestly feel that this has strengthened our marriage because we make the most of our time together. We get to see each other about twice a month - it varies according to my test schedule. If I'm particularly stressed out - he'll fly up and "take care of me". The most difficult part about being separated is when he's not here physically for the little things (flat tires, etc.....) but I've made lots of friends who help me out. I do get tired of explaining to people that we're married but living apart

- people automatically assume that there's trouble (or that we don't love each other enough). My husband and I dated for 9 years before marrying - we met in college - he was my first true love (and vice versa). I know it sounds corny - but I knew he was the one for me almost immediately. We waited so long to get married because even though we knew we were right for each other - we always felt too young and unprepared. Our educational goals always came first and I feel had we gotten married earlier - I wouldn't be in med school (which has been my life long dream).

Even though we've only been married 1 yr - I know we have a successful marriage - I think part of it stems from being best friends - being honest and handling life's "stressors". He respects what I'm doing very much - he knows how tired and stressed I can get; so he'll send me a little card to make me laugh. After 10 years of being together; we're still in love; we still do goofy things, we still fight over his mother... I think it's very important to be able to laugh. I still look in his eyes and get butterflies in my stomach.

Since we have so little time together - our arguments must be short. We decided that we can't waste our time arguing over little things. When we do fight - its usually over \$; but now that he has a good job; those fights are

over. One of his best friends died recently of cancer at age 29 leaving a wife and 3 month old triplets. I have one parent who is terminally ill and another who is 73 years old. My husband and I realize that life is too short and can be snatched up any time -so we're not going to argue about the little things and we try not to dwell on the big things. Don't get me wrong - we don't "avoid" our problems- we just don't fight over who takes the trash out. We never go to bed angry at each other. We never hang up the phone on each other without resolving a conflict and we never have sex when either one of us is not in the mood. If one partner gives in just to "get it over with"; there will be problems (we did this once and only once!)

All in all, med school is a huge stressor - I'm seeing some marriages in my class break-up. The spouse of the student needs to realize that med school is an all encompassing challenge - you sometimes put so much into studying, tests, etc.... that there's nothing left over for the spouse. If couples can realize that this is temporary (at least until tests are over) - then things can work. Most of all, talk to each other and talk about your future together - what it will be like when we're finally together!

A happily married med student

25)good communication!

27) I believe it's mutual respect and space. In a good marriage, neither dominates the spouse and allows the other room to accomplish what he/she needs to feel self-satisfaction. My spouse never exerts undue influence or pressure on me in decision-making. I have always felt like my own person.

28) Communication.

30) Communication - to work things out, to love each other, to help each other. Christianity, and commitment to the Lord

31) communication and tolerance

33) Trust and friendship. Each spouse must trust the other implicitly and absolutely and each must be a true and honest friend to the other.

34) Truth and respect - if you cannot trust someone then you have no foundation with which to build. You build respect from your trust and without these two things there is nothing.

36) friendship

37) communication

38) cooperation based on mutual self-understanding arrived at by the ability to be open, honest and trusting.

39) Respect for your partner, honesty, communication

40) cooperation, communication, trust, sense of humor

42)faith in the lord - sense of respect, thankfulness and commitment to spouse

45)love, communication, physical intimacy, individual growth, responsibility

46)Open communication between partners.

48)love, trust, constant communication, working hard at the marriage every day

49)Being committed Christians and building marriage on Christian principles. Being able to say "I'm sorry" when I have wronged and having it said to me when he is wrong. Keeping our friendship alive, sharing with each other all of our hopes and dreams.

50)Both partners are committed Christians.

51)trust!!!

52)Trust

55)Communication, compromise, commitment

56)Be able to share good times and bad times together.

58)I think that having a solid foundation is a key to maintaining a successful marriage during graduate school. My wife and I were married almost two years before I started, and we were both thankful that we didn't have the additional stress of getting adjusted to living together before starting school. The key is to communicate with one

another and keep all of your problems current and out in the open.

59)trust

60)honesty and communication

62)open communication, trust

64)Hard work - you must work at making your marriage successful. You have to consider how what you do affects the ones you love. This includes not only major things like career decisions, but little things like avoiding doing the little things that irritate them. You have to make an effort to do not only the fun romantic things that keep the relationship in good shape but also the unpleasant things like dealing with financial matters which keeps serious misunderstandings from occurring.

69)commitment to the Lord and each other

70)commitment

73)When we have problems, we always go back to our Christian faith, guidance in the Bible, and commitment and love for one another: equally.

74)Being honest to each other in all things and having God word as the rule book to go by.

76)To me, friendship and trust are two of the most important aspects of marriage. No matter how good

everything else is, a marriage is destined to fail if these two things are not met.

80) I think being able to talk to one another,
communication

84) Communication! Most definitely! I learned that you can't read each other's mind. You may think they know what they do bothers you, but most of the time they don't. It's okay to argue, we're all different people, we can't agree on everything. I'm enjoying the fact that we can have an argument and not get all heated and hostile. We've really learned how to talk things out, neither one wants to fight.

93) communication

97) common relationship with God. Constant communication; honesty, open mindedness to change, flexibility.

101) love and communication

102) mutual respect and love

104) trust, friendship, common goals

106) commitment

107) caring and sharing

108) open channels of communication available even if not always used. This encourages awareness and respect of yourself and partner.

109)communication. Also, I recently quit my job when we had our 1st child (2 months ago). I answered questions 114-121 based on the future.

110)Unconditional commitment, a willingness to communicate through difficult circumstances. "The absence of divorce" - Carl Reiner

112)I think honesty is the most important aspect of a marriage. Honesty leads to trust but without it, trust can never really exist.

113)communication

116)commitment

117)Belief and faith that permanent, lifetime marriage to 1 spouse was and is ordained by God, and a personal commitment to this belief.

118)Commitment is absolutely essential. The sensual aspects will wax and wain depending on many external factors. Pregnancy and the time constraints from studying for the bar are two factors which are currently affecting our time together. But, our commitment to God and each other supersede all other problems which are temporary. Law school was a unique and fulfilling time for us. The demands of the school could have very well had an adverse affect on us. But, we had a strong marriage going in and an even stronger one coming out. My husband did not make law school

his God or his mistress. I think a strong faith, unwavering commitment and a sense of humor make for a fun, stable marriage.

119) open, honest communication. friendship, trust, having fun together.

120) The most important aspect of a successful marriage is putting God in and letting him lead your lives together.

123) Trust, respect, friendship

124) communication

126) The most important aspects of a successful marriage are commitment and an ability to forgive one another's faults. As long as you are both determined to make the marriage work and can forgive the mistakes made along the way - you have a much better chance at a successful marriage.

127) To be able to communicate with each other one's feelings and thoughts. To not let things build up. Let it out by talking about it or reacting to a situation.

129) It's very important to take time and get away from school to keep in touch with each other without the cloud of school hanging over our heads. In the future this will translate into vacations and weekend getaways from the grind of daily life. Without this time, communication will decrease and erode the relationship.

130)communication, love and respect

132)common interests and life's goals

134)understanding and respect

136)sense of humor, patience and understanding

137)Knowing each other very well (at least for several years) before marriage. Living away from family - this makes us have to work out our problems together without running to mom or dad. Communicating daily. Showing interest in your spouse's interests (job, hobbies, etc.). Having a dog!!! You learn lots about each other through sharing responsibilities of caring for a pet. (assuming no children are yet involved).

138)Initially, success depends on how well partners know each other. It is vitally important to spend as much time as possible learning each others strengths, weaknesses and quirks. Continued success depends on openness, caring, and avoiding pettiness. It's easy to point out faults but it's rarely productive. If it is necessary to voice such things it should be done in a calm, constructive manner. So if you don't like the way your spouse folds the towels or makes the bed, learn to like it.

139)love your mate as you love yourself.

140)open communication, listening and being listened to.

141) To me, the most important aspect of a successful marriage is a loving, caring commitment toward teamwork. Marriage is the ultimate support structure; a safe haven, so to speak, from "the cold cruel world". That unsurpassable combination of best friend, cheerleader and lover all in one! It is important to keep in mind that the two form one team that is stronger together, than if apart. A synergistic effect - it no longer equals 2 - instead 10 +! "ours" is the focus, instead of "mine" and "yours". We've found it effective and pleasing to have our marriage guided by principles of "management by objective", we talk frequently of our goals- both short and long term - discuss what we feel to be the best way for us to work toward these goals together - revising as we go. In effect, a game plan for our team, a team based upon love, commitment, caring, sharing, growing, supporting, accepting, believing.

142) Living in harmony through life's tribulations. Accepting each other no matter what. Just as the vows that you say on your wedding day is what it's all about.

144) Trust, love, sharing tasks, responsibilities and having fun together. Working at doing things together that each of us enjoys. Maintaining communication.

145) A desire and willingness to compromise.

146) Time

147) Communication

148) Compromise and talking problems over

149) Patience

150) A sense of humor to help handle arguments, and to help you live with each other's and life's flaws. Learning communication effectively, taking into account you and your partners needs, sensitivities, etc.

151) Communication

152) Open communication between both partners and making time for just the two of you.

155) Mutual understanding

156) Understanding

157) Communicating in ways your spouse understands your total, irreversible commitment to your spouse.

158) Commitment to the relationship, open and effective communication, and complete trust.

159) Commitment

160) Communication and trust!

161) Laughter and fun, communication, active participation by both, initiative by both partners, supportiveness, dreams and goals, to genuinely like the essence of each others being, being able to trust your partner independently, to know what to do when and how in given situations, compatible attitudes, approaches, and

passions for life, understanding and tolerance, chemistry, bringing out the best in each other naturally through a positive mode (not competitive), fostering spiritual growth in each other, enhancing each others human spirit, friendship (commitment, energy, attitude, kindness, ceremony and pageantry), scorepad mentality has no place in marriage, concentrate on personal integrity, goals, commitments and enrichment and long term wellness, enjoy the journey, make it good as it goes along.

162)love, which we have a lot of. Communication, which we don't. Q107 What about engineering?

165)The ability to trust in the other partner and to listen to the other partner.

166)love

167)Implicit trust, mutual respect and honesty.

168)Love, honesty, and friendship.

169)Love and trust.

170)Communication is the most important aspect of a successful marriage.

173)Respect for each other, no name calling or cheap shots, politeness, being able to talk through problems, and reach solutions, sensitivity to each other's moods and feelings. Faithfulness, absolute loyalty, especially when sides are being taken in a spouse's family.

175) Love, mutual respect, trust, good sex, the ability to forgive, forget, and go on, being together, fitting together, having mutual morals, values, and visions, being able to be flexible, a sense of humor!

176) Trust, respect, great sex, mutual interest.

178) Genuine love. All else descends from this. When I have my love for my wife in mind, I do okay. When I allow myself to get distracted and busy, so that I no longer think of my love for her, then I become insensitive to her needs.

179) Respecting and understanding each other. Loving and caring for each other. Last but not the least, some adjustment (accommodating) with the spouse as no one can be exactly like you.

180) Married life is never as perfect as is romance novels. However, to be happy both the spouses need to cooperate, compromise or even sacrifice sometimes. (Whether it is a small issue or a big one). May be my cultural background may be influencing me..... I also feel that both should be able to communicate at the same intellectual and emotional level. If one really loves and respects each other I suppose that some of the above mentioned things can be achieved.

181) The most important aspect of a successful marriage is never keeping account or talking about one aspect of the

marriage - money, school, profession - who does what. A marriage goes through seasons. At times the wife gives more, at times the husband gives more. In our family, we married as undergraduates, had one child in undergraduate and one child in grad school ten years ago. We are both in prof. grad. school now at the same time with the oldest child a senior at Tech. One spouse's degree may have higher economic value, but never a higher intrinsic worth.

182) Communication and willingness to compromise.

185) An inexplicable sense of love for your spouse.

186) I know that a tried and true answer to this question is communication - it's what all the women's magazines say. There has to be something else though. Probably something like companionship - really liking your spouse and being able to sometimes not communicate and have that be OK (like just enjoying the other person's company [usually] without having every moment be meaningful quality time). How about this - the "3 COMs" of marriage - communication, companionship, and commitment. [There's a journal article title in there somewhere!]

187) A strong relationship with God! God, too, is a part of our marriage. If our relationship with God is going well, then our relationship with each other goes well. We have our own personal time with God, as well as time

together with him. He teaches us the importance of forgiveness and unconditional love every day! His rules for making a marriage work are very simple and easy to follow.

188) A mutual faith in Jesus Christ, unconditional love, a serious commitment to the marriage, other married friends to talk with, the willingness to seek help (before it's too late) if needed.

189) Not giving up at the least problem, commitment to making it work, even after 30 years.

190) Sharing responsibilities as well as the good times. However, each needs some space for their own pursuits. If children are involved, agreement between parents concerning discipline is a necessity.

191) Honesty with self and spouse.

192) Communication

194) Communication, understanding, friendship

195) Mutual commitment, trust, and communication. From my experience, that seems easier for those who have committed themselves to God through accepting (trusting) Jesus Christ as personal savior. My wife and I each know we are not perfect, but our ultimate trust is in God who is perfect. Since he forgives us, it is easier to forgive each other and continue commitment in love. To me, love is much more a commitment to put the other person first than a

feeling. Feelings come and go based on lots of things. A commitment can continue in spite of difficulties. Please see comments on some of the questions as I was not certain of the meaning in all cases.

196) Most people, however much in love, are selfish. The most important aspect of a successful marriage is that both partners have first committed themselves to Jesus Christ and are willing to do what He wants. That means, of course, that the people have to both read the Bible and obey it (lots of people think they know what the Bible says but never read it - with the usual misquotes and inaccuracies). However, being genuine followers of Christ means that emotional health is more possible - he helps a person balance their life and is a never ending source of love, joy, peace (in the middle of stress), patience, kindness, and so forth.

197) A spouse who listens to your concerns, hopes, dreams. Without good communication, a marriage can have problems. Best of luck with your dissertation! This was a good research instrument!

198) Mutual respect for each other and allowing each other to pursue their respective goals so as to improve self-worth and not feel stifled

199) Commitment to the relationship especially through hard times.

202) Commitment - to the spouse and to the marriage.
Also - a sense of humor!

203) Communication with spouse. A household which places Christ in the center.

206) Your not coding your own measures?? That's half the fun!

208) Reliance and dedication of both parties to GOD.

209) Communication and Compromise.

211) Definitely communication! No matter how bad things get, sharing your mind with your spouse is essential for marital stability.

212) Communication. Openness of communication and the ability to say anything to each other contributes to a stable marriage.

217) Open communication and faith in God at all times, good and bad.

218) Understanding each other, sharing thoughts, ideas, and personal feelings and doing things together especially during "quality time". Finally, involve each other during critical decision-making process.

219) A deep and committed friendship - being supportive, understanding, and always there for each other- having a marriage built on trust, caring and love.

220) learning to resolve differences is win/win.
Supportive of each other's efforts.

221) I feel this was a poor questionnaire. You assumed the couple married before graduate school. You assumed one spouse was contributing more than the other; not equally (i.e. income). Question 30 makes no sense - I'm in graduate school as a research assistant. Responsibilities also include car repairs, computer expertise, electronic repairs... Your bias shows.

222) communication, concern, caring, and commitment.

223) Communication, good luck!

224) love, time, sex, individuality

225) mutual caring/trust

226) Honest communication and the willingness of both partners to compromise and be flexible; often participating in activities you aren't that interested in, but do so because it's important to your spouse. The ability to listen and provide support and comfort in times of stress. Trying to give and take in division of responsibilities.

231) A belief in God. The knowledge that God sanctions marriage and He will help you make it last if you trust Him

and put some effort into it. And that marriage lasts a lifetime.

232) Dawn, a successful marriage is based on one thing and one thing alone... the individual commitment to Jesus on the part of both husband and wife. All things beyond this will fall into place. I do not DEPEND on my spouse to meet my "needs" - I depend on God. If He so chooses to meet her needs through me, I am blessed. If He chooses to meet my needs through her, I am blessed. Mind you, this is not "religion", as so called in question #18 - it is a supernatural relationship with God -- who is very much alive and real.

235) Communication, love, and comprehension. Making our marriage as one person. Sharing illusions, friendship, I think doing our best thinking and feeling real love.

236) To have common goals in life. To have an open mind.

237) Love and trust.

238) I think the most important aspects in a marriage are honesty and communication. To go along with these is also LOVE!!

240) Communication. The ability to not just listen to what your spouse has to say but to really hear them. Very often, the reason a person gives for being upset may mask

something more serious. If one doesn't really listen to his/her spouse, dissatisfactions could grow until they destroy the relationship when in reality, they could have been solved if caught earlier.

243) A strong personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

244) Communication with each other.

245) Communication and love.

248) To realize that a marriage does not mean the end of one's dreams, only someone to help you with those dreams and to carry the load when you are too tired to continue.

249) Commitment to making the relationship work - no matter what factors impact the marriage and to support and love each other in meeting our own needs as well as needs of the family.

250) A partner who is loving, caring, understanding, encouraging, supportive, and forgiving.

251) Choosing every day to be committed to your marriage and to be positive.

252) Communication.

253) Open and honest communication and respect for each other.

254) Communication!

255) A sense of humor and the ability to truly listen to your spouse.

257)Not becoming too busy to share time together.

258)The most important aspect of a successful marriage includes many others, trust, attention, care, friendship, helpfulness, sharing, love, admiration, commitment, consideration, generosity, understanding, etc.

259)A commitment to your partner, to your family, and to the institution of marriage itself. Shear determination and commitment coupled with a selfless devotion to these 3 principles and in that specific order, are key to a successful marriage. You must first want a successful marriage and then channel that will into the necessary acts that will build a successful marriage. All of this requires maturity, and discipline.

260)Communicating with each other and never forgetting that your spouse exists and that they are your spouse. Trying to keep the romance alive by going out and doing little things for each other that mean a lot. Never forget to say I LOVE YOU!

261)Communication, mutual respect, sense of humor

262)Communication

263)A sense of humor

264)Attempting to make one another as happy as possible and recognizing that the academy is unavoidably stressful.

265) Communication, honesty, support, willingness to go the distance to support your spouse, understanding, patience. (you can see that a lot of things are important to me!)

266) Communication, understanding

267) Liking as well as loving each other. Mutual respect for one another goes hand-in-hand with that.

268) I think that trust and respect for each other is very important. You can also must like the person.

271) Husband and wife who both care enough to put effort into the marriage and into the family.

272) Love and commitment to each other and family.

273) Devotion to Christ and family.

274) Love and serve the Lord then each other.

275) For a successful marriage, I believe you must always show respect for one another. Each person should feel free to express his/her thoughts or concerns about the marriage or personal areas. Also, I believe that one should try to avoid problems caused by "stubborn pride", and instead of trying to dominate or conquer you should be concerned with making your spouse feel that they are the most important thing to you.

276) Having God in the center of our lives and our marriage. Communication is extremely important. Learning

how to disagree and argue about our differences without "tearing" each other down. Being supportive and lifting each other up. Being aware of each others needs and desires as well as his dreams.

277)Communication is essential. Putting each other's needs ahead of one's own needs is also vital. To me, probably the very most important factor is a living and active faith in Jesus Christ.

278)An individual and mutual commitment to living our lives for Jesus Christ.

279)Empathy and communication

280)Honesty-discussing problems. caring for one another.

281)Being understanding of one's spouse and talking together.

282)Communication, having realistic priorities, having realistic expectations, being non-judgmental, complete trust.

283)Good communication

284)Trust and consideration of each other. I feel respect is also very important.

289)Unconditional love.

291)Communication

292) Commitment to each other and the relationship.

Understanding and acceptance of each other's lives.

293) Fidelity.

294) Conflict resolution skills.

295) Communication.

296) Communication and an innate understanding that each of us is only human and is therefore subject to screw-ups. These lapses are part of life. Enjoy it! The alternative is not a good option!

297) Commitment to the marriage. Communication

302. Mutual caring about each other.

307) Love, patience, and understanding.

308) Trust.

313) Our faith is critical. I can't imagine anyone else for me.

314) Striving together for a common goal such as raising our children and fulfilling God's will for our life together.

316) Husband and wife have to know and understand each other very well.

318) No PMS and no credit cards.

319) Communication!

320) I think it is very important to have an honest and open marriage. I also feel that a person's spouse should be his/her best friend.

322) Commitment to each other and religion.

The Following Responses were from the Unpaired Data

1001) The most important aspect to lead a successful marriage is to try to try the best way to have or to achieve happiness in your family. We or human beings can make many things (kill, rape, destroy, invent, procreate, study, get degree, etc., etc., etc.,, But the most difficult thing to achieve is to make a happy marriage and a happy family. If we can (or husbands) through our input make a happy family (wife and children) then we can say, I have done my job in life.

1002) The marriage should be approached as a partnership. The roles of both the husband and wife should be agreed to and understood by both partners. If both parents work outside the home, then both parents need to share the household chores and responsibilities regardless if one makes more money than the other. Also, each needs to respect the other and not take each for granted.

1003) Your spouse should be your best friend and should confide his hopes, dreams, desires, problems, etc. in you.

1004) Communication and mutual respect.

1007) I think the most important aspect of a successful marriage is communication because once partners stop talking to each other there is a tendency to turn the anger/frustration on the other.

1009) Trust in your spouse and a faith in a church.

1011) Finding balance between fostering the individual growth of the two people and allowing for intimacy and emotional support.

1016) Communication!

1017) The most important aspect of a marriage is to put God in the center of everything. With his help anything can be worked out or accomplished.

1022) An enduring combination (Gestalt, one might even say) of tender feelings, sexual feelings, and commitment to making the relationship work, from both partners.

1023) After spending nine years in a very one-sided marriage, I believe the most important aspect of a successful marriage is working together as partners and I hope I find that someday. PS. I'm sorry for the tardiness in returning your questionnaire, however, and ironically so,

we are in the process of determining the future direction of our relationship.

1024) Sharing responsibilities, good times, and bad as supportive partners and friends for each other.

1027) Communication! at all times. A word about the test. I had a difficult time being fair to my husband in this exam, because he works out of town Mon. thru Fri. Most responsibilities fall on me, however, if he were here he would be doing more.

1028) Letting your spouse know you appreciate the things he does for you - showing him this through praise, communication, sex, thanking him, etc.

1029) My husband and I are both in graduate school. It has been difficult, but we live on hope. We hope we will make it through school and we hope we haven't ruined our children's lives. It just seemed that we had no other choice but to obtain more education (my husband has a professional degree and is currently in Law school). Our parents are married to their original partners - they have weathered children, careers, etc. and "stuck it out". I married at 20 yrs. old - too young. This is not the life I thought I would have. I'm now 37 years old with no money (only debts) and I work so hard and don't seem to get anywhere. I could have done better, but it's too late.

1030)I received this survey recently, but unfortunately I have divorced my wife (as of Nov. 1991). I completed the survey anyhow as I felt it would let me express how graduate school destroyed my marriage. Good luck on meaningful data!!

1032)Communication, honesty, faithfulness, true friendship. Note: My answers may be somewhat skewed from normative responses because my wife and I are presently going through a very bitter divorce. I have tried to respond as I would have in the days before our separation.

1033)Patience and forgiveness, communicating instead of arguing, making time for each other. I wish to state that my participation in graduate school has resulted in a voluntary separation between my wife and I, for financial reasons. The total lack of support for spouses relocating with student husbands, along with the regional prejudices against "outsiders" in this community was a cultural shock to both of us. She has returned to her former job "up north" and is counting the days till my graduation.

APPENDIX L
PUBLISHED MEANS FOR RAS

Table 33: Published means for RAS

<u>Married couples</u>		<u>Mean</u>
Inman-Amos, Hendrick, & Hendrick (1994)		4.16*
		4.27**
Contreras, Hendrick, & Hendrick (in press)		4.25***
<u>Dating couples</u>		<u>Mean</u>
Hendrick & Hendrick (1995)		3.63*
		3.85**
Hendrick (1988)		4.34***
<hr/> * males ** females ***total sample		