

COMMUNICATION WORK STYLES AND
MARITAL SATISFACTION AMONG
SINGLE WORKER AND DUAL-WORKER COUPLES

by

CHARLOTTE SHOUP OLSEN

B. S., Kansas State University, 1969

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1979

Approved by:



Major Professor

LD
2668
.T4
1970
0428
c.2.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Major Focus of Study	3
The Problem	4
Design of Investigation	5
II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	7
Properties of Family Systems	7
Function of Communication	10
The Relationship of Communication to Employment	12
Hypotheses of the Investigation	15
III. PROCEDURE AND METHOD	17
Measurement of Dyadic Communication	17
Measurement of Marital Satisfaction	21
Collection and Coding of the Data	23
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	25
Descriptive Statistics	25
Inferential Statistics	29
Multiple Regression Correlational Analysis	42
Establishment of "work" Patterns	49

V. DISCUSSION	53
VI. SUMMARY	62
REFERENCES	65
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	69
Appendix B	74
Appendix C	78
Appendix D	80
Appendix E	82
Appendix F	85

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Selected Demographic Characteristics of the Dual-Worker Sample and the Single Worker Sample	26
2. Occupational Level of the Dual-Worker Sample and the Single Worker Sample	30
3. Joint Income Level for the Dual-Worker Sample and the Single Worker Sample	32
4. Comparison of Group Means for Marital Satisfaction and Use of Styles III and IV Between Dual-Worker Couples and Single Worker Couples	34
5. Comparison of Group Means for Marital Satisfaction and Use of Styles III and IV Between Dual-Worker Husbands and Single Worker Husbands	35
6. Comparison of Group Means for Marital Satisfaction and Use of Styles III and IV Between Dual-Worker Wives and Single Worker Wives	36
7. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Styles III and IV for Dual-Worker Couples, Dual-Worker Husbands, and Dual-Worker Wives	37
8. Correlations of Dual-Worker Husband's Marital Satisfaction With Dual-Worker Wife's Use of Styles III and IV	39
9. Correlations of Dual-Worker Wife's Marital Satisfaction With Dual-Worker Husband's Use of Styles III and IV	39
10. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Use of Styles III and IV for Single Worker Couples, Single Worker Husbands, and Single Worker Wives	40

TABLE	Page
11. Correlations of Single Worker Husband's Marital Satisfaction With Single Worker Wife's Use of Styles III and IV . . .	41
12. Correlations of Single Worker Wife's Marital Satisfaction With Single Worker Husband's Use of Styles III and IV	41
13. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Use of Styles III and IV for Wife of a Student Husband	43
14. Multiple Regression Analysis of Husband's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Dual-Worker Couples	44
15. Multiple Regression Analysis of Wife's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Dual-Worker Couples . . .	45
16. Multiple Regression Analysis of Husband's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Single Worker Couples . . .	46
17. Multiple Regression Analysis of Wife's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Single Worker Couples	47
18. Multiple Regression Analysis of Husband's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Marital Satisfaction and Wife's Use of Style IV for Single Worker Couples . . .	48
19. Comparison of Group Means for Number of "Work" Patterns Established and Average Length of "Work" Patterns Between Dual-Worker Couples and Single Worker Couples . .	50
20. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Number of "Work" Patterns Established and Length of "Work" Patterns for Dual-Worker Husbands and Dual-Worker Wives	51
21. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Number of "Work" Patterns Established and Length of "Work" Patterns for Single Worker Husbands and Single Worker Wives	52

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to all of my professors at Kansas State University, but especially to Dr. Stephan Bollman, Dr. Candyce Russell, Dr. C. E. Kennedy, and Dean Ruth Hoeflin. Each has contributed in a unique way to my educational experience. I wish to extend a special thanks to Dr. Walter Schumm for his untiring assistance in the statistical analysis of my research. In addition, I offer my appreciation to Dr. Dennis Bagarozzi and Dr. Candyce Russell for allowing me to use their research data and to each of the subjects who volunteered for the couples communication research program. To Jennifer Scheier, my colleague in this investigation, and to the numerous transcribers of the behavioral data, I extend my sincere thanks. Finally, to my husband, Don, who has constantly encouraged my academic endeavors and cooperated unceasingly in the care of our two year old daughter, Livia, I extend a very special thanks. And to Livia and my parents, Francis and Marceille Shoup, I appreciate your positive attitude that allowed me to enjoy this work and to learn during my years at Kansas State University.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During recent history, the family has been structured in ways which assume that only one marriage partner, usually the husband, would economically support the family (Price-Bonham, 1978). However, a number of complex trends in our social milieu are broadening the role options for married women. Among these trends are access to higher education, trend toward equal opportunity, more efficient household appliances to reduce home tasks, fewer numbers of children in families and a change in the pattern of spacing of children, delay or absence of child rearing, marriage at a later age, shifts in social values, and increased emphasis on self-fulfillment (Arnott, 1972; and U. S. Department of Labor, 1975).

These changes, coupled with inflationary pressures and higher expectations for our standard of living, have led to greater sharing between the husband and wife in both the financial and non-financial aspects of family life. Kenneth Keniston in a study for the Carnegie Council on Children, All Our Children (1977), cited dramatic changes that are occurring. In 1950, 56 per cent of husband-wife families listed the husband as the sole breadwinner; in 1975, that

number had decreased to 34 per cent. The percentage of married women with school-age children who were employed outside the family rose from 26 per cent in 1948 to 54 per cent in 1975 with the majority full time employed. The rising rate is even more dramatic among married women who have pre-school children. Thirteen per cent were employed in 1948 while 37 per cent were employed in 1976.

The dual-worker couple in which each spouse is employed full time outside the home is definitely an emerging phenomenon. Numerous authors (Burke and Weir, 1976; Holmstrom, 1972; and Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971) have predicted that increasingly employed women will want to commit themselves to continuous, developmental, ongoing careers as well as family life, thus creating, not only the dual-worker family, but the dual-career family.

Why do working couples generate special issues in contemporary society? Industrialized society has evolved a dominant lifestyle of sex-roles and division of labor between home and work. The male has been seen as the provider and the female as the one who cares for the home and the children (Rapoport, Rapoport, and Bumstead, 1978). When the wife becomes employed, a change is demanded in her pattern of activities, commitments, and responsibilities which, in turn, affects the family structure and its functioning, according to Burke and Weir (1976). These changes are often considered deviations from the cultural and social norms and can create a potential for stress within the family systems, including

the marital dyad.

When viewing the marital dyad within the family structure, research has suggested that communication (both verbal and non-verbal behavior) is a central process in marital relationships and it has been highly correlated with marital satisfaction (Miller, Corrales, and Wackman, 1975). If the family successfully copes with the complexities encountered by the employment of the wife, it is suspected that the communication processes will be altered to accommodate the changing family dynamics.

Major Focus of Study

This study attempts to assess differences in marital communication between dual-worker couples and single worker couples and to correlate these differences with the levels of marital satisfaction for the respective groups. According to Rapoport and Rapoport (1976), contemporary society's value and normative systems do not adequately support the family where both husband and wife work and especially if each one pursues a career. Consequently, these families have evolved communication patterns to help sustain their life style which are likely to be different from the communication patterns of single worker couples.

Hopkins and White (1978) pointed out that a number of new dimensions are added to the already burdened expectations of marriage when both husband and wife work and problem

solving becomes more difficult. The results of this investigation may show that concentrating on specific communication skills might help dual-worker couples to experience more satisfaction from their marriage. They could be helped to be expressive about "the constraints of their life style as well as the opportunities" (Hopkins op cit., p. 257).

The Problem

No previous research has been found to address the employment status of the husband and wife in relation to intracouple communication correlated with marital satisfaction. Studies have shown that "work" communication styles were positively correlated with levels of marital satisfaction, but the employment of the husband and wife was not statistically controlled (Corrales, 1974; McIntire, Drummond, and Carter, 1977; and Miller, 1974).

In each of these studies, the term, "work", denoted "any speech in which the speaker attempted to identify and disclose his/her own thoughts, feelings, and intentions associated with an issue or problem which concerns the speaker or involves another person present in the situation" (Miller, 1974, p. 18). Non-work speech was classified as being sociable, playful, conventional, or persuasive, demanding, blaming, evaluative, and reactive.

Previous studies (Epstein, 1971; Holmstrom, 1972; Poloma, 1972; and Rapoport and Rapoport, 1969, 1971, 1976, and 1978) offered insights into personal, relationship, and

societal issues created by both the husband and wife working by delineating five foci of stress that are found more often among dual-worker couples than single worker couples. They are role overload, environmental social sanctions, personal identity and self-esteem, social-network functioning, and family role cycling (definition of these concepts given on pages 12, 13, and 14). Each of these sources of tension are capable of affecting marital satisfaction if not satisfactorily resolved by the couple. By assessing communication types in relation to marital satisfaction, this research will attempt to gain insight into how dual-worker couples are coping with the stresses inherent in their life style.

Design of Investigation

The respondents in the study were 33 intact husband-wife dyads who participated in couples communication research conducted in a midwestern city. Couples were recruited through university and community announcements and each couple contacted the researchers to be included in the project.

Prior to any type of communication training, data for this study were collected during the initial interview with each couple. They were asked to complete self-report marital satisfaction instruments in a lab setting which was followed by a fifteen minute videotaping of intra-couple communication.

To measure communication "work" styles in the videotaping, the Verbal Communication Styles Framework developed by Miller (1974) was used. This framework operationalized communication by categorizing it into four distinct styles (I, II, III, and IV) and four content classifications (topic, testing situation, person, and relationship). Communication delivered in Styles III and IV with person and relationship messages are considered to create the greatest potential for "work" within a dyadic relationship (see Appendix A).

Instruments used to measure marital satisfaction were the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale (Orden and Eradburn, 1968), and the marital happiness score (item 31) from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (see Appendix B).

The two dependent variables, the communication behavioral score and the marital satisfaction scores, were correlated to test whether a significant relationship existed for dual-worker couples and a weaker relationship existed for single worker couples. The intended analyses were done by computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975). T-test analyses were computed to determine if a significant relationship existed between the two groups and multiple variate correlate analyses were computed by using two variable scattergrams (Cohen and Cohen, 1975).

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The systems conceptual framework was used as a rationale for investigating the communication process in relation to marital satisfaction between husband-wife dyads. Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) characterized families as "rule governed systems" with numerous sub-systems within the family (i.e. parent-child, sibling-sibling, and husband-wife) with a system being defined as "two or more communicants in the process of defining the nature of their relationship".

Properties of Family Systems

Russell (1976) delineated six properties of family systems which are:

1. Openness
2. Wholeness
3. Non-summativity
4. Goal directedness
5. Ultrastability
6. Circular relatedness

The family is a set of components which are always interacting with one another in the internal family system as well as with external systems (i.e. work, social, school, etc.), thus giving each system a characteristic of openness. The

amount and quality of interchanges that take place in the family sub-systems and with the external environment vary with the situational and developmental demands that are confronted by the family. The more direct and clear the communication is between members and with the outside world, the more open the system will be to incoming information.

Wholeness implies that a change in one part of the family system will result in a change in other parts of the system. For instance, when a wife enters the labor market, she may experience changes which, in turn, will be reflected by changes in the family.

Non-summativity looks at the entire "gestalt" of the family. The whole system is defined by interactions of the members which implies that the family is more than just the sum of its parts. One family member acts differently when he/she is alone compared to interacting with different family members; hence, the "gestalt" of a marital dyad is more accurately captured in a dyadic interchange than in personal reactions to the marital relationship.

Families are viewed as being goal directed in that they achieve their goals by checking out the realities of the environment with the family comparator (rules which are often unspoken and unwritten). A feedback loop regulates the limits of acceptable behavior by its family members-- if a family member violates a family rule (comparator), negative feedback will urge the person to return to the usual family behavior while positive feedback from other family

members allows the person to break a rule which has the effect of amplifying change in a system.

Ultrastability is defined as the capacity to persist through a change of structure and behavior (Cadwallader, 1959). The feedback loop as explained for goal directedness helps a family to maintain stability and also provides procedure for change which are both important for optimal family functioning. Negative feedback causes the system to maintain the status quo or a position of homeostasis while positive feedback propells the family toward a state of morphogenesis. Midway between these two extremes is the point of ultrastability. As Nunnally, Miller, and Wackman (1977) explained, two types of rules exist within a system to define interaction patterns for establishing stability and for providing procedure for change. These two types of rules are not incompatible--stability depends on the capacity to change in the face of situational and developmental changes.

Circular relatedness refers to the concept that looks at the circular feedback loops of the family and how these interactions and the context in which they occur affect the relationships of the family members. All behavior within a system is a product of the relationship and everyone bears some responsibility for the interactions, making it hard to assign blame to one person for being the cause of a family problem.

The Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems (Olson, Sprenkle, and Russell, 1979) takes into account the

properties of family and marital systems by categorizing family systems along two dimensions: adaptability and cohesion. The two dimensions need balancing for optimal family functioning. However, on the cohesion dimension, a family can be on a continuum from completely separated to completely connected and on the adaptability dimension, a family can be on a continuum from allowing too much change (chaotic) to resisting any change (rigid).

Indicators of the separateness-connectedness balance are how a family spends its time, how they organize their space, how friendships are maintained, how money is spent, how decisions are made, how interests and recreation are pursued, how emotional support is given, how independent are the family members, and how permeable are the family boundaries. The degree of adaptability is measured by the assertiveness, control, discipline, negotiation, roles, rules, and system feedback that is displayed by the family system.

Function of Communication

Watzlawick et. al. (1967) suggested that communication is a medium for creating, maintaining, altering, or terminating a relationship based on two axioms of communication: all behavior is communication and all communication implies a commitment by defining the relationship. Communication consists of a report and a command component. The report is the content (i.e. what's said) and the command component

(i.e. how it's said) defines the relationship as complementary or symmetrical.

Communication processes have specifically been examined in relation to marital satisfaction in three studies found in the literature. The study by McIntire, Drummond, and Carter (1977) examined a Hill Interaction Matrix instrument (Hill, 1965) for measuring marital happiness. Happily married couples as measured by the Locke-Wallace Short form of the Marital Adjustment Scale preferred non-personal topics when interacting outside the dyad, but no results were given when a married couple interacted by themselves. The researchers suggested that the HIM instrument has potential value as an assessment technique for communication styles.

Corrales (1974) investigated influence of family life cycle categories, marital power, spousal agreement, and communication styles upon marital satisfaction in the first six years of marriage. With the Verbal Communications Styles Framework, he found that open communication styles substantially and positively influenced marital satisfaction and this relationship held across class, residence, and religious affiliation. The highest levels of satisfaction were reached when both spouses were observed in interaction to be high in the open style and each spouse was perceived by the other as being open.

Miller (1974) compared couples who presented themselves for conjoint marriage counseling with couples who participated

in a series of semi-structured, open-ended conjoint marital assessment questions and tasks. As was expected, couples enrolled in marriage counseling were much less satisfied with their marriages than the couples in the control group. Miller had expected non-counseling couples to exhibit significantly more communication "work" patterns than the counseling couples. However, the two samples did not differ significantly in their communication "work" patterns although the trend was in the predicted direction. He concluded that non-counseling couples "have less pressing personal and relationship issues than marriage counseling couples; and when they do choose to work on the issues, they are not as likely to be caught in an impasse in trying to begin work" (p. 23).

The Relationship of Communication to Employment

From the systems conceptual framework, it appears that family relationship rules and the interaction patterns (both verbal and non-verbal) are likely to show changes in order for the dual-worker family to maintain a state of ultrastability when the wife becomes employed. Several authors (Epstein, 1971; and Rapoport et. al., 1971) suggested that the marital-work partnership, if it is to successfully cope with the added stresses, creates a potential for greater communication and an added sense of purpose within the marital relationship.

Why are these stresses different from those of the single worker family? By cultural definition, domestic

maintenance has primarily been the sole responsibility of the wife (Rapoport et. al., 1976), but when both spouses are occupied with full time demanding work roles outside the home, routine household chores are possibly handled as 'overtime'. Dual-employed couples may be faced with the dilemma of who is to be burdened with the work, thus creating the strain of role overload. For dual-worker families, tasks are left undone or there is the stress of getting the chores completed by one of the spouses or by outside help.

Environmental social sanctions continue to exist which creates covert uneasiness, anxiety, and guilt in dual-worker couples. This dilemma is activated most frequently when the first child is born and the wife continues to remain in the work force rather than remaining at home to become a single worker family.

Connected to this strain is the personal identity and self esteem issue. Internalized early childhood experiences for both the husband and wife may be incongruous with the integration of work and home roles for each spouse. The husband may feel his authority is challenged and the wife may feel discomfort in trying to combine the roles of a wife, mother, and career woman. Couples modify behavior in the direction of egalitarian values, but a point in which discomfort arises, called identity tension lines, causes a change which will accomodate these stress points (Rapoport et. al., 1976).

Traditional social network obligations are modified in

the dual-worker family. Limited time changes kin contact and friendship patterns differ from the single worker families. The dual-worker family's social network will involve a separate one for each of the husband's and wife's working situation, another one relating to kin, and another one relating to family life, particularly since there will be a reliance on others for child care and housework. Therefore, there is a need to limit social activities, and this tends to mean a weakening of these social networks (Bebbington, 1973).

Role cycling can become a dilemma for dual-worker families. Demands of occupational roles may conflict with family roles such as beginning a family or the demands of each spouse's career may conflict. For instance, one spouse may need to move for career advancement before the other partner is ready to move.

Rapoport, Rapoport, and Thiessen (1974) studied married couples who were rated high on having a symmetrical relationship in that the woman either worked or valued her participation in activities outside the home. They suggested that the more symmetrical a family, the less enjoyable, less satisfied, and more stressful because of the increase in overloads, conflict in authority, and confusion about sex-role identities; or they also suggested an alternate outcome--an increase in symmetry could lead to an increase in enjoyment and marital satisfaction and a decrease in stress symptoms caused by a balance of family life and outside-the-home roles for both spouses. Their findings suggested that more activities were

enjoyed by both spouses if the husband was family oriented; that the wife in a symmetrical relationship was more likely to enjoy everyday activities than a wife who was totally home oriented; and that the husband's orientation had a greater impact on his spouse's enjoyment than did the wife's orientation on her husband's enjoyment.

Bebbington (1973) argued that stress created by both spouses working plays an adaptive function to create a more satisfying marriage. It creates a potential for dual-worker couples to increase their use of communication "work" styles.

Hypotheses of the Investigation

Hypothesis I. Dual-worker couples who use higher proportions of work styles in their negotiations will report higher marital satisfaction than do dual-worker couples who use a lesser proportion of work styles in their negotiations.

Hypothesis Ia. Dual-worker couples who establish communication work sequences will report higher marital satisfaction than dual-worker couples who do not establish communication work sequences.

Hypothesis Ib. Dual-worker couples who establish longer work sequences will report greater marital satisfaction than dual-worker couples with shorter work sequences.

Hypothesis II. There will be a less strong relationship between marital satisfaction and the proportion of work styles used among single worker couples than among dual-

worker couples

Hypothesis IIa. There will be a less strong relationship between marital satisfaction and establishment of communication work sequences among single worker couples than among dual-worker couples.

Hypothesis IIb. There will be a less strong relationship between marital satisfaction and the length of work sequences among single worker couples than among dual-worker couples.

Hypothesis III. Dual-worker couples will use more work styles in their negotiations than do single worker couples.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHOD

Measurement of Dyadic Communication

Processes and patterns of communication between spouses are of a complex nature and are difficult to measure. Family relationships are assumed to be in process rather than in equilibrium at any given point in time and to look at marital communication, a process-oriented, multiple level conceptual model is required (McIntire et. al., 1977). Such a model, the Hill Interaction Matrix (Hill, 1965), was originally developed to serve as an index of the therapeutic value of verbal statements made during psychotherapeutic group interaction by analyzing both the "work" style of group members and their preference for intimacy.

This model was adapted for use with marital dyads by Miller (1974) and was used for assessing the behavioral data in this study. Miller's Verbal Communication Styles Framework takes into account "both content (report component) and relationship (command component) aspects of communication" (p. 17) in nontherapeutic settings. Communication is categorized in terms of style and content.

Each style is characterized by different sets of intentions which are inferred from tone of voice and other verbal and non-verbal behavior (see Appendix C). Styles I and II

compose a "non-work" mode of communication while Styles III and IV compose a "work" mode (see page 4 for definitions of "work" and "non-work" modes of communication).

Style I, also called the conventional style, introduces little risk to the relationship. Factual information, simple reporting, simple preferences, and non-hostile joking and story telling are examples of Style I.

Style II is risky for the relationship in that it features directives and manipulations and offers no opportunity for the listener to give perceptions of his/her own world. Examples of this closed style are labelling, evaluating, blaming, demanding, self-depreciating, complaining, calling for defense, ignoring, indirect avoiding, and acting out feelings.

In the "work" styles, Styles III and IV, the speaker reveals his/her self-awareness and talks openly, clearly, honestly, and directly, without defending or blaming himself/herself, the other person, or demanding change. The speculative style (III) is low risk; it is tentative with a high level of information revealed. Examples are giving impressions, giving explanations, talking about reasons, speculating about causes, interpreting, unelaborated questioning, inviting information, supportive reflecting, and giving and receiving advice kindly.

Style IV, the open style, is a high risk and high information style of communication. Self-information is revealed and the speaker has the intention of hearing from the other

person. It is documenting, expressing feelings, expressing intentions, revealing impact, identifying tension, attentive listening, elaborated questioning, giving supportive statements, and accepting differences.

The content categories focus on what is said. Topic means that the content of the interchange is derived from the universe of non-personal ideas, thoughts, and experiences available to the partners. Very little self-information is revealed. The testing situation category is similar to topic--communication centers around the changes in the environment due to the research situation (i.e. videotape machine).

In person-related messages the speaker deals with his/her feelings, intentions, and interpretations about his/her own universe of experiences. The speaker moves to feelings, intentions, and interpretations about the partner in relationship messages. According to Hill (1965), messages on the person and relationship levels have more potential for work.

In the Verbal Communication Styles Framework, Miller (1974) also used a sequential analysis approach in that a "work" communication pattern is established only after three consecutive single acts (speeches) of "work". He stated:

The first act in any three-act sequence represents an invitation to work on a personal or relationship issue (or to continue in work if it has already started). The second act represents an

acceptance (or rejection) of the invitation to work. The third and key act represents a confirmation (or disconfirmation) of the invitation made in the first act. (p. 16)

The three-act unit of analysis considers both individuals' contributions to the on-going interaction and their interdependence and, therefore, is a more accurate description of the system as a whole.

The empirical validity of the three-act "work" sequence is indicated by the following data. From the interactions of 31 non-counseling couples, 169 potential "work" sequences were identified, and of these sequences, 68 per cent ended after one statement when the partner rejected the first person's invitation to work. Fourteen per cent of the sequences ended after two acts when the first person disconfirmed his/her original invitation to "work". Only 18 per cent of the "work" potential sequences actually became "systemic work" (three sequential "work" speeches). Of this 18 per cent, only 30 per cent (5.4 per cent of the total) ended after three acts, 43 per cent (7.7 per cent of the total) lasted from four to nine acts, and 27 per cent (4.9 per cent of the total) continued for ten acts or more. Miller (1974) suggested that these results indicated clearly that once a couple has begun to work on an issue, there is a high probability that work sequences will continue.

Measurement of Marital Satisfaction

Just as communication is difficult to assess, measuring marital satisfaction implies a state of marital interaction at a given point in time. However, marital interaction is never static and a concept to measure marital behavior must recognize its dynamic properties (Lively, 1969).

Spanier (1976) defined marital or dyadic adjustment as "...an ever changing process with a qualitative dimension which can be evaluated at any point in time on a dimension from well adjusted to maladjusted" (p. 17). He developed a 32-item scale, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, which assesses four empirically verified components of dyadic adjustment: dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, and affectional expression.

To establish criterion-related validity for this scale, it was administered to a married sample of 218 persons and a divorced sample of 94 persons. Each of the 32 items in the scale correlated significantly with the external criterion of marital status (i.e. married or divorced). The mean total scale scores were significantly different at the .001 level using a t-test. Items for the scale were evaluated by three judges for content validity.

For construct validity, the scale was correlated with a frequently used marital adjustment scale, the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (1959), and the correlation was .86 among married respondents and .88 among divorced respon-

dents. Construct validity was further established through the factor analysis of the scale. Reliability or internal consistency was determined by Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The coefficient for the total scale was .96.

In addition to the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, marital satisfaction was assessed by the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale (Orden et. al., 1968). The Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale (MABS) is derived from a theoretical model of the structure of marriage happiness. The model is composed of a dimension of satisfactions and a dimension of tensions which function independently to produce happiness in marriage. Orden and Bradburn suggested that both dimensions relate to marriage happiness and "marriage may be viewed as a function of the balance between the satisfactions and tensions experienced in the marriage" (p. 715).

Construct validity of MABS was established by comparing the relationship of self-reports of marriage happiness and other demographic and psychological variables to the marital satisfaction and tension indexes of MABS. Data was collected from 781 husbands and 957 wives through personal interviews.

Marriage happiness self-ratings and the MABS were found to be positively related to over-all happiness in the expected direction. In addition, marriage happiness was related to over-all happiness for both the positive and negative indexes of the MABS although the strength of the associations was not always the same for men and women. Therefore, Orden and Bradburn suggested that the chief advantage of MABS was

its ability to treat the component parts separately.

Besides the two marital satisfaction scales, the marital happiness score from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale was used as a measure of marital satisfaction. Also included in the research was a social desirability check with items from the Edmonds Scale of Marital Conventionalization (Edmonds, 1967) and the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability (Marlowe and Crowne, 1964).

Collection and Coding of the Data

Data for this study were collected during the initial interview with the respondents. Each couple completed a biographical data and consent form (see Appendix D and E) and they individually reported their marital satisfaction on the two self-report measures, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale. The couple was given the following instructions prior to a fifteen minute videotaping of their dyadic interchange:

One of you is to give the other one a message that you want the other one to hear. In fact, the message can begin by negotiating who is to give the first message. You are allowed fifteen minutes for this interchange; however, you may terminate your negotiations before the fifteen minutes have lapsed. I will be waiting outside this room. Come and get me when you are finished. The marital satisfaction instruments were scored according

to the scoring indexes given in Appendix B. Two trained persons transcribed and coded the videotapes independently after reaching a inter-rating reliability score of at least .80. The behavioral data were transferred to a summary form (see Appendix F) and the percentage of communication acts for each style and content category were calculated. All data were prepared for SPSS programming (Nie et. al, 1975).

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The results of this investigation are presented in two sections. The first section includes a description of the sample along the parameters of age, educational attainment, times married, years married to current spouse, number of children, ages of children, joint income, occurrence of marriage counseling, and occupation.

Descriptive Statistics

The men in the single worker population were slightly higher educated than the dual-worker men while the reverse was true for the women in each group as described in Table 1 on the following page. The single worker women were nearly one year older, on the average, than the dual-worker women; however, the men in the two groups were evenly matched on age.

The entire group of single worker couples were in their first marriage and for the dual-worker couples, the husbands had been married an average of 1.23 times and the wives had been married 1.14 times. No one had been married more than two times.

Thirteen of the dual-worker couples were childless while all of the single worker couples had children.

Table 1. Selected Demographic Characteristics of the Dual-Worker Sample (N = 22) and the Single Worker Sample (N = 11).

Variable	Subject	Measure of		Range	
		Central Tendency (Standard Deviation)	a DW	b DW	c SW
Age (years)	Husband	28.64 (6.43)	28.64 (5.46)	20-44	19-42
	Wife	26.43 (5.49)	27.36 (5.70)	20-38	20-41
Education ^d	Husband	2.18 (1.14)	2.00 (1.18)	1-4	1-4
	Wife	2.41 (1.14)	2.73 (.91)	1-4	2-4
Years Married To Current Spouse	Couple	4.91 (4.97)	6.00 (2.96)	1-19	1-10
Number of Children ^e	Couple	.77 (1.31)	1.91 (.83)	0-5	1-4
Age of Youngest Child	Couple	3.50 ^f (4.34)	1.42 ^f (.98)	1-14	1-3

Table 1, continued

^aUnless otherwise indicated, the mean is presented as the measure of central tendency.

^bRepresents the dual-worker sample (N = 22).

^cRepresents the single worker sample (N = 11).

^dRepresents the measure of central tendency (mean) in units described below:

1. Graduate professional degree
2. College degree - B.S.
3. Some college - two years
4. High school graduate
5. Junior high school
6. Below 7th grade

^eTotal number of children living at home under the age of 16 years since 16 years was the age of the oldest child in the samples.

^fRepresents the median value for a measure of central tendency as it more accurately described the age of the youngest child.

Ten of the 33 couples had sought marriage counseling; seven of them were in the dual-worker category which was 33 per cent of dual-worker couples and three couples were single worker dyads which was 27 per cent of the single worker sample.

The occupational scale that was developed by Hollingshead (1958) stratified the subjects into seven major classifications which are given below.

1. Higher executives, proprietors of large concerns, and major professionals.

2. Business managers, proprietors of medium sized businesses, and lesser professionals.

3. Administrative personnel, small independent businesses, and minor professionals.

4. Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses.

5. Skilled manual employees.

6. Machine operators and semi-skilled employees.

7. Unskilled employees.

For purposes of this research, two additional categories were added:

8. Undergraduate student (full time).

9. Graduate student (full time).

Thirty-three per cent of the husbands ($N = 10$) and 27 per cent of the wives ($N = 9$) were students with 80 per cent of the student husbands and 100 per cent of the student wives in the dual-worker sample.

Full time college students were categorized as working in that the time constraints and the subjective definition of importance and commitment were judged by the researcher to be similar to full time employment. Besides being college students, occupations of the husbands included lawyer, college professor, store manager, heavy equipment operator, and letter carrier. Of the thirty-three wives, eleven of them were full time housewives and occupations of the employed women included a pre-school teacher, college instructor, factory worker, and travel agent. Table 2 gives the numbers of subjects in each occupation category for the two groups.

The final demographic characteristic to be described is the joint income level of the couples in each sample. Table 3 gives the number of couples for each income level.

On the whole, the dual-worker couples had a lower income, had been married fewer years, and had fewer children. They also had remarried more often although there was little difference in the percentage of each group that had sought marriage counseling. The high proportion of dual-worker couples that were students could account for some of the demographic distributions in that they were at a lower income level and had delayed child rearing.

Inferential Statistics

Marital satisfaction as measured by the Dyadic Adjustment Scale(DAS), the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale (MABS), and

Table 2. Occupational Level of the Dual-Worker Sample (N = 22) and the Single Worker Sample (N = 11).

Category ^a	Subject	Frequency ^b	
		DW ^c	SW ^d
1	Husband	5	2
	Wife	1	0
2	Husband	2	1
	Wife	5	0
3*	Husband	2	3
	Wife	2	11
4	Husband	2	2
	Wife	2	0
5	Husband	1	2
	Wife	0	0
6	Husband	1	0
	Wife	2	0
7	Husband	0	0
	Wife	1	0
8	Husband	3	0
	Wife	6	0
9	Husband	6	1
	Wife	3	0

*Housewives are included in category 3.

Table 2, continued

^aRepresents the categories developed by Hollingshead (1958).

^bRepresents the number of subjects per occupational category.

^cRepresents the dual-worker sample (N = 22).

^dRepresents the single worker sample (N = 11).

Table 3. Joint Income Level for the Dual-Worker Sample (N = 22) and the Single Worker Sample (N = 11).

Level of Income	Frequency ^a	
	^b DW	^c SW
\$0 - \$4,999	1	0
\$5,000 - \$9,999	5	3
\$10,000 - \$14,999	5	1
\$15,000 - \$19,999	4	3
\$20,000 - \$24,999	2	0
\$25,000 - \$29,999	1	2
\$30,000 and over	0	1
Mean Income	\$11,000	\$15,000

^aRepresents the number of couples in each income level.

^bRepresents dual-worker sample (N = 22).

^cRepresents single worker sample (N = 11).

the marital happiness score (MARHAP) from the Dyadic Adjustment scale, and "work" styles (III and IV) were computed to determine the difference in the mean scores of the two groups and to determine if a significant relationship did exist between the two groups. The results of the T-test (2-tailed) analysis are given in Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6.

From this analysis, it appears that the employed couples had higher mean scores on each of the three measures of marital satisfaction than did the single worker couples. However, on only the Dyadic Adjustment Scale was the difference significant ($p < .01$). This finding was consistent for the couple's score, the husband's score, and the wife's score.

To test hypothesis I. that dual-worker couples who use more work styles will report greater marital satisfaction than do dual-worker couples who use lesser proportion of "work" styles, a bivariate correlational analysis was computed by using 2-variable (marital satisfaction and "work" styles) scattergrams. The simple linear regression correlation coefficients computed for each scattergram are given in Table 7.

Overall results do not indicate a highly significant relationship between marital satisfaction and the use of "work" styles among the dual-worker subjects. The husband's marital satisfaction is related to his use of Style III ($p < .05$) and is a trend in the expected direction. The use

Table 4. Comparison of Group Means for Marital Satisfaction and Use of Styles III and IV Between Dual-Worker Couples and Single Worker Couples.

Dependent Variable	Means		t
	(Standard Deviation)		
	^a DW	^b SW	
^c DAS	218.45 (18.38)	195.45 (23.97)	-3.06**
^d MABS	8.05 (4.59)	5.73 (4.52)	-1.37
^e MARHAP	7.23 (2.31)	6.45 (1.97)	-1.00
Use of Style III (%)	45.05 (17.25)	45.09 (21.37)	0.01
Use of Style IV (%)	8.05 (6.82)	2.55 (3.30)	-3.12**

^aRepresents dual-worker couples (N = 22).

^bRepresents single worker couples (N = 11).

^cDyadic Adjustment Scale.

^dMarriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^eMarital happiness score from Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

** $p < .01$

Table 5. Comparison of Group Means for Marital Satisfaction and Use of Styles III and IV Between Dual-Worker Husbands and Single Worker Husbands.

Dependent Variable	Means		<u>t</u>
	(Standard Deviation)		
	^a DW	^b SW	
^c DAS	110.68 (9.73)	98.82 (12.83)	-2.97**
^d MABS	4.09 (2.64)	3.09 (2.91)	-0.99
^e MARHAP	3.64 (1.14)	3.55 (1.21)	-0.21
Use of Style III (%)	43.64 (20.16)	42.82 (15.51)	-0.13
Use of Style IV (%)	7.73 (8.31)	1.91 (2.59)	-3.01**

^aRepresents dual-worker couples (N = 22).

^bRepresents single worker couples (N = 11).

^cDyadic Adjustment Scale.

^dMarriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^eMarital happiness score from Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

** $p < .01$

Table 6. Comparison of Group Means for Marital Satisfaction and Use of Styles III and IV Between Dual-worker Wives and Single Worker Wives.

Dependent Variable	Means		t
	(Standard Deviation)		
	^a DW	^b SW	
^c DAS	107.77 (9.66)	98.82 (15.38)	-2.76**
^d MABS	4.05 (2.54)	2.64 (1.91)	-1.78
^e MARHAP	3.73 (1.28)	2.91 (0.94)	-2.08
Use of Style III (%)	46.59 (16.37)	39.00 (17.23)	-1.23
Use of Style IV (%)	8.50 (7.74)	2.27 (4.17)	-3.00**

^aRepresents dual-worker wives (N = 22).

^bRepresents single worker wives (N = 11).

^cDyadic Adjustment Scale.

^dMarriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^eMarital happiness score from Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

** $p < .01$

Table 7. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Styles III and IV for Dual-Worker Couples, Dual-Worker Husbands, and Dual-Worker Wives.

Measure of Satisfaction	Unit of Analysis	r	
		Style III	Style IV
^a DAS	Couple	.36*	.01
	Husband	.36*	.15
	Wife	.20	-.01
^b MAES	Couple	.21	.09
	Husband	.31	.08
	Wife	.17	.05
^c MARHAP	Couple	.17	-.17
	Husband	.12	-.21
	Wife	.11	-.15

^aDyadic Adjustment Scale.

^bMarriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^cMarital happiness score from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

* $p < .05$

of "work" styles by one partner was not significantly correlated to the other partner's marital satisfaction for dual-worker couples as indicated in Table 8.

Similar correlation analysis for single worker couples are given in Tables 10, 11, and 12. As with the dual-worker couples, the correlations were not highly significant. However, the wife's use of Style IV showed a trend of having a negative association with the husband's marital satisfaction as indicated by two of the measures. There is one note of caution connected with this trend--36 per cent of the single worker couples used no Style IV's in their negotiations which decreased the number of couples analyzed to six, a very small number.

Throughout the scattergrams, the dual-worker couple's plotted data points were generally more scattered with higher levels of marital satisfaction and greater use of "work" styles. Single worker couple's plotted data points were more concentrated with lower levels of marital satisfaction and "work" styles used. Nevertheless, the correlation coefficients for each group were not significantly related.

Since ten out of 33 husbands were students, a bivariate correlational analysis was computed when the husbands were students ($N = 10$). The correlations for the couple's marital satisfaction and the husband's marital satisfaction and use of "work" styles were not significantly related; however, it was a different situation for the wives--

Table 8. Correlations of Dual-Worker Husband's Marital Satisfaction With Dual-Worker Wife's Use of Styles III and IV.

Measure	r	
	Style III	Style IV
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	.33	-.06
Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale	.20	.20
Marital Happiness Score	.04	-.15

Table 9. Correlations of Dual-Worker Wife's Marital Satisfaction With Dual-Worker Husband's Use of Styles III and IV.

Measure	r	
	Style III	Style IV
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	.36*	-.05
Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale	-.02	.01
Marital Happiness Score	.25	.04

* $p < .05$

Table 10. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Use of Styles III and IV for Single Worker Couples, Single Worker Husbands, and Single Worker Wives.

Measure of Satisfaction	Unit of Analysis	r	
		Style III	Style IV
^a DAS	Couple	-.12	-.22
	Husband	.08	.64*
	Wife	-.33	-.20
^b MABS	Couple	.16	-.36
	Husband	.54*	.16
	Wife	.00	-.44*
^c MARHAP	Couple	-.31	-.40
	Husband	-.25	-.05
	Wife	.17	-.20

^aDyadic Adjustment Scale.

^bMarriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^cMarital happiness score from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

* $p < .05$

Table.11. Correlations of Single Worker Husband's Marital Satisfaction with Single Worker Wife's Use of Styles III and IV.

Measure	r	
	Style III	Style IV
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	-.22	-.50
Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale	-.15	-.65**
Marital Happiness Score	-.25	-.41

** $p < .01$

Table 12. Correlations of Single Worker Wife's Marital Satisfaction With Single Worker Husband's Use of Styles III and IV.

Measure	r	
	Style III	Style IV
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	.32	.20
Marriage Adjustment Balance	.53*	.22
Marital Happiness Score	.44	.24

* $p < .05$

the wives' marital satisfaction scores were significantly related to their use of Style IV's in the negative direction.

Multiple Regression Correlational Analyses

To understand if an interaction between the use of Style IV's by each spouse affected individual marital satisfaction as reported on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, a multiple regression correlational analysis was computed. As indicated in Tables 14 and 15 for the dual-worker couples and Tables 16 and 17 for the single worker couples, the interaction of the use of Style IV for the husband and wife added little in the regression.

However, one additional regression computation suggested that the single worker wife's marital satisfaction, her use of Style IV's, and the interaction of the two were related to the husband's marital satisfaction. Table 18 summarizes the finding.

Table 13. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Use of Styles III and IV for Wife of a Student Husband (N = 10).

Measure	r	
	Style III	Style IV
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	-.22	-.75**
Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale	-.28	-.41
Marital Happiness Score	-.23	-.61*

** $p < .01$

* $p < .05$

Table 14. Multiple Regression Analysis of Husband's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Dual-Worker Couples (N = 22).

Independent Variable	r^a	b_1^b	b_2^c	t^d
Wife's Use of Style IV (A)	-.06	-.17	-.29	
Husband's Use of Style IV (B)	.15	.24	.00	
Interaction Effect (A x B)	.12		.32	
R^2		.04653	.05466	.393

^a Zero-Order Pearson correlation with husband's marital satisfaction.

^b Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation not including interaction effect.

^c Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation with interaction effect included.

^d Value from t-test for differences in R^2 ; a significant value of t indicates that interaction effect adds to the predictability of the dependent variable.

Table 15. Multiple Regression Analysis of Wife's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Dual-Worker Couples (N = 22).

Independent Variable	r^a	b_1^b	b_2^c	t^d
Wife's Use of Style IV (A)	-.01	.02	.26	
Husband's Use of Style IV (B)	-.05	-.06	.44	
Interaction Effect (A x B)	-.09		-.68	
R^2		.00291	.03975	.831

^a Zero-Order Pearson correlation with wife's marital satisfaction.

^b Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation not including interaction effect.

^c Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation with interaction effect included.

^d Value from t-test for differences in R^2 ; a significant value of t indicates that interaction effect adds to the predictability of the dependent variable.

Table 16. Multiple Regression Analysis of Husband's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Single Worker Couples (N = 11).

Independent Variable	r^a	b_1^b	b_2^c	t^d
Wife's Use of Style IV (A)	-.50	-.42	-.45	
Husband's Use of Style IV (B)	.64	.58	.55	
Interaction Effect (A x B)	.13		.06	
R^2		.58399	.58620	.192

^a Zero-Order Pearson correlation with husband's marital satisfaction.

^b Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation not including interaction effect.

^c Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation with interaction effect included.

^d Value from t-test for differences in R^2 ; a significant value of t indicates that interaction effect adds to the predictability of the dependent variable.

Table 17. Multiple Regression Analysis of Wife's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Use of Style IV and Husband's Use of Style IV for Single Worker Couples (N = 11).

Independent Variable	r^a	b_1^b	b_2^c	t^d
Wife's Use of Style IV (A)	-.20	-.17	-.05	
Husband's Use of Style IV (B)	.20	.17	.32	
Interaction Effect (A x B)	-.20		-.31	
R^2		.06885	.13637	.740

^a Zero-Order Pearson correlation with husband's marital satisfaction.

^b Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation not including interaction effect.

^c Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation with interaction effect included.

^d Value from t-test for differences in R^2 ; a significant value of t indicates that interaction effect adds to the predictability of the dependent variable.

Table 18. Multiple Regression Analysis of Husband's Marital Satisfaction as a Function of Wife's Marital Satisfaction and Wife's Use of Style IV for Single Worker Couples (N = 11).

Independent Variable	r^a	b_1^b	b_2^c	t^d
Wife's Marital Satisfaction (A)	.57	.24	1.06	
Wife's Use of Style IV (B)	-.50	-.40	4.96	
Interaction Effect (A x B)	.13		-5.74	
R^2		.54727	.80108	2.989*

^a Zero-Order Pearson correlation with husband's marital satisfaction.

^b Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation not including interaction effect.

^c Standardized regression coefficient for variables in regression equation with interaction effect included.

^d Value from t-test for differences in R^2 ; a significant value of t indicates that interaction effect adds to the predictability of the dependent variable.

* $p < .05$

Establishment of "Work" Patterns

When testing hypotheses Ia., Ib., IIa., and IIb., the analyses revealed that 76 per cent ($N = 16$) of the dual-worker couples and 55 per cent ($N = 6$) of the single worker couples established "work" patterns. A T-test (2-tailed) analysis was computed to determine if a significant relationship existed between the couples in each group who established "work" patterns. From Table 19, it is apparent for those who established patterns that the dual-worker couples established more patterns with a longer average length than did the single worker couples.

A two variable scattergram was plotted and a simple linear regression correlational coefficient was computed to determine whether dual-worker and single worker couples who established a greater number of "work" patterns that had a longer average length would report higher levels of marital satisfaction than couples who established fewer patterns with a shorter length.

Table 20 reveals that no significant relationship existed for the dual-worker couples and in table 21, the only significant correlation was for the wives. There was a negative correlation between the length of "work" patterns established and the wife's marital satisfaction for two out of three measures.

Table 19. Comparison of Group Means for Number of "Work" Patterns Established and Average Length of "Work" Patterns Between Dual-Worker Couples and Single-Worker Couples.

Dependent Variable	Means		t
	(Standard Deviation)		
	DW ^a	SW ^b	
Number of patterns established	4.50 (2.78)	2.67 (1.51)	-1.98
Average length of pattern (in words)	6.94 (3.04)	4.83 (1.17)	-2.34*

^a Represents dual-worker couples (N = 16).

^b Represents single worker couples (N = 6).

* $p < .05$

Table 20. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Number of "Work" Patterns Established and Length of "Work" Patterns for Dual-Worker Husbands and Dual-worker Wives (N=16).

Measure of Satisfaction	Unit of Analysis	r	
		Number of Patterns	Length of Patterns
^a DAS	Husband	.42*	-.07
	Wife	.16	.13
^b MABS	Husband	.17	.01
	Wife	.24	.28
^c MARHAP	Husband	.09	.20
	Wife	-.15	-.22

^a Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

^b Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^c Marital happiness score from Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

* $p < .05$

Table 21. Correlations of Marital Satisfaction With Number of "Work" Patterns Established and Length of "Work" Patterns for Single Worker Husbands and Single Worker Wives (N = 6).

Measure of Satisfaction	Unit of Analysis	r	
		Number of Patterns	Length of Patterns
^a DAS	Husband	.48	-.30
	Wife	.06	-.85*
^b MABS	Husband	.56	-.73*
	Wife	.00	-.59
^c MARHAP	Husband	-.42	-.54
	Wife	.45	-.72*

^a Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

^b Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale.

^c Marital happiness score from Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

* $p < .05$

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The findings of this investigation did not support two of the three major hypotheses. Dual-worker couples used more work styles in their negotiations than single worker couples (hypothesis III); however, no significant correlation existed between the use of communication work styles and marital satisfaction for dual-worker couples as stated in hypothesis I. Consequently, hypothesis II was not substantiated--there was not a stronger correlation for dual-worker couples than for single worker couples.

These results pose validity problems for the entire spectrum of marital enrichment and couples communication programs since the use of self-disclosing communication styles was not significantly correlated with marital satisfaction. Goals of communication skills training are geared toward increasing self-disclosure in the couple dyad as a means to enriching the dyadic bond (Nunnally et. al., 1977). Previous studies (Corrales, 1974; and Miller, 1974) have supported the validity of this approach.

This investigation appears to have design flaws that might be responsible for the lack of statistical statements of significance. Since the subjects were exposed to a lab setting for the first time during the collection of the

data, reactivity to the testing situation could be suspected as a factor in limiting self-disclosure.

Secondly, the subjects were not randomly selected and volunteered for a publicized couples communication training research program. Three suggested incentives for volunteering for a couples communication program are:

1. Aid for solving existing relationship problems.
2. Opportunity for self-growth and marital enrichment with no specific relationship problems.
3. Opportunity to learn about a resource that might be useful for one's own profession.

When contrasting the second and third incentives to the first incentive, Miller (1974) suggested that when no pressing personal and relationship problems exist, couples will not exhibit significant "work" patterns, but when they choose to work on issues, they are not as likely to be caught in an impasse in using "work" patterns as couples who have relationship problems. Therefore, it is possible that the subjects in the study had few relevant relationship and personal problems at the time the data were collected.

A third deficiency of this study was the size of the subject pools: N=22 for dual-worker couples and N=11 for single worker couples. These sample sizes limited the statistical controls and prevented the generalization of these findings to a larger population. Nevertheless, the small samples enabled the investigator to collect behavioral data,

a costly and time consuming method of research. Other researchers (Rapoport et. al., 1974; and Bebbington, 1973) suggested that systematically analyzing the couple as a unit reveals the wholeness and non-summativity of a relationship, thereby invalidating self-report measures by themselves as an accurate description of the dynamics of a relationship. Relationship rules (often unspoken and unwritten) are more accurately detected in behavioral data that is viewed by a party outside the dyadic system. In this study, the trade-off was a small sample in exchange for collecting behavioral data.

The trend toward symmetry between the sexes in their family and work roles has been suggested by Young and Willmott (1975). Some studies over the years have concluded that couples with equalitarian power structures were higher in marital satisfaction than were couples with other kinds of power structures (Lu, 1962; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Corrales, 1974; and Rainwater, 1965). Therefore, the assumption for this study was that families where both husband and wife work suggested a more symmetrical relationship and the couple would likely exhibit high levels of marital satisfaction, but only if they engaged in communication processes that helped them to deal with the complexities created by the dual employment of the spouses.

What are some reasons why no significant correlation existed between marital satisfaction and the use of communi-

cation "work" styles? The couples were not statistically controlled in terms of their occupational status, their reasons for working, nor their educational levels. Orden and Bradburn (1969) found that both partners were lower in marriage happiness if the wife participated in the labor market out of economic necessity than if she participated by choice. In fact, the wife's occupational status in comparison to her husband's has been correlated with significant differences in their type of communication (Safilios-Rothschild and Dijkers, 1978). Communication was found to be strained when the wife was well-educated and had a more prestigious job than her husband. Status similarity between spouses or a slightly superior employment status of the husband was the most conducive to "work" communication.

For working couples, the effect of status and income inequalities between spouses on the wife's marital satisfaction varied according to the woman's level of education (Safilios-Rothschild op. cit., 1978). The wife's education was relevant to the types of values and expectations she had from marriage. Lower educated women held predominantly traditional values and were less satisfied when they were higher in status and income earnings than their husbands. Well-educated women were more likely to espouse egalitarian beliefs that allowed them to enjoy their husbands even when they were higher educated.

Another reason for lack of correlation among the dual-worker couples may be attributed to their differing stages of

the family life cycle. Thirteen out of the 22 couples were childless and of those couples who had children, the mean age of the youngest child was five years old and the median age was 3.5 years old. According to Orden et. al. (1969), a woman choice of the labor market over the home market strained the marriage only when there were preschool children in the family.

The change in the family system as produced by the onset of childrearing produces changes in the entire familial system (refers to concept of wholeness). These findings coincide with Rollins and Cannon's (1974) results that marital satisfaction has a U-shaped trend over the family life cycle with the downward trend being most noticeable after children enter the family system. For the dual-working families, the correlation coefficients for marital satisfaction and use of communication "work" styles were widely distributed on the scattergrams--a likely reason is the differences in their family life cycles.

The student population may have been an intervening variable for the dual-worker couples. Salience of the commitment toward school was assumed to be similar to the commitment to full time employment. However, there may be distinct differences in the degree of openness between student couples and full time employed couples. Rapoport and Rapoport (1978) reported that the loss of sources of social support among dual employed couples is common. Therefore, the wives become

more dependent on a narrow range of people such as their husbands. The couples in which one is a student may continue to have a high degree of interchange with outside social systems (i.e. parents) and, consequently, communication "work" styles to fulfill personal and relationship needs are not as imperative to use for marital satisfaction. The analysis computed for couples in which the husband was a student (N=10) revealed that the wife's use of Style IV was negatively correlated with her marital satisfaction.

The dual-worker couples and the single worker couples were significantly different in their levels of marital satisfaction. The dual-worker couples were higher in marital satisfaction on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale at the $p < .01$ level. The major factor for this difference is likely to be the stage of the family life cycle. The dual-worker families had .77 children on the average and the average age of the youngest child was five years old; for the single worker couples, the average number of children was 1.91 and the youngest child was 1.81 years old on the average.

Single worker couples had been married an average of 6.0 years while the dual-worker couples had only been married an average of 4.9 years. A "seven year danger point in marriage" has been espoused by Chilman (1968) which is likely to be reached in the late 20s or early 30s (average age of single worker couples was 28 years old). Family and work

careers are going through identifiable stages which requires the family to reach a new level of homeostatis. The demographic characteristics of the single worker couples reveal that they were entering this crucial period and were closer to this transitional time than the dual-worker couples when the data was collected.

The significant differences in the use of Style IV between the two groups may also be attributed to the stage of the family life cycle. In addition, the symmetrical issue is suggested as a possible explanation in that the single worker couples may have been more complementarily oriented which was reflected in their communication styles.

A significant correlation among the single worker group was the interaction of the wife's use of Style IV and her marital satisfaction which was negatively correlated with the husband's marital satisfaction ($p < .01$) on the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale. The use of Style IV could be viewed as the wife's attempt at moving toward greater symmetry in the marital relationship. This is not to mean that the wife is not happy in her role as a housewife--quite the contrary as her marital satisfaction scores revealed. In a study of women in the Chicago area (Lopata, 1971), many women identified with the home and stated that only family roles should have primary significance for women. Work was viewed as significant only prior to their marriages, before children were born, after children were

in school or grown, or in cases of widowhood or financial reverses. The exceptions were among those professional women who had a strong involvement in their work careers.

When the wife in the single worker marriages uses more Style IV, this may indicate a change in the goal directedness of the family's behavior and the husband's negative feedback may be reflected in his marital satisfaction scores. Gowler and Legge (1978) suggested that in conventional marriages (single worker marriages) "the husband derives his greatest satisfaction from his job/career outside the home, while the wife derives hers, not from a job/career commitment, but from her activities within the home itself" (p. 50). There is a high level of differentiation in their productive roles. A hidden 'work' contract for the couple dictates that the wife give high priority to the husband's work role and she provides back-up necessary services. This contract is balanced by a complementary hidden marriage contract in that if the wife goes along with demands of his job, she reaps greater say in other areas. Bailyn (1970) found that these unspoken contracts were satisfactory for most single worker couples. Dissatisfaction arose when a lack of explicit agreements about the terms involved created tension and when a re-evaluation in priorities and values caused by different stages in personal and marriage lives created changes that were unacceptable to the other partner. Likewise, Fogarty, Rapoport, and Rapoport (1971) reported that interest

in areas of work, family, and leisure shift over time, causing a family to fluctuate on the continuums of adaptability and cohesion.

The single husband's marital satisfaction negatively correlated with the wife's marital satisfaction and her use of Style IV suggests that shifts are taking place in the family, combined with developments in the external environment. Her self-disclosure may be incongruent with his awareness of the issues and he may feel threatened by her open communication.

There was not a significant relationship between establishing communication "work" patterns and levels of marital satisfaction for either of the groups as hypotheses Ia. and IIa. stated. Fifty-five per cent of the single worker couples as compared to 76 per cent of the dual-worker couples established work patterns and the dual-worker couples established more patterns with a longer average length. The only significant correlation was that the length of the pattern was negatively related to the single worker wife's marital satisfaction. These findings could be attributed to the differences in the family life cycle and the degree of symmetry in the marital dyads which creates varying levels of openness in marital dyads.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

This study was guided by the following propositions:

- (1) the family in which the wife works outside the home is an emerging trend;
- (2) the employment status of the wife affects the functioning and structure of the entire family system;
- (3) the dual employed marital dyad encounters role overload, social sanctions, personal identity dilemmas, diminished social networks, and role cycling difficulties;
- (4) these stresses are more pronounced among dual-worker couples than among single worker couples; and
- (5) communication is a central process in maintaining marital relationships.

The basic assumption of this study was that the added stresses of both spouses in the labor market require the dual-worker couple to use more communication "work" styles to maintain marital satisfaction similar to that of single worker couples.

The Verbal Communication Styles Framework (Miller, 1974) was used to assess the negotiations of marital dyads. Marital satisfaction was measured by the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) and the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale (Orden and Bradburn, 1968).

This study was based on a population of 33 couples--

22 dual-worker couples and 11 single worker couples. Fifteen minutes of behavioral data were collected in a lab setting at the time that the subjects answered the marital satisfaction instruments.

Four limitations of this study were identified. They were: (1) the sample was not randomly selected, but were volunteers for a couples communication research program; (2) the behavioral data were collected in a lab setting rather than in a home setting; (3) the sample size was small which limited the use of statistical controls and prevented the generalization of findings; and (4) the demographic variables of the 33 couples showed considerable variation.

No significant correlations between the use of communication "work" styles and levels of marital satisfaction were found for the dual-worker couples. For the single worker couples, the husband's marital satisfaction was negatively correlated with the wife's marital satisfaction interacting with her use of Style IV's. The marital satisfaction scores of the two groups were significantly different as well as their use of communication "work" styles. The establishment of "work" patterns was not significantly correlated with marital satisfaction for each group; however, the dual-worker group established more "work" patterns which were longer in length.

From a systems conceptual framework viewpoint, it was suggested that differences in family life cycles and in the degree of symmetry found among the subjects could account

for these findings.

Although the goal of this study was not to suggest change nor stability within the communication processes of dual-worker couples, just for the sake of change, it was hoped that communication processes would be seen as a means to a workable resolution of family and work demands for each partner and for the family as a whole. However, additional studies will be required to substantiate such a claim.

REFERENCES

- Arnott, C. . Married women and the pursuit of profit: an exchange theory perspective. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1972, 35, 122-131.
- Bailyn, L. Career and family orientations of husbands and wives in relation to marital happiness. Human Relations, 1970, 23 (2), 97-113.
- Bailyn, L. Accommodation of work to family. In R. Rapoport, R. N. Rapoport, and J. M. Bumstead (Eds.), Working Couples. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Bebbington, A. C. The function of stress in the establishment of the dual-career family. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1973, August, 530-531.
- Blood, R., and Wolfe, D. N. Husbands and wives. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.
- Burke, R. J., and Weir, T. Some personality differences between members of one-career and two-career families. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1976, 38, 453-460.
- Cadwallader, M. L. The cybernetic analysis of change in complex social organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 65, 154-157.
- Chilman, C. S. Families in development at mid-stage of the family life cycle. Family Coordinator, 1968, 172, 297-310.
- Cohen, J., and Cohen, P. Applied Multiple regression/correlational analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1975.
- Corrales, R. The influence of family cycle categories, marital power, spousal agreement and communication styles upon marital satisfaction in the first six years of marriage. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35(5-A), 3141. (Abstract)
- Edmonds, V. H. Marital conventionalization: Definition and measurement. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1967, 29, 681-688.

- Epstein, C. D. Law partners and marital partners: Strains and solutions in the dual-career family enterprise. Human Relations, 1971, 24, 549-563.
- Fogarty, M. P., Rapoport, R., and Rapoport, R. N. Sex, career, and family. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971.
- Gowler, D., and Legge, K. Hidden and open contracts. In R. Rapoport, R. N. Rapoport, and J. M. Bumstead (Eds.), Working couples. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Hill, W. F. Hill interaction matrix - a method of studying interaction in psychotherapy groups. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Youth Studies Center, 1965.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Two factor index of social position. Unpublished manuscript, New Haven, Connecticut, 1957.
- Holmstrom, L. L. The two-career family. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishers, 1972.
- Hopkins, J., and White, P. The dual-career couples: Constraints and supports. Family Coordinator, 1978, 27, 253-260.
- Keniston, K., and The Carnegie Council on Children. All our children: The American family under pressure. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich, 1977.
- Lively, E. L. Toward concept clarification: The case of marital interaction. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1969, 31, 108-114.
- Lopata, H. Occupation: Housewife. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Lu, Y. Marital roles and marital adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 1952, 36, 364-368.
- Marlowe, D., and Crowne, D. P. The approval motive. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- McIntire, W. G., Drummond, R. J., and Carter, C. E. The HIM-B as a family interaction assessment technique. Small Group Behavior, 1977, 8(3), 361-368.

- Miller, S. Couple communication patterns and marital satisfaction. Visiting Scholars Seminars, 1974, Home Economics Centers for Research, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974, 13-34.
- Miller, S., Corrales, R., and Wackman, D. B. Recent progress in understanding and facilitating marital communication. Family Coordinator, 1975, 24(2), 143-152.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. H. (Eds.). Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Nunnally, E. S., Miller, S., and Wackman, D. B. Couple communication instructor manual. Minneapolis: Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc., 1977.
- Orden, S., and Bradburn, N. Dimensions of marriage happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 715-731.
- Orden, S., and Bradburn, N. Working wives and marriage happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 1969, 74, 392-407.
- Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., and Russell, C. S. Circumplex model of marital and family systems: 1. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. Family Process, 1979, 18(1), 3-27.
- Poloma, M. M. Role conflict and the married professional woman. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a sociology of women. Lexington, Mass.: Xerox, 1972.
- Price-Bonham, S. Dual-worker families: Trends and impacts. Unpublished manuscript, Kansas State University, 1978.
- Rainwater, L. Family design. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.
- Rapoport, R., and Rapoport, R. N. The dual-career family: A variant pattern and social change. Human Relations, 1969, 22(1), 3-30.
- Rapoport, R., and Rapoport, R. N. Dual-career families. Harmondworth, England: Penguin, 1971.
- Rapoport, R., and Rapoport, R. N. Dual-career families re-examined. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Rapoport, R. N., and Rapoport, R. Dual-career families: Progress and prospects. Marriage and Family Review, 1978, 1(5), 1-12.

- Rapoport, R., Rapoport, R. N., and Bumstead, J. M. (Eds.). Working couples. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Rapoport, R., Rapoport, R. N., and Thiessen, V. Couple symmetry and enjoyment. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1974, 46, 558-591.
- Rollins, B. C., and Cannon, K. A. Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle: A reevaluation. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1974, 36, 271-282.
- Russell, C. S. The systems approach to family study. Unpublished manuscript, Kansas State University, 1977.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C., and Dijkers, M. Handling unconventional asymmetries. In R. Rapoport, R. N. Rapoport, and J. M. Bumstead (Eds.), Working couples. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Spanier, G. B. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1976, 38, 15-28.
- United States Department of Labor. 1975 handbook on women workers. Bulletin 297. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., and Jackson, D. D. Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interaction patterns, pathologies and paradoxes. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1967.

APPENDIX A

Description of Communication Styles

	Topic	Testing Situation	Person	Relation
Style I Conventional				
Style II Closed				
Style III Speculative				
Style IV Open				

Style I
Conventional: Low risk, no commitment to serious discussion; may involve retreat from serious discussion. Conversation is usually light, or casual; including joking.

Examples:

Topic: the weather, somebody else.

Testing situation: comments about machine.

Personal: preferences, i.e. characterizing, and biographical and autobiographical information.

Relation: joking, bantering, flirting.

Style II
Closed: High risk taking in terms of risking strong negative, i.e., angry or hurt, reactions, and closed to: (1) hearing new information from the other and (2) self-disclosure as a means of letting the other really know oneself. There is little or no real checking out. Involves viewing the relation as a "win-lose" situation. The emphasis is on power or control rather than upon intimacy and caring. The principles of respect and responsibility are likely to be lacking.

Nevertheless, the assertive style may at times be appropriate and have utility (though not very often in intimate relations).

Examples:

Topic: debates of a political issue; persuasive argumentation as to where to go on vacation.

Testing situation: blaming other for research participation.

Personal: dogmatic criticisms of other or self, especially "labelling".

- Relation: normative statements as to how other should treat oneself: "you should..." or "you ought to...".

Style III

Speculative: Exploration and examination of intentions and of origins of attitudes, values, beliefs, feelings, and events. Distinguished by its tentativeness and safety (relatively low risk). A protecting and protected style. Feedback more likely elicited than spontaneously volunteered. Feedback is primarily intellectually based.

Examples:

Topic: cooperative venture in learning from one another about a topic external to self and relation, a thinking through together of a topic such as presidential candidates. Questions asked are really intended to elicit information and point of view.

Testing situation: discussion of reasons for volunteering to participate.

Person: Intent, by mutual agreement, to explore and understand the feelings, behavior, or hangups of one person present, either self or other. Advice kindly given and accepted.

Relation: Feedback regarding you-me, regarding how we are together, but more analytical-intellectual than confrontive. "Perhaps one reason why we argue about what you should be doing around the house is that we grew up in such different families."

Style IV

Open: High risk in terms of directly, self-responsibly revealing one's own inner experience, one's thoughts and feelings, thus making oneself vulnerable to the other. "Open" also in the sense of readiness to hear new information from the other—thus increasing the likelihood of having to recognize the desirability of making changes in oneself—and in the sense of actively eliciting information in order to understand what the other means, intends, and feels, i.e., "checking out". Basic ingredients of the open style include (1) Speaking for self (each is the authority of his own thoughts and feelings and takes responsibility for his own); (2) Documenting thoughts and feelings with descriptive behavioral data (behavioral examples are absolutely necessary for sharing meanings and negotiating); (3) Checking out, a process by which one clarifies the meanings that the other has attached to a set of data, avoiding premature closure; (4) Risk taking, in the sense of making one's reactions immediately available to the other, thus surrendering some control to the other, making one's inner experience accessible to the other.

Examples:

Topic: Insightful statements about something external to the persons and relationship but having consequences for person and relationship in terms of changing attitudes and behavior. (Because of the close connection with person and/or relation, a "pure" topic-focused confrontive statement is hard to create. Here is an example, however: "It's important to deal with our feelings as they occur.")

Testing situation: Relating inhibitions about participating in the research.

Personal: The focus is primarily on one member of the dyad, i.e., one person's behavior, but, again, the confrontive level is so highly interactional that no attempt is made here to concretely discriminate person from relation.

Relation: Whether the initial "target" of the statement is topic, self, or other, there is feedback and checking out around the interrelating of you and me. "I noticed that you started to talk before I finished. It left me feeling kind of mad and sad because it seemed to me you weren't really interested in what I had to say. I feel kind of reluctant to try and tell you things when you do this. Were you aware of this?"

APPENDIX B

Marital Satisfaction Instrument

Couple No. _____

Date _____ 75

Group Leader _____

- I. These are some things that married couples often do together. Please check each one you and your (husband/wife) have done together in the past few weeks:

- Had a good laugh or shared a joke.
 Been affectionate toward each other
 Spent an evening just chatting with each other
 Did something the other particularly appreciated
 Visited friends together
 Entertained friends in your home
 Taken a drive or walk for pleasure
 Gone out together - movie, bowling, sporting, or other entertainment
 Ate out in a restaurant together

- II. These are some things about which husbands and wives sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Please check which ones caused differences of opinions or were problems in your marriage during the past few weeks:

- Being tired
 Irritating personal habits
 Household expenses
 Being away from home
 How to spend leisure
 Time spent with friends
 Your job or your spouse's job
 In-laws
 Not showing love

- III. Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occa- sionally Disagree	Fre- quently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1. Handling family finances	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Matters of recreation	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Religious matters	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Demonstrations of affection	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Friends	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Sex relations	5	4	3	2	1	0
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	5	4	3	2	1	0

	<u>Always Agree</u>	<u>Almost Always Agree</u>	<u>Occasionally Disagree</u>	<u>Frequently Disagree</u>	<u>Almost Always Disagree</u>	<u>Always Disagree</u>
8. Philosophy of life	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
11. Amount of time spent together	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
12. Making major decisions	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
13. Household tasks	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
14. Leisure time interests and activities	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
15. Career decisions	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

	<u>All the time</u>	<u>Most of the time</u>	<u>More often than not</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
16. How often have you discussed or considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your spouse are going well?	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
19. Do you confide in your mate?	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
20. Do you ever regret that you married?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
21. How often do you and your spouse quarrel?	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

	<u>Every day</u>	<u>Almost Every day</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
23. Do you kiss your mate?	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>All of them</u>	<u>Most of them</u>	<u>Some of them</u>	<u>Very few of them</u>	<u>None of them</u>
24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

	Never	Less than once a Month	Once or twice a Month	Once or twice a week	Once a day	More often
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
26. Laugh together	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
27. Calmly discuss something	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
28. Work together on a project	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Check yes or no)

Yes No

29. 0 1 Being too tired for sex.

30. 0 1 Not showing love.

31. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

5 I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.

4 I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.

3 I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.

2 It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.

1 It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.

0 My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

APPENDIX C

Descriptions of Intentions
for Communication Styles

Low Risk

High Risk

Low
InfoStyle I (Conventional)

Factual information
 Chit-chat
 Simple reporting
 Simple preferences
 Story telling
 Non-hostile joking

Style II (Closed)

Labelling
 Evaluating
 Blaming
 Demanding
 Self-deprecating
 Complaining
 Call for defense
 Ignoring
 Indirect avoiding
 Acting out feelings

Mixed Messages

Advice giving
 Hostile joking
 Hidden intention

High
InfoStyle III (Speculative)

Giving impressions
 Giving explanations
 Talking about
 reasons
 Speculating about
 causes
 Interpreting
 Unelaborated
 questions
 Inviting
 information
 Supportive
 reflections
 "There and then" time

Style IV (Open)

Documenting
 "Here and now" time
 Expressing feelings
 Expressing intentions
 Revealing impact
 Identifying tension
 Attentive listening
 Elaborated questions
 Supportive statements
 Accepting differences

APPENDIX D
Consent Form

Purpose of the Study

We're interested in testing the effectiveness of structured skills training in increasing the level of satisfaction married couples have with their relationship.

Procedure

You will be asked to videotape a fifteen minute discussion before a six-week training period and at three points after training (immediately after, after 60 days, and after 120 days). You will also be asked to fill out a marital satisfaction inventory and review your videotape prior to the group and three times after completion of training (immediately after, 60 days after, and 120 days after).

All data are confidential. Your videotapes will be erased after they are coded. Names will not be attached to the data, only couple code numbers. You are free to omit any questions which you feel unduly invade your privacy or which are otherwise offensive to you. Confidentiality is guaranteed; your name will not be associated with your answers in any public or private report of the results.

You will have the opportunity to discuss the results of the study with one of the principal investigators after the 120-day post-test period has elapsed.

Benefits and Discomforts

Previous couples have enjoyed the training experience. However, it is possible that you and your partner may experience some awkwardness as you first learn the skills, but this should pass with further practice.

I have read the above information and understand that my confidentiality is guaranteed and I may omit any questions or withdraw from the study at any time.

_____ Date _____

_____ Date _____

APPENDIX E

Biographical Data Form

I. Husband's Name: _____ Age _____

Husband's Occupation: _____

Describe:

Husband's Education: grammar school ___ high school ___ college ___ graduate ___

Husband's Religion: _____

Is this your first marriage? ___yes ___no

How many times have you been married? _____

How long divorced from your last spouse? _____ Deceased _____

How long have you been married to current spouse? _____

II. Wife's Name: _____ Age _____

Wife's Occupation: _____

Describe:

Wife's Education: grammar school ___ high school ___ college ___ graduate ___

Wife's Religion: _____

Is this your first marriage? ___yes ___no

How many times have you been married? _____

How long divorced from your last spouse? _____ Deceased _____

How long have you been married to current spouse? _____

III. Number of Children? _____

Age and Sex of Children:

1. _____ 4. _____

2. _____ 5. _____

3. _____ 6. _____

IV. Joint Family Income for 1977? _____

V. Have you ever sought marriage counseling? ___yes ___no

How long did you continue in counseling? _____

Whom did you consult? Psychiatrist ___ Psychologist ___ Social Worker ___

Family Counselor ___ Clergy Member ___ Other _____

Did you find counseling helpful? ___yes ___no

Explain:

V. Is there any additional information you would like to tell us that you feel we should know?

APPENDIX F

Summary Coding Form: Behavioral Data

SUMMARY CODING FORM: BEHAVIORAL DATA

86

Couple No. _____

Tape No. _____

WifeHusband

	Topic	Testing Sit.	Person	Relation-ship	Topic	Testing Sit.	Person	Relation-ship
I								
II								
III								
IV								
Mixed								

Couple

	Topic	Testing Sit.	Person	Relationship
I				
II				
III				
IV				
MIXED				

Comments: (primary type of any mixed messages, unusual testing circumstances, etc.)

VITA

CHARLOTTE SHOUP OLSEN

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Human Resources Coordinator, Northeastern Colorado Council of Governments, Wray, Colorado, 1976.
Youth Extension Agent, Colorado State University Extension Service, Sterling, Colorado, 1973-75.
Peace Corps Volunteer and Administrator, Liberia Peace Corps in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Liberia, West Africa, 1970-72.

EDUCATION

Master of Science, Department of Family and Child Development, Kansas State University, 1979.
Bachelor of Science, Home Economics Vocational Education, Kansas State University, 1969.
Diploma, Belle Plaine Rural High School, Belle Plaine, Kansas, 1965.

PERSONAL DATA

Age: 32
Birth date and place: July 17, 1947, Wichita, KS.
Marital status: Married
Husband's name: Donald R. Olsen
Children: Daughter, Livia, age 2.
Physical condition: Excellent
Hobbies: Playing piano, backpacking, reading, and international cooking.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

National Council on Family Relations, Phi Upsilon Omicron, and Omicron Nu.

COMMUNICATION WORK STYLES AND
MARITAL SATISFACTION AMONG
SINGLE WORKER AND DUAL-WORKER COUPLES

by

CHARLOTTE SHOUP OLSEN

B. S., Kansas State University, 1969

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

1979

Labor statistics reveal that women, including wives and mothers, are increasingly entering the job market. From a systems conceptual framework viewpoint, Burke and Weir (1976) suggested that a change in a married woman's employment status will affect the structuring and functioning of the entire family system and its component sub-systems. Suggested problems are: role overload, social sanctions, personal identity dilemmas, diminished social networks, and role cycling difficulties (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1978). To maintain satisfactory marital relationships with these added stresses, communication has been defined as a crucial process for the dual-worker couple. The basic assumption of this study was that the added stresses of both spouses in the labor market requires the dual-worker couple to use more communication "work" styles to maintain marital satisfaction similar to that of single worker couples.

Thirty-three intact husband and wife pairs (22 were dual-worker couples and 11 were single worker couples) completed the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) and the Marriage Adjustment Balance Scale (Orden and Eradburn, 1968) as measures of marital satisfaction. A fifteen minute video-taping of each dyad's intra-couple communication was scored by the Verbal Communication Styles Framework (Miller, 1974), an extension of the Hill Interaction Matrix (Hill, 1965).

The dual-worker couples exhibited more "work" styles, had higher levels of marital satisfaction, and established

more sequential work patterns; but their use of communication "work" styles was not significantly correlated with their marital satisfaction scores. For the single worker couples, the husband's marital satisfaction was negatively correlated with his wife's use of communication "work" styles interacting with her reported marital satisfaction ($p < .05$). No other significant relationships were evident.

Four limitations of the study were: volunteer subjects rather than randomly selected subjects, reactivity to the lab setting during the collection of the behavioral data, small sample size, and uncontrolled demographic variables. Possible explanations for the findings were differences in stages of the family life cycle and differences in degrees of symmetry within the marital dyads.

Although the goal of this study was not to suggest change nor stability within the communication processes of dual-worker couples, just for the sake of change, it was hoped that communication processes would be seen as a means to a workable resolution of family and work demands for each partner and for the family as a whole. However, additional studies will be required to substantiate such a claim.