

1996

The Effect of Congruent Religious Orientations and Problem Solving Styles on Marital Satisfaction in Religious Couples

Winston Seegobin

George Fox University, wseegobin@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Seegobin, Winston, "The Effect of Congruent Religious Orientations and Problem Solving Styles on Marital Satisfaction in Religious Couples" (1996). *Faculty Publications - Grad School of Clinical Psychology*. Paper 112.
http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac/112

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Clinical Psychology at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - Grad School of Clinical Psychology by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

**THE EFFECT OF CONGRUENT RELIGIOUS ORIENTATIONS
AND PROBLEM SOLVING STYLES ON MARITAL
SATISFACTION IN RELIGIOUS COUPLES**

Winston Seegobin

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Psychology**

Department of Psychology

**Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan
May, 1996**

Accepted by the Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies,
Central Michigan University, in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Doctor of Psychology degree

Dissertation Committee:

<u>James F. L. Andrews</u>	Chairperson
<u>Edgar A. Jones</u>	Faculty Member
<u>James F. Carroll</u>	Faculty Member
Date: <u>May 20, 1996</u>	
<u>Carole Beere</u>	, Dean
	College of Graduate Studies
Date: <u>June 19, 1996</u>	

Dedicated to
my wife, Karen and my mother, Jestina Seegobin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are several people to whom I am grateful and would like to express my sincere thanks and deepest appreciation for their assistance in completing this research project. First of all, I would like to thank the pastors, church leaders and all the church members who participated in this project.

Secondly, I wish to express my deep appreciation to my committee chairperson and mentor, Dr. George Ronan, for his consistent motivation, encouragement, patience, expertise, and his "belief in me" during this project. I also extend sincere thanks to my committee members, Dr. Edgar Long and Dr. James Carroll, who supported me in numerous ways and provided wisdom and counsel.

Thirdly, I am exceedingly grateful for the love, support, and patience of my wife, Karen, who often encouraged and assisted me during this project. A special thank you is extended to my mother Jestina Seegobin. Although not directly connected with this project, she taught me the value of hard work and persistence.

Fourthly, I extend sincere appreciation to the internship director at Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services, Dr. Harry Piersma, for his support, and intern colleague, Steve Johnson, for his computer expertise.

Finally, I wish to thank Almighty God for His provision of continual strength, direction, enthusiasm, and assurance during this project (Phillipians 4:16).

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF CONGRUENT RELIGIOUS ORIENTATIONS AND PROBLEM SOLVING STYLES ON MARITAL SATISFACTION IN RELIGIOUS COUPLES

by Winston Seegobin

This study explores the effect of congruent religious orientations, religious problem-solving styles, and marital stress on the marital satisfaction of religious couples. Based on social exchange theory, couples who were congruent in their religious orientation were expected to evince higher marital satisfaction when compared with couples who endorsed incongruent religious orientations. Moreover, this congruent orientation was expected to mediate marital stress. Congruent styles of religious problem-solving were also predicted to mediate marital stress. More specifically, couples who employed a collaborative approach to religious problem-solving were expected to demonstrate higher marital satisfaction than couples who employed other styles of religious problem-solving. Results confirmed that marital stress was inversely related to marital satisfaction. Intrinsic religious orientation and religious problem solving styles also predicted marital satisfaction for husbands and wives, even after controlling for social desirability. The results provided some support for the hypotheses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
---------------------------------	------------

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Application of Social Exchange Theory	3
A Congruency Hypothesis	6
Marital Satisfaction and Marital Stress	8
Buffering Effects of Religious Orientation	14
Implied Role of Problem Solving	24
Influence of Social Desirability	27
Hypotheses	31
II. METHODS	34
Subjects	34
Measures	34
Procedure	42
III. RESULTS	43
Subject Characteristics	43
Hypotheses	47
IV. DISCUSSION	59
Theoretical Implications	63
Limitations	64
APPENDIX: Questionnaires	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Demographic Characteristics	44
2. Ethnic Background	45
3. Denominational Affiliation	46
4. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients for Wives	48
5. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients for Husbands	49
6. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients for Congruency Measures	52
7. Hierarchical Regression Analysis using Religious Problem Solving Styles to Predict Marital Satisfaction	55
8. Means and Standard Deviations on DAS for Denominational Groups for Wives and Husbands	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The role of religion in the modulation of psychological and emotional well-being has been argued for some time. Most often the argument has addressed whether religion contributes to or impedes psychological health (Genia & Shaw, 1991). The empirical evidence, although not conclusive, seems to suggest that religious beliefs are associated with the reduction of psychological distress, especially the symptoms of depression and anxiety (Ross, 1990). Religious beliefs have also been observed to relieve pain and suffering, bring comfort, make life worthwhile (Stark, Doyle, & Rushing, 1983), give hope and meaning (Hadaway, 1978), and provide ways of coping with problems (Stack, 1983b). Mental health surveys have shown that among both Catholics and Protestants, religiosity (as evidenced by church attendance) was positively related to adjustment and happiness, lower levels of psychological distress, and less concern about "having a nervous breakdown" (Gurin, Veroff, & Feld, 1960). However, not all community studies support the view that religion is related to well-being. A meta-analysis done by Bergin (1983) found that only half of the 24 studies surveyed found a positive relationship between religion and mental health.

One of the key areas where the influence of religion has been posited as exerting a positive influence has been on marital relationships. Positive findings have emerged when studying the relationship between religiosity and marital adjustment (Filsinger & Wilson, 1984; Hansen, 1987; Schumm, Obiorah, & Silliman, 1989), marital commitment (Larson & Goltz, 1989), marital satisfaction (Dudley & Kosinski,

1990; Hatch, James, & Schumm, 1986; Heaton & Pratt, 1990), and marital success (Schumm, Jeong, & Silliman, 1990). Generally, religious couples report more positive perceptions of their marriage suggesting that religious practices influence marital perceptions.

Although these studies have provided the beginning of an understanding of the relationship between religion and marriage, most often external measures (e.g., frequency of church attendance, frequency of devotional reading, frequency of prayer) were used as measures of interest (Burchinal, 1957; Kunz & Albrecht, 1977; Wallin, 1957). An unexplored area is the role of a religious commitment, and the relationship between a mature religious commitment and marital satisfaction. This issue is addressed in this study.

Another factor influencing marital satisfaction is problem-solving ability. Several studies have shown that problem-solving skills can distinguish non-distressed from distressed couples, an indication that couples with more satisfied marriages have better problem-solving ability (Hahlweg, Revenstorf, & Schindler, 1984; Sabourin, Laporte, & Wright, 1990). However, few studies have examined the relationship between religion, problem-solving and marital satisfaction. This study examines how congruence in problem-solving styles influence marital satisfaction, focusing in particular on the influence of religious problem solving styles (Pargament, Kennell, Hathaway, Grevengeod, Newman, & Jones, 1988).

Marital stress is another factor affecting marital satisfaction, and is often associated with reductions in the level of marital satisfaction. Studies have shown that

marital stress significantly affects the quality and stability of a marriage (Belsky, 1986; Elliott, Trief, & Stein, 1986; Mitchell, Cronkite, & Moos, 1983).

In formulating the relationship between religious orientation, religious problem-solving, marital stress, and marital satisfaction, one of the ways in which the interaction of these variables can be explored or understood is through social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The central focus of social exchange theory is that relationships with more rewards and fewer costs are more satisfying and stable (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). This study will explore how social exchange theory applies to marital satisfaction, and the roles that religious orientation and religious problem-solving play in this approach.

The Application of Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory is based on the assumption that the principles which govern profits and losses in the business world can be applied to the motivations regulating social interactions in relationships (Blau, 1964; Brehm, 1992; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Blau referred to social exchange as "voluntary actions of the individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others" (p. 91). He noted that the exact nature of the returns are neither determined in advance nor negotiable because they depend on the discretion of the one making them. Rather, the perceived returns depend on trusting the other to fulfill their obligations.

Brehm (1992) described five major components of social exchange theory: rewards, costs, expectations, perceived alternatives, and investments (p. 157).

Thibaut & Kelley (1959) refer to rewards as "pleasures, satisfactions, and gratifications the person enjoys", and costs as "factors that operate to inhibit or deter the performance of a sequence of behavior" (p. 12). Consequently, relationships that involve fewer costs and more rewards tend to have higher satisfaction and greater endurance (Brehm, 1992). Studies examining rewards and costs in couples who are happily married found that for some couples, rewards were more related to marital satisfaction (Jacobson, Waldron, & Moore, 1980) whereas for others, costs were more predictive of marital satisfaction (Wills, Weiss, & Patterson, 1974). According to Lewis and Spanier (1979), the quality and continuance of marital relationships are dependent on the rewards and costs in the relationship. They noted that "the greater the rewards from spousal interaction, the greater the marital quality" (p. 285). Other studies have demonstrated that happy couples behave in more rewarding and positive ways with their spouses when compared with unhappy couples, and that both happy and unhappy couples respond in a more negative manner with each other when compared to their responses to strangers (Birchler, Weiss, & Vincent, 1975; Jacobson, Follette, & McDonald, 1982; Margolin & Wampold, 1981; Vincent, Weiss, & Birchler, 1975).

Other aspects of social exchange theory are expectations, alternatives, and investments. Thibaut and Kelley (1959) noted that expectations of satisfaction within a relationship depend on past experience, and that commitment to a relationship

depends on whether there are alternative relationships available to the individuals which may be more satisfying. Commitment to the relationship usually involves investing in it, and fits with Brehm's (1992) statement that "investments strengthen commitment" in the relationship (p. 167).

Jacobson and Margolin (1979) viewed marital relationships as being interdependent. They indicated that couples are continually behaving in ways which have reinforcing or punishing effects on the spouse, and that each of these behavioral exchanges results in an outcome for the partners. These outcomes determine the flow of rewarding behaviors in future situations, the level of satisfaction in the relationship, and the desire to continue in the relationship. Jacobson and Margolin noted that a strong relationship existed between satisfaction in a relationship and the tendency to exhibit pleasing behaviors toward one's spouse.

In this study, husbands and wives who are intrinsic in their religious orientation are expected to "live their religion". Since most religions place value on virtues such as kindness and loyalty, it is expected that these qualities will be present in marital interactions and, according to social exchange theory, will be reinforcing to the other spouse. Religious couples also are expected to make a considerable investment in the marriage because of their commitment. Therefore, it is predicted that husbands and wives who are congruent in intrinsic religious orientation will have higher marital satisfaction because spouses will reward each other through pleasant exchanges and be more committed because of their desire to "live their religion".

It is predicted that a similar occurrence will take place when both husbands and wives are congruent in their problem-solving style, because they will both work together in the solution of problems, which is a reinforcing task, and will consequently result in greater satisfaction in the marital relationship.

A Congruency Hypothesis

Research has clearly shown that homogamous couples have more satisfying marriages (Deal, Wampler, & Halverson, Jr., 1992; Pickford, Signori, & Rempel, 1966; White & Hatcher, 1984). The data seem to indicate that similarity in the marital relationship reduces conflict and tension and tends to increase the positive exchanges in the marriage. Similarity has been called the "glue" of marriage (Scanzoni & Scanzoni, 1976), an essential component of the marital relationship (Pasley, Ihinger-Tallman, & Coleman, 1984), and a correlate of marital adjustment (Booth & Welch, 1978). The importance of similarity between spouses is emphasized in behavioral marital therapy (Jacobson, 1981) and the communication's approaches to family therapy (Satir, 1964). The strong spousal coalition which characterizes much of the school of structural family therapy occurs only when spouses share common values, goals, and perspectives, that is, when there is a high level of similarity between spouses (Minuchin & Fishman, 1981).

Deal et al. (1992) examined the role of similarity in the marital relationship and its influence on the cohesiveness of the relationship. They defined similarity as "a couple's perceptions of a common focus" and administered the Barrett-Lennard

Relationship Inventory (Wampler & Powell, 1982), the Dyadic Adjustment scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976), the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1986), the FACES II (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1982), and the Symptom Checklist 90 (Derogatis, 1977) to 119 couples. A strong relationship between high levels of functioning in the marital relationship and similarity in perceptions between the spouses was observed. Couples who had similar perceptions of their marriage were those who indicated they were satisfied with their marriages, perceived their spouses as having high regard for them and being empathic toward them, and described their interactions as being characterized by positive, open communication. Deal et al. also noted that the most powerful predictor of marital similarity is marital cohesion.

Pickford et al. (1966) tested the relationship between similar personality traits and marital happiness. They administered the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (1949) and the Wallin General Satisfaction Schedule (Burgess & Wallin, 1953) to three groups of 35 couples each: one happily married, one having difficulties but planning to stay together, and one on the verge of separation. They found that happy couples were significantly similar in general activity, friendliness, restraint, and personal relations while unhappy couples were dissimilar.

Murstein and Beck (1972) used the Locke-Wallace Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959) and an adjective checklist to examine similarity and marital adjustment in 60 couples. A significant relationship was found between similarity and husband's

marital adjustment and couple's average marital adjustment. The correlation between similarity and wife's marital adjustment was positive but not significant.

Since similarity plays such an important role in happy and stable marriages in the United States, Weisfeld, Russell, Weisfeld, and Wells (1992) decided to test the similarity hypothesis with a sample of 1053 British couples. They used a general purpose marital questionnaire to measure marital satisfaction. They found that homogamous couples tended to be significantly more satisfied with their marital relationships.

Because similarity has been shown to have a positive influence on marital satisfaction, this study examines the effects of similarity by looking at how congruence on religious orientation and religious problem solving styles affect marital satisfaction.

Marital Satisfaction and Marital Stress

As a construct, marital satisfaction has a long and controversial history (Heyman, Sayers, & Bellack, 1994). Early studies on marital satisfaction date back to the work of Pratt (1930), Horney (1932), and Toops (1929). Pratt examined the underlying mechanisms for dissatisfaction in marriage which were found to be emotional immaturity, excessive narcissism, sadism, homosexual trends, unwisely directed will power, frigidity, and impotence. Horney noted that marital unhappiness occurred because of early developmental problems brought into the marriage by the individuals, and that marital happiness was dependent on the life attitudes of the

couple. Toops focused on the research required in establishing valid tests to measure success in marriage and parenthood.

Over the years, researchers have used the terms marital satisfaction, marital adjustment, marital quality, marital commitment, marital happiness, and marital success synonymously because they see these terms as global measures of satisfaction (Gottman, 1990). Lewis and Spanier (1979) distinguished marital quality from marital stability. They suggested that marital quality is "a subjective evaluation of a married couple's relationship" (p. 269) and encompassed terms such as marital satisfaction, marital happiness, and marital adjustment. They defined marital stability as "the formal or informal status of a marriage as intact or nonintact" (p. 269). To Lewis and Spanier (1979), a stable marriage ends only by the natural death of a spouse, while an unstable marriage is intentionally terminated by one or both spouses, the most common form being divorce. They also stated that greater marital quality resulted in greater marital stability. In this study, the terms marital satisfaction, marital quality, and marital adjustment will be used synonymously.

In an effort to better understand factors that lead to marital satisfaction and stability, a few studies will be described. Fenell (1993) examined the characteristics of long-term, satisfactory marriages of 147 couples who were married over 20 years. Marital satisfaction was measured with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), and the Delphi process was used to determine the most highly rated characteristics. He found that marital satisfaction was associated with (a) lifetime commitment to marriage, (b) loyalty to spouse, (c) strong moral values, (d) respect for spouse as best

friend, (e) commitment to sexual fidelity, (f) desire to be a good parent, (g) faith in God and spiritual commitment, (h) desire to please and support spouse, (i) good companion to spouse, and (j) willingness to forgive and be forgiven.

Thomas, Albrecht, and White (1984) examined the determinants of high quality and low quality dual-career marriages. Thirty-four professional dual-career couples completed the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Inventory (Schaefer & Olson, 1981) and the Career/Marital Stress of Women Inventory (Thomas & Shoun, 1981). Lewis and Spanier's (1979) model of marital quality was used as the theoretical framework for a qualitative analysis because of its proven ability to distinguish low and high quality dual-career couples. The findings were that marital quality was related to: (a) socioeconomic adequacy, (b) wife's satisfaction with her employment, (c) degree of husband's approval of wife's employment, (d) optimal household composition, (e) community embeddedness, (f) positive regard for spouse, (g) emotional gratification, (h) effectiveness of communication, (i) role-fit, and (j) amount of interaction.

After examining factors which contribute to marital satisfaction, it is important to note that one of the factors known to negatively affect marital satisfaction or marital quality is marital stress. Marital stress has often been related to marital distress and usually results in dissatisfied marriages. Belsky (1986) discussed four types of stresses in adjustment to parenthood which affected couples' marital satisfaction: (a) the physical burden of caring for the child, such as loss of sleep and increased fatigue, (b) the strain on the husband-wife relationship, because of reduced time together and

changes in the sexual relationship, (c) the emotional costs associated with doubts about competence and responsibilities of parenthood, and (d) personal confinement. Belsky noted that these common stresses usually resulted in a decline in marital satisfaction which began during the last trimester of pregnancy and leveled off during the second half of the baby's first year.

Depression in one spouse can create stress in a marriage and negatively affect marital satisfaction. This was evident in a study by Gotlib and Whiffen (1989) who evaluated the relationships among psychological distress, perceived stress, marital satisfaction, and coping in three groups of couples: 20 couples in which the pregnant wife was diagnosed with major depression, 20 couples in which the pregnant wife was diagnosed with minor depression, and 40 couples in which the pregnant wife was nondepressed. Psychological distress was measured with the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression Scales (Radloff, 1977), the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI; Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961), and the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983). The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) assessed marital distress, and the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) measured the level of stress perceived by the subjects. Subjects also completed the Ways of Coping Checklist (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). Results indicated that the depressed subjects and their husbands reported greater dissatisfaction in their marriages and also used more dysfunctional strategies to cope in comparison to the nondepressed control couples. These findings are similar to those in an earlier study by Mitchell et al. (1983) who compared the

problem-solving and emotional-discharge coping responses of 157 clinically depressed patients and their spouses to a recent stressful event with 157 community couples.

Social-background factors, negative life events, strains, coping responses and functioning was measured with the Health and Daily Living Form (Moos, Cronkite, Billings, & Finney, 1983). Aspects of individuals' family settings was measured with the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1981), and stressful aspects of work settings was measured with the Work Environment Scale (Moos, 1981). They found that the spouses of the depressed patients reported more somatic and depressive symptoms than the spouses of the control group, suggesting that the depressed spouse was a strain and produced emotional distress in the non-depressed partner, which usually resulted in marital distress.

A spouse with chronic pain is another source of stress in marital relationships. Elliott et al. (1986) investigated marital stress, strain, and coping strategies in 55 married chronic pain patients. Subjects participated in the Problems of Everyday Life Interview (PEL; Pearlin and Schooler, 1978), and completed the Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale (Zung, 1965). Based on their PEL scores, subjects were assigned to either limited, moderate or heightened mastery groups. Individuals in the heightened mastery group reported less marital strain, less marital stress, more use of negotiation, less use of selective ignoring, and less use of manage-stress coping strategies than either of the other two groups. Elliott et al. suggested that marital stress should be identified and treated through exploring mastery and coping strategies in the marital role of the chronic pain patient. A limitation of the study is that it involved the self-

reports of one spouse, thus furnishing an incomplete picture of the marital relationship.

Pearlin (1975) examined how differences in the status backgrounds of husbands and wives related to the stresses they experienced in marriage. After interviewing a sample of 2300 persons, he found that individuals who placed importance on status advancement and were married to spouses of lower status experienced a sense of loss which led to disruptions in reciprocity, expressiveness, affection and value sharing in marital exchange. These disruptions in turn led to an increase in emotional stress.

Fowers (1991) investigated how gender differences affected marital satisfaction in a sample of 7,261 married couples. Measures included the multidimensional inventory ENRICH (Olson, Fournier, & Druckman, 1983), a single-item marital satisfaction measure, and a single-item measure of marital distress. The results indicated that men were more satisfied with their marriages than women. Religion was found to be a more significant factor in the marriage for men, while women saw egalitarian roles as being more important. Fowers also found a significant interaction between marital distress and gender on the Sexual Relationship, Communication, Parenting and Children, and Equalitarian Roles scales, suggesting that these areas were important in distressed couples.

These studies clearly demonstrate the negative effects of marital stress on couples' marital satisfaction. This author now examines the buffering effects of religious orientations and religious problem-solving on marital stress.

Buffering Effects of Religious Orientation

Religious orientation or religiosity can be defined in several ways. In a work that is now considered classic, Allport (1950) presented his theory on how religion affects behavior. Initially, he distinguished between mature and immature religious sentiment. He defined sentiment as "an organization of feeling and thought directed toward some definable object of value" (p. 63). Religious sentiment represented "a stable unit of mental life" involving both motivational and organizational functions. Immature religious sentiment was characterized by impulsive self-gratification, self-centered interests, and a lack of reflection. It failed to provide a context of meaning for life's experiences. Immature religious sentiment was also spasmodic, segmented, and fanatic in intensity, while failing to have a unifying effect on the personality. On the other hand, a mature religious sentiment was perceived as a disposition arising out of experience which influences the individual to respond favorably and in habitual ways to concepts and principles which the individual values, and which he or she perceives as being a significant part of one's life (Allport, 1950). Mature religiosity has six attributes. These are described as a differentiated, dynamic, consistently moral, comprehensive, integral, and heuristic approach toward religion.

First of all, mature religion was well differentiated. This refers to its richness and complexity. According to Allport, it is "the outgrowth of many successive discriminations and continuous reorganization"(p. 67), and involved reflective examination and questioning. It was comprised of subsidiary attitudes, arrived at after

critical consideration of all alternatives, and was flexibly maintained as one's experiences expanded.

Secondly, Allport observed that the most significant distinction between the immature and the mature religious sentiment is the basic difference in their dynamic characters. He noted that while immature religion is motivated by the drives and desires of the body and is primarily concerned with magical thinking, self-justification, and comfort, mature religion focused on mastery of life and involved controlling and directing motives toward goals not regulated by self-interest. Mature religion is neither fanatic nor compulsive and is not motivated by impulse, fear, or wishful thinking. Allport further stated that "the power of religion to transform lives - assuming that we are dealing with genuine transformations and not with ephemeral conversions - is a consequence of the functional autonomy that marks the mature religious sentiment" (p. 73).

Thirdly, mature religion is demonstrated through consistency in one's moral choices and awareness of moral consequences. It involved congruence between one's conduct and convictions and minimal discrepancy between belief and behavior over time.

Fourthly, mature religion provided a comprehensive philosophy of life that transcended material concerns to one's emotions, values and striving for perfection. It conferred "intelligibility and direction upon conduct, prescribes rights and duties; is highly motivational; is satisfying ... confers unity to the mind, and provides significance and enlargement to the lives of those who possess them" (p. 77).

Fifthly, mature religion was integrative in that it knitted all of life's experiences and dilemmas into a harmonious whole. Allport noted the deterministic nature of mature religion. He noted that issues such as the problem of evil and the suffering of the innocent must be faced and fought through before the religious sentiment can be considered mature.

Sixthly, mature religion involved a heuristic approach to religion. Beliefs are held tentatively until confirmed or until a more valid belief is discovered. Allport noted that mature religion is "ordinarily fashioned in the workshop of doubt" (p. 83), and that absolute certainty is not necessary to act whole heartedly. He also observed that:

A heuristic commitment is not a matter of illusion, at least until such a time as the probabilities upon which it is based are proved to be absolutely groundless. And if one cannot prove the religious commitment to rest on certainties, neither can one prove it to be groundless (p. 83).

In The Nature of Prejudice (1954), Allport applied the constructs of mature and immature religious sentiment to the study of prejudice and modified his classification schema, referring to mature religion as "interiorized" religious outlook, and immature religion as "institutionalized" religious outlook. He observed that "those who were considered the most devout, more personally absorbed in their religion, were far less prejudiced than the others. The institutional type of attachment, external and political in nature, turns out to be associated with prejudice" (p. 452). In a subsequent article (Allport, 1966), he described the concept of mature and immature religion by referring to them as "associational" and "communal"

interests in religion respectively. Communal interests include getting together to gossip, for entertainment, or even to sell insurance. Associational interests, on the other hand, involve getting together for the primary purpose of religious fellowship. Allport (1966) further developed the concept of mature and immature religion by borrowing the concept of intrinsic and extrinsic value from axiology to distinguish individuals who saw religion as an end in itself from those who saw it as instrumental. He initially described the intrinsic type as those who:

...regards faith as a supreme value in it own right...oriented toward a unification of being, takes seriously the commandment of brotherhood, and strives to transcend all self-centered needs. Dogma is tempered with humility...A religious sentiment of this sort floods the whole life with motivation and meaning. Religion is no longer limited to single segments of self-interest (p. 455).

He described the extrinsic type as those who:

...have no true association with the religious function of the church...they feel no obligation to attend church regularly nor to integrate religion into their way of life...most extrinsics are casual and peripheral churchgoers... a type of religion that is strictly utilitarian: useful for the self in granting safety, social standing, solace, and endorsement of one's chosen way of life (p. 455).

To test these constructs, Allport and Ross (1967) developed the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Scale and refined it eventually in the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS). The ROS was initially used to investigate religious orientation and prejudice. The sample included 309 cases from six different denominations (Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Nazarene, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist), and five different states. A four-part typology of religious orientation emerged. The first, Extrinsics, were individuals who engage in religious activity as a means to other ends. They "use" their

religion. The next type, Intrinsic, integrated their religious beliefs and behavior in such a manner that they "lived" their religion. The third, the Indiscriminately Pro-religious, and the fourth, the Indiscriminately Anti-religious failed to differentiate whether they "used" or "lived" their religion. The results of the study suggested that individuals with an Extrinsic religious orientation were more prejudiced than individuals with an Intrinsic religious orientation. Another finding was that the Indiscriminate religious orientation showed more prejudice than the two pure types, with the Indiscriminate Proreligious showing the most prejudice (Allport & Ross, 1967).

The ROS was used by Genia and Shaw (1991) to examine the relationship between religious orientation and depression. A sample of 309 religious individuals from five major denominational groups participated. Depression was measured with the Beck's Depression Inventory, and the results indicated that individuals categorized as intrinsic in their religious orientation were the least depressed. There were no differences in the levels of depression among those categorized as extrinsic, proreligious and antireligious.

These studies indicated that religious orientation affected both degree of prejudice, and level of depression. This study examines how congruence on religious orientation moderates marital stress and affects marital satisfaction in religious couples.

Researchers studying the relationship between religion and marital satisfaction have employed diverse measures of religiosity across various marital dimensions using

varied religious populations. The majority of the studies report a significant and positive relationship between religiosity and marital satisfaction. Early studies used unidimensional religiosity measures such as church affiliation and church attendance to measure religiosity. For example, Burchinal (1957) examined the relationship between marital satisfaction and church membership, and marital satisfaction and church attendance with a sample of 242 husbands and 246 wives. Marital satisfaction was measured with a marriage questionnaire consisting of 28 items adapted from the Burgess and Wallin marriage success indexes (Burgess & Wallin, 1953), and frequency of church attendance and church membership were obtained from a personal interview with the subjects. He found that husbands who were church members had significantly higher marital satisfaction scores than husbands who were not church members. However, there was no significant difference in marital satisfaction scores between wives who were church members and those who were not. Results also indicated that husbands who attended church occasionally and wives who attended church regularly reported the highest marital satisfaction scores.

Wallin (1957) used frequency of church attendance as his measure of religiosity in looking at sexual gratification and marital satisfaction in 1,000 couples. Sexual gratification was measured by self-reported orgasm frequency for women and extent of relief from sexual desire for men. Marital satisfaction was based on responses to a series of items indicating general satisfaction with one's marriage and marriage partner. He found that the religious women's marital satisfaction scores were less depreciated by low sexual gratification when compared with non-religious

women, that this hypothesis did not hold for men, and that there were no differences in the marital satisfaction scores of religious and non-religious husbands and wives when sexual gratification was high.

Kunz and Albrecht (1977) studied a sample of 2,227 households looking at the impact of religious behavior (church attendance) on marital stability. Church attendance was measured on a five-point scale ranging from "regularly" to "not at all". A questionnaire with three indicators of marital stability and happiness were used to measure marital stability: current marital status, decision about whether they would marry the same spouse again, and extent and frequency of conflict and disagreement between spouses. Religious activity was strongly related to indicators of marital happiness (e.g. absence of divorce, willingness to marry the same spouse again, and absence of disagreement over a range of marital roles).

Other researchers have elected to use multidimensional measures of religiosity. For instance, Carey (1966) used five indices of religious orientation (a devotional index; an ethical attitudes index; a doctrinal attitudes index; a religious knowledge index; and a Catholic schooling index) in examining religion and marital happiness in a sample of 1,617 married Catholics. Marital happiness was measured by self-report to a single question about their level of general happiness. Results indicated that three of the five indices (devotional, ethical attitudes, and doctrinal attitudes) showed a significant positive linear relationship with the general happiness of Catholics married to Catholics, with devotional and ethical attitudes having the strongest association.

Wilson and Filsinger (1986) looked at the relationship between religiosity and marital adjustment. They used a sample of 190 white, married couples from a southwestern metropolitan area. Religiosity was measured with the DeJong, Faulkner, and Warland (1976) Religiosity Scale. Marital adjustment was measured with the Spanier (1976) Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The short form of Edmond's (1967) Marital Conventionality scale was used to control for social desirability. A strong pattern of positive relationship was found among dimensions of religiosity and marital adjustment. There were significant correlations between religious ritual, experience, and, to a lesser extent, belief and the dimensions of marital adjustment, even when marital conventionality (social desirability) was controlled. They also found that religiosity affected all areas of marital adjustment except affectional expression.

Hunt and King (1978) hypothesized that a positive relationship exists between pro-religiosity and marital satisfaction. Sixty-four couples were administered the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959), measures of marital satisfaction, marital happiness, and change in partners' love for each other since being married, and seventeen measures of religiosity. Results confirmed the hypothesis that "greater happiness, adjustment, and satisfaction in marriage is related to positive beliefs about religion, greater effort, more religious participation, more agreement about religion, greater tolerance, and higher extrinsic motivation toward religion" (p. 404).

An investigation of the relationship between spiritual well-being (a well-integrated internal religious orientation) and marital adjustment was done by Roth

(1988) with a sample of 147 married individuals who attended church. Marital adjustment was measured with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), and spiritual well-being was measured with the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982). Roth found a positive relationship between spiritual well-being and marital adjustment, with individuals married 10-40 years having a higher correlation than those married over 40 years.

The data from these studies seems to suggest that there is a positive relationship between religiosity and marital satisfaction. However, few studies have looked at religious orientation (intrinsic-extrinsic) and marital satisfaction, and how congruence in religious orientation affects marital satisfaction. One such study by Heaton and Pratt (1990), tested how marital satisfaction could be influenced by three types of religious homogamy - denominational affiliation, church attendance, and belief in the Bible - using interview data from the National Survey of Families and Households. The total sample was 13,017 households, and the analysis for the study consisted of 61% of the total sample. Marital satisfaction was measured with a single question about the marriage with responses ranging from unhappy (1) to very happy (7). Denominational affiliation was determined by self-report, church attendance was assessed on responses ranging from "never" to "more than once a week", and belief in the Bible was measured by responses to a single question about agreeableness with the Bible as the answer to human problems. Religious affiliation homogamy was the type of homogamy most associated with marital satisfaction and stability. Church

attendance only contributed slightly and beliefs about the Bible were not significantly correlated with marital satisfaction and stability.

Chi and Houseknecht (1985) also examined the relationship between religious affiliation and marital satisfaction. Their sample included 12,000 cases from the General Social Surveys conducted between 1972 and 1980. The findings indicated that Fundamentalist Protestants with congruent spousal religions were not more likely to be satisfied with their marriages than Non-Fundamentalists Protestants. They also found that when one of the spouses was not a Fundamentalist, Fundamentalism had a strong negative influence on marital satisfaction.

Dudley and Kosinski (1990) also investigated the relationship between religiosity and marital satisfaction, examining the role of congruence in the marital relationship. They included a sample of 228 individuals from a Seventh-day Adventists background from four states in the midwest. Marital satisfaction was measured with the Locke-Wallace (1959) Short Marital Adjustment Test. Intrinsic-extrinsic orientation was measured by the Validated Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972). Congruence was determined by responses to 2 questions about spousal congruence. They found that intrinsic religious orientation, private and public ritualistic practices, religious experience, salience, congruence and family worship correlated at a significant level with marital satisfaction. Congruence in religious orientation was also found to be an important factor in marital satisfaction. These studies clearly support the existence of a positive relationship between religiosity and marital satisfaction.

Problem solving is another factor which has been shown to significantly influence marital satisfaction and buffer the effects of marital stress. It will now be reviewed in this study.

Implied Role of Problem Solving

Problem solving skills training is a significant aspect of treatment in most behavioral marital therapy programs (Hahlweg et al., 1984; Jacobson & Margolin, 1979). Empirical findings support the view that problem solving skills differ among distressed and nondistressed couples (Hahlweg et al., 1984; Sabourin et al., 1990). Sabourin et al. (1990), for instance, investigated the relationship between problem solving self-appraisal and marital distress in 75 couples. They used the Problem Solving Inventory (PSI; Heppner & Petersen, 1982) to assess self-reported problem-solving behaviors and attitudes. The PSI was able to adequately distinguish distressed from nondistressed couples. Distressed couples, as compared with nondistressed couples, displayed less problem solving confidence, a stronger tendency to evade different problem solving activities, and exhibited poorer strategies to control their behavior.

Testing similar hypotheses, Hahlweg et al. (1984) determined whether couples changed their communication and problem solving behavior after undergoing marital therapy that was focused on training in communication and problem solving skills. The sample consisted of 29 couples who received problem-solving and communication training, 14 couples who were on a waiting-list control group, and 12 couples who

were nondistressed. The communication and problem solving skills of the couples were assessed by videotapes of the couples' discussions. The coding was done using the Couples Interaction Scoring System (Weiss & Margolin, 1986), the Marital Interaction Coding System (MICS; Floyd, O'Farrell, & Goldberg, 1987), and the Kategoriensystem für Partnerschaftliche Interaktion coding system (Halweg et al., 1984). Halweg et al. noted that the interaction patterns of the treated couples had a close resemblance to the pattern exhibited by the nondistressed couples. The waiting list couples, on the other hand, did not show any change during their waiting time.

Vincent et al. (1975) conducted a similar study using twenty four volunteer married couples to compare the problem solving behavior of distressed and nondistressed couples, and explored the "state" versus "trait" nature of problem solving by comparing married and stranger dyads. They used the MICS to code the behaviors of the couples, during spouse and stranger interactions, around a conflict they were asked to solve. Problem solving behaviors were measured through this process. The results indicated that subjects used more negative problem solving statements with their spouse than they did with strangers regardless of whether they came from a distressed or nondistressed marriage. It was also noticed that distressed couples' problem solving was more negative than nondistressed couples.

Jacobson (1984) used the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) to evaluate the effectiveness of therapy comparing the differences between the interventions of behavior exchange and communication/problem solving training. He found that behavior exchange led to greater increases in positive behaviors than the

communication/problem solving training. However, at a six month follow-up, it was found that the couples who received the communication/problem solving training were able to maintain their gains from treatment and continued to improve.

Behrens, Sanders, and Halford (1990) administered the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) to four couples in their study before treatment, and got scores reflecting a range from mild to severe marital distress. The first phase of their treatment focused on communication and problem solving skills, and the second phase focused on conflict management skills. It was found that all eight spouses showed clinically significant improvement on the DAS following treatment. The DAS was again used at a three month follow up to measure marital distress and three of the couples showed less distress than in pretreatment.

While problem solving skills have been found to influence level of distress and marital satisfaction in couples, to date no studies have examined how religious couples' marital satisfaction is affected by religious problem solving (Pargament et al., 1988). Pargament et al. have proposed that religious problem solving consists of three styles of problem-solving, each involving a different relationship between the individual and God. The first, Self-Directing, focuses on the individual's responsibility to resolve problems and engages an active problem-solving stance. The second, Deferring, focuses on the individual's deferment of the responsibility of problem-solving to God; the individual waits for solutions to emerge from God. In the third, Collaborative, the responsibility for problem-solving is held jointly by the

individual and God. Religious problem solving and its relationship to marital satisfaction will be addressed in this study.

Social desirability, another factor affecting marital satisfaction as well as religiosity, will be addressed in the next section.

Influence of Social Desirability

Social desirability has been documented as a significant factor affecting research in religion as well as marriage (Batson, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978; Hansen, 1981; Leak & Fish, 1989; Morris, Hood, Jr., & Watson, 1989). Social desirability is defined as individuals' tendency to respond to questions and measures in a manner which presents them in a favorable fashion. The influence of social desirability on religiosity has been studied for some time now (Batson, 1976; Watson, Hood, Jr., Morris, & Hall, 1984; Watson, Morris, Foster, and Hood, Jr., 1986). Much of the research have focused on the relationship between intrinsic or end religiosity and socially desirable responding. Leak and Fish (1989) examined how religious orientation, impression management, and self-deception relate to social desirability in a sample of 56 female and 28 male students. Impression management and self-deception were measured with the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Version 3 (Paulhus, 1984), and religious orientation was measured with the Batson's Interactional scale (Batson, 1976) and the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS; Allport & Ross, 1967). Results indicated that intrinsically religious persons tended to distort the way in which they saw themselves (self deception) and how they presented themselves

to others (impression management). Since self deception and impression management are socially desirable ways of responding, findings indicated a positive relationship between intrinsic religiosity and social desirability. These results also supported Batson et al. (1978) conclusion that intrinsically oriented individuals are overly concerned with appearances.

Watson et al. (1986) did a series of five studies exploring the significance of the positive relationship between end religiosity (intrinsic religiosity) and social desirability. End religiosity was measured with the Batson's Internal, External, Interactional, and doctrinal Orthodoxy Scales (Batson & Ventis, 1982), and the ROS (Allport & Ross, 1967). Social desirability was measured with the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Results indicated that intrinsic, end religiosity was positively associated with the SDS. However, no relationship was found between social desirability and personality measures examining defensiveness or psychological unease. They also found that intrinsic, end religiosity was unrelated to several impression management measures such as social anxiety, self consciousness, fear of negative evaluation, approval motivation, and a fake good scale. Watson et al. concluded that high scores on the SDS occurred with religious subjects because a significant number of items are confounded by a "religious relevance dimension" (p. 230).

Richards (1994) examined the relationship between religious commitment and impression management using the ROS (Allport & Ross, 1967), the SDS (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), the Self-Consciousness

Scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975), the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison & Paloutzian, 1978), and the Self-Control Schedule (Rosenbaum, 1980) with a sample of 178 undergraduate students. He also found that intrinsic religiosity was positively related to SDS. However, no relationship was found between intrinsic religiosity and self-consciousness and social anxiety. Another significant finding was that intrinsic religiosity was positively related to existential and religious well-being. He concluded that there was little empirical support for the notion that religiously committed individuals have a greater tendency to engage in impression management tactics than less religious individuals.

These studies consistently support a positive relationship between intrinsic religiosity and SDS, and suggest the possibility that the SDS may be confounded with religiously committed individuals. However, the relationship between intrinsic religiosity and impression management seemed inconsistent.

The measurement of marital satisfaction also seems to be affected by social desirability. Edmonds (1967) noted that marital adjustment measures are so contaminated by social desirability that they have little value. As such, the relationship between marital satisfaction or adjustment and social desirability is a crucial one. Hansen (1981) tested the nature of this relationship with a sample of 365 married individuals. Marital adjustment was measured with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), marital conventionalization was measured with the Edmonds' (1967) Marital Conventionalization Scale, and social desirability was measured with scale composed of 15 items from the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale

(Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). A significant positive relationship between social desirability and marital adjustment was found for men, women, and the total sample. The Marital Conventionalization Scale was found to be contaminated by marital adjustment. This finding was further substantiated by Fowers and Applegate's (1995) study of 101 married persons. As a result of the contamination effect of the Marital Conventionalization Scale and its relationship with marital adjustment, the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale was used to measure social desirability in this study.

Hypotheses

After having investigated the relevance of social exchange theory to couple research, the importance of similarity in marital relationships, the effect of marital stress on marital satisfaction, and the influence of religion and problem solving on marital satisfaction, the following hypotheses were predicted.

Hypothesis 1:

A congruent religious orientation between husbands and wives will be associated with higher marital satisfaction. Moreover, this congruent orientation is expected to mediate the effects of stress on marital satisfaction. This prediction is based on the effect of similarity on marital satisfaction (Deal et al., 1992), and the "rewards" aspect of social exchange theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), which emphasizes that individuals with satisfying and rewarding relationships may handle stress better. Similarly, husbands and wives categorized as having an intrinsic religious orientation will have higher marital satisfaction than the husbands and wives with an extrinsic religious orientation. This hypothesis is based on Allport and Ross' (1967) theory that intrinsics "live" their religion, thus having more positive qualities and behaviors in their marital relationship leading to higher marital satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2:

Husbands and wives who are congruent in their style of religious problem-solving will have higher marital satisfaction than husbands and wives who are incongruent in their

style of religious problem-solving. Moreover, husbands and wives who are congruent in the collaborative approach to religious problem-solving are expected to have higher marital satisfaction than husbands and wives who are congruent in either of the other two styles of religious problem-solving. This prediction is based on Pargament et al.'s (1988) study where the collaborative approach was found to be superior to the other two styles of problem solving, thus having a positive influence on marital satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3:

Husbands and wives who are congruently intrinsic in their religious orientation and who are also congruent in their use of the collaborative approach to problem-solving will have the highest level of marital satisfaction of all the groups. Moreover, a significant interaction is predicted between the collaborative approach to problem-solving and the intrinsic religious orientation for predicting marital satisfaction. This prediction is based on Pargament et al.'s (1988) conclusion that a significant relationship existed between intrinsic religiosity and collaborative problem solving.

Hypothesis 4:

After controlling for a congruency measure of intrinsic religious orientation and a congruency measure of collaborative problem-solving and their interaction, the stress measure will no longer account for a significant portion of the variance when predicting marital satisfaction. This hypothesis is based on the relationship between

investments and commitment in social exchange theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), suggesting that couples who are "committed" to their relationship because of their "investments", and committed to "living" their religion will experience less stress in their marriage.

Hypothesis 5:

Hypothesis 1 to 4 are expected to maintain themselves even after controlling for social desirability. This prediction is based on significant findings by Wilson and Filsinger (1986) between religiosity and marital adjustment after controlling for social desirability.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Subjects

The subjects in this study were 140 married couples from 18 different churches in a midwestern rural area. They were recruited because they were religious and frequently attended church services. Most of the subjects completed the questionnaires at their church buildings.

Measures

Gorsuch (1984) has suggested that researchers studying religious phenomena use established measures because these are available and have good validity and reliability. Consequently, this study used the following set of already existing instruments: (1) Religious Orientation Scale (Allport & Ross, 1967), and (2) Religious Problem-Solving Scales (Pargament et al., 1988). Marital satisfaction was measured with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) and marital stress was measured with the Life Distress Inventory (Thomas, Yoshioka, & Ager, 1993). Social desirability was measured with the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). These instruments are described below.

Religious Orientation Scale

The Religious Orientation Scale (ROS; Allport, 1950, 1966; Allport & Ross, 1967) is a self-report measure designed to establish an individual's religious

orientation/response to their religious beliefs. The 20 items of the ROS were chosen from an initial pool of 21 items developed at Harvard University. Allport initially organized the items into the intrinsic (9 items) and the extrinsic (11 items) subscales. The ROS was initially used in Allport's landmark study on religious orientation and prejudice (Allport & Ross, 1967). Allport and Ross (1967) reported a $-.21$ correlation between the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales.

Individuals with an extrinsic religious orientation agreed with the extrinsically worded items and disagreed with the intrinsically worded items on the scale. Those with an intrinsic religious orientation agreed with the intrinsically worded items and disagreed with the extrinsically worded choices on the scale. Two other categories of religious orientation emerged in a subsequent study by Allport and Ross (1967), namely the indiscriminately pro-religious and the indiscriminately anti-religious. The indiscriminately pro-religious endorsed both intrinsically and extrinsically worded items on the scale. The indiscriminately anti-religious failed to endorse any items of a religious nature and were low on both intrinsically and extrinsically worded items.

Donahue (1985a) reported KR-20 reliabilities of $.91$ for the Intrinsic scale and $.85$ for the Extrinsic scale. Cronbach alpha reliabilities for three denominational groups ranged from $.93$ to $.81$ for the Intrinsic scale and $.82$ to $.69$ for the Extrinsic scale, and item-total correlations for the Intrinsic scale were from $.28$ to $.58$, and $.18$ to $.50$ for the Extrinsic scale (Donahue, 1985a). In terms of validity, Donahue (1985b) noted a correlation of $.76$ between the Intrinsic scale and religious commitment, and a correlation of $.03$ between the Extrinsic scale and religious

commitment. One of the criticisms about the validity of the Intrinsic scale is that it is denomination-specific, embodying a "Southern Baptist" theology (Donahue, 1985a, p. 419). Genia (1993) noted that there is much controversy surrounding the interpretation of the ROS. Although early psychometric analyses of the Intrinsic/Extrinsic (I/E) items produced two orthogonal dimensions (Feagin, 1964), other investigators viewed the ROS as measuring three factors: Intrinsic and two Extrinsic scales (Ep: use of religion for personal benefits, and Es: use of religion for social reward) (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989; Kirkpatrick, 1989).

Religious Problem-Solving Scales

The Religious Problem-Solving Scales (RPSS; Pargament et al., 1988) is a self-report measure designed to establish an individual's style of problem-solving that involves the relationship between that individual and God. The RPSS is comprised of three independently scored scales: Self-Directing, Deferring and Collaborative. The 36 item test (each of the subscales consists of 12 items) can be completed in 15 to 20 minutes. Overall scores on the subscales range from 5 to 60.

Internal consistency for all three subscales were calculated using Cronbach's alpha statistics and found to be high: Self-Directing, .94; Deferring, .91; and Collaborative, .94. The means and standard deviations obtained from a sample of 197 church members were: Self-Directing (mean = 29.70; standard deviation = 10.71); Deferring (mean = 25.81; standard deviation = 9.19); and Collaborative (mean = 36.02; standard deviation = 10.67). A test-retest reliability analysis with a sample of

97 college students revealed reliability estimates of .94 (Self-Directing), .87 (Deferring), and .93 (Collaborative) (Taitel, Kooistra, & Hathaway, 1987).

Pargament et al. (1988) examined religious orientation and religious problem solving styles and concluded that an intrinsic religious orientation, the frequency of prayer, and religious salience were positively related to the Collaborative style. The Self-Directing style related negatively to the frequency of prayer, an intrinsic religious orientation, doctrinal orthodoxy, and a belief in God control. The Deferring style correlated significantly with doctrinal orthodoxy, a belief in God control, and an extrinsic religious orientation. Pargament et al. (1988) noted that the Self-Directing style was not entirely a "non-religious approach;" individuals with this style of problem-solving saw themselves as integrally involved in problem definition and solution, and felt less reliance on religious involvement. However, both the Deferring and Collaborative styles indicated greater involvement with religion. The Deferring style was associated with a religious orientation based on reliance on external rules, beliefs, and authority to solve problems. The Collaborative style was related to a religious orientation with an internalized commitment based on a close interactive relationship with God.

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) is a widely used thirty-two item self-report measure of marital satisfaction (Jacobson, 1984; Sabourin et al., 1990; Behrens et al., 1990). Spanier (1976) defined dyadic adjustment as the outcome of a

process which is determined by variations in (a) troublesome dyadic differences; (b) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety; (c) dyadic satisfaction; (d) dyadic cohesion; and (e) consensus on significant matters related to dyadic functioning. The DAS was created from an initial pool of 300 items. After duplicate items were eliminated, three judges determined the items which best fit the theoretical definition of dyadic adjustment. Twenty-five new items, which included checks for the effects of alternative wording and fixed-choice responses, were added to the remaining to create a 200 item questionnaire. This questionnaire was administered to 218 married persons and 94 divorced persons. Based on frequency distributions, items with low variance and high skewness were eliminated. Items that failed to discriminate between married and divorced persons at the .001 level of significance were eliminated based on t tests. At this point questions with alternative wording were reexamined and items with the lowest t-value were eliminated. The remaining 40 items were factor analyzed which resulted in the current 32-item scale.

The DAS has four interrelated dimensions based on the theoretical definition. Dyadic Consensus has to do with the degree to which the couple agrees on matters of importance to the relationship; Dyadic Cohesion focuses on the degree to which the couple engages in activities together; Dyadic Satisfaction is the degree to which the couple is satisfied with the present state of the relationship and is committed to its continuance; and Affectional Expression is the degree to which the couple is satisfied with the expression of affection and sex in the relationship (Spanier & Filsinger, 1983, p. 157).

Internal consistency reliability for the DAS was determined by Chronbach's coefficient alpha and was .96 for the total scale. Internal consistency reliability for the subscales were as follows: dyadic consensus, .90; dyadic cohesion, .86; dyadic satisfaction, .94; and affectional expression, .73 (Spanier, 1976).

Validity of the DAS was established in three ways. Firstly, judges ascertained the content validity of the test items based on the theoretical dimensions. Secondly, the test items discriminated between married and divorced individuals suggesting criterion validity. Finally, the test conformed to a theoretical structure, an indication of construct validity. The correlation between the DAS and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale was .86 for married individuals and .88 for divorced persons (Spanier, 1976; Spanier & Filsinger, 1983).

The total score on the DAS ranges from 0-151. The ranges for the subscales are as follows: dyadic consensus, 0-65; dyadic cohesion, 0-24; dyadic satisfaction, 0-50; and affectional expression, 0-12. The mean scale scores were 114.8 for married persons ($SD = 17.8$) and 70.7 for divorced persons ($SD = 23.8$) (Spanier, 1976). This instrument was used in this study because it was well-developed and has been used in several studies as a measure of marital satisfaction.

Life Distress Inventory

The Life Distress Inventory (LDI) is a fairly recent self-rating instrument developed by Thomas et al. (1993) to assess the current level of distress experienced across 18 areas of life. The LDI has been successfully utilized in the rapid assessment

and monitoring of spouse distress, in the evaluation of treatment to reduce such distress, and in the examination of the correlates of life distress. The LDI measures distress related to marital concerns (MC), career concerns (CC), outside activities (OA), self and family (SF), and life satisfaction/optimism (SO). A total score for general distress can also be obtained, ranging from 0 to 126.

The LDI was developed on a basically white, educated, middle-class female sample of spouses of alcohol abusers who did not want to stop drinking or seek treatment (N=77). The mean LDI score for general distress was 3.27 (SD=.82). Means for the subscales were as follows: MC (4.9), SO (4.2), CC (2.4), OA (2.8), and SF (2.7). Test-retest reliability for the total score over a 6-month interval for the 42 spouses who did not have immediate treatment in the experimental evaluation was $r = .66$, an indication of good temporal stability. The total score had high internal consistency with an alpha of .85. Alphas for the subscales signified fair to good internal consistency: MC = .84, CC = .55, OA = .76, SF = .71, and SO = .77. The LDI correlated positively with the Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory, indicating its convergent validity, and was not related to SES, education, or religion, supporting its discriminant validity. The LDI was selected for this study to measure marital distress because of its global reading of current distress. Only the general distress score will be used in this study.

Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale

The Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (SDS) is a 33-item self-report measure developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1964) to ascertain the subjects' tendency to provide socially desirable responses. Subjects are requested to indicate whether the items are true or false as they relate to them. Scores range from 0 to 33 with a higher scores indicating greater social desirability. The items in the scale were devised from personality inventories. In order to be included in the scale, an item had to meet with cultural approval, be untrue of almost all people, and have minimal pathological implications. The preliminary form of the scale, which consisted of 47 items, was administered to 76 introductory psychology students. Thirty three items on the scale discriminated at the .05 level when an item analysis was done, with 18 being true and 15 false. These items make up the present scale. Reliability of the scale was based on a test-retest correlation of .88, and the internal consistency coefficient of the scale being .88 as determined by the Kuder-Richardson formula 20. A comparison of the SDS and the MMPI indicated that the SDS correlated positively with the K and L validity scales and negatively with the F scale of the MMPI. Norms for the scale were drawn from a sample of introductory psychology students at Ohio State University. For males, the mean was 15.06 and the standard deviation was 5.58. For females, the mean was 16.82 and the standard deviation was 5.50 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). This SDS was used in this study to control for social desirability because the sample was religious.

Procedure

Pastors of churches were contacted by telephone and a brief explanation of the study was presented to them. If they expressed interest in the study and a willingness to have their members participate, a meeting was set up to discuss the study in more detail and work out a time when the study could be presented to the church members. At the time when the study was introduced, couples expressing an interest were asked to write their names and telephone numbers on sheets and place them in a box in the foyer. These couples were contacted and a time was set up (usually a time before or after a church meeting) to complete the questionnaires. Some couples were contacted by their church leaders and subsequently volunteered to participate.

At the meeting, couples were given a packet of the questionnaires to fill out. Husbands and wives filled out the questionnaires separately and each returned their completed questionnaires separately. A few (10) couples received the questionnaires at church and because of time constraints completed them at home and mailed them to the author. The measures included in the packet were the marital satisfaction scale, the religious problem-solving scale, the religious orientation scale, the marital stress index, a measure of social desirability, and a demographic questionnaire.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Subject Characteristics

There were 140 couples in this study. Denominations which were represented in the sample included Assemblies of God (11.05%), Baptist (10.0%), Brethren (3.6%), Catholic (.7%), Charismatic (5.0%), Church of Christ (5.0%), Evangelical Presbyterian (10.7%), Evangelical Free (3.6%), Free Methodist (8.6%), Lutheran (13.25%), Mennonite (6.75%), Mormon (6.4%), Nazarene (3.6%), Non-denominational (2.85%), Presbyterian (3.6%), United Methodist (.35%) and other (5.0%). The ethnic backgrounds represented in the sample were asian (.35%), caucasian (95.7%), hispanic (1.05%), native american (1.8%), and other (1.05%). Eighty-five percent of the couples were in their first marriage, 12 percent were in their second marriage, 2 percent were in their third marriage, and 1 percent were in their fourth marriage. The length of marriage ranged from 1 to 56 years. Number of children ranged from 0 to 9 children. The age range of husbands was 24 to 82. The average age of husbands was 46.09. The age range of wives was 23 to 79. The average age of wives was 44.05. In terms of level of school completed, 25.36% completed graduate professional training, 31.07% completed only college, 26.79% completed only partial college, 14.64% completed only high school, 1.07% completed only partial high school, and 1.07% completed only junior high school. Tables 1, 2 and 3 contain some relevant demographic characteristics.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics

Variables	Husband	Wife
Age		
M	46.09	44.05
SD	12.81	12.28
Number of Marriages		
M	1.19	1.18
SD	.54	.47
Years Married		
M	19.91	19.84
SD	12.98	12.85
Children		
M	2.78	2.65
SD	1.48	1.40

Table 2

Ethnic Background

Ethnicity	Husband Percent	Wife Percent
Caucasian	95.0	96.4
Asian	0.0	.7
Hispanic	.7	1.4
Native American	3.6	0.0
Other	.7	1.4

Table 3

Denominational Affiliation

Denomination	Husband Percent	Wife Percent
Assembly of God	10.7	11.4
Baptist	10.0	10.0
Brethren	3.6	3.6
Catholic	1.4	0.0
Charismatic	5.7	4.3
Church of Christ	5.0	5.0
Evangelical Presbyterian	10.7	10.7
Evangelical Free	3.6	3.6
Free Methodist	8.6	8.6
Lutheran	12.9	13.6
Mennonite	7.1	6.4
Mormon	6.4	6.4
Nazarene	3.6	3.6
Nondenominational	2.1	3.6
Presbyterian	3.6	3.6
United Methodist	0.0	0.7
Other	5.0	5.0

Hypotheses

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations for husbands and wives are presented in Tables 4 and 5. To determine whether husbands and wives obtained similar scores on these measures, a series of repeated measure ANOVAs were performed. Both husbands and wives obtained remarkably similar scores on all measures. Notable differences were that husbands endorsed greater use of self-directing problem-solving strategies ($F = 16.16$; $p = .001$), and wives endorsed a greater use of deferring and collaborative problem-solving strategies ($F = 8.65$; $p = .004$ and $F = 27.83$; $p = .001$ respectively). A perusal of the correlations also revealed that both wives and husbands responded to the measures in a similar manner. Major differences were that the intrinsic religious orientation correlated negatively and significantly with extrinsic religious orientation for husbands but not wives ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$ and $r = -.14$ respectively), marital stress was correlated negatively and significantly with deferring problem solving for husbands but positively and not significant for wives ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$ and $r = .12$ respectively), and social desirability correlated positively and significantly with intrinsic religious orientation for husbands but was nonsignificant and negatively correlated for wives ($r = .26$, $p < .01$ and $r = -.01$ respectively). Additional differences were that religious commitment was correlated negatively and significantly with marital stress for wives but not husbands ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$ and $r = -.05$ respectively), and positively and significantly with social desirability for wives but not husbands ($r = .26$, $p < .01$ and $r = .10$ respectively).

Table 4
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients for Wives

Variables	Mean	(sd)	DAS	RPSS	RPSD	RPSC	RE	RI	LDI	SDS	RCS
DAS	114.25	(16.01)	1.0	-.24**	.21*	.35**	-.02	.15	-.37**	.25**	.21*
RPSS	25.44	(7.09)		1.0	-.30**	-.66**	.22**	-.44**	.05	-.21*	-.21*
RPSD	36.89	(7.89)			1.0	.51**	.12	.18*	.12	.30**	.28**
RPSC	47.39	(5.64)				1.0	-.02	.47**	-.17*	.28**	.36**
RE	23.46	(6.77)					1.0	-.14	-.09	-.04	-.12
RI	40.79	(4.45)						1.0	-.07	-.01	.37**
LDI	40.20	(11.86)							1.0	-.22**	-.27**
SDS	16.63	(5.87)								1.0	.26**
RCS	11.04	(1.03)									1.0

Note: DAS = the Dyadic Adjustment Scale; RPSS = scores on the self-directed subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RPSD = scores on the deferring subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RPSC = scores on the collaborative subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RE = scores on the extrinsic subscale of the Religious Orientation Scale; RI = scores on the intrinsic subscale of the Religious Orientation Scale; LDI = the Life Distress inventory; SDS = scores on the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; RCS = the Religious Commitment Scale.

* = $p < .05$

** = $p = < .01$

Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients for Husbands

Variables	Mean	(sd)	DAS	RPSS	RPSD	RPSC	RE	RI	LDI	SDS	RCS
DAS	115.03	(13.09)	1.0	-.18*	.27**	.34**	.04	.26**	-.37**	.46**	.21*
RPSS	28.61	(7.43)		1.0	-.34**	-.59**	.25**	-.39**	.16	-.21*	-.39**
RPSD	34.78	(8.46)			1.0	.43**	.12	.18*	-.27**	.23**	.22**
RPSC	43.93	(6.42)				1.0	-.07	.35**	-.19*	.18*	.28**
RE	24.40	(6.86)					1.0	-.31**	-.01	.08	-.12
RI	40.01	(4.17)						1.0	-.12	.26**	.37**
LDI	41.62	(12.30)							1.0	-.24**	-.05
SDS	16.81	(6.22)								1.0	.10
RCS	10.97	(1.17)									1.0

Note: DAS = the Dyadic Adjustment Scale; RPSS = scores on the self-directed subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RPSD = scores on the deferring subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RPSC = scores on the collaborative subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RE = scores on the extrinsic subscale of the Religious Orientation Scale; RI = scores on the intrinsic subscale of the Religious Orientation Scale; LDI = the Life Distress inventory; SDS = scores on the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; RCS = the Religious Commitment Scale.

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

The initial analysis of religious orientation was based on Hood's (1970) "median split" scoring of the ROS. According to this procedure, a subject is classified as intrinsic if their score on the intrinsic subscale is above the median and their score on the extrinsic subscale is below the median. A subject is classified as extrinsic if their score on the intrinsic subscale is below the median and their score on the extrinsic subscale is above the median. Congruence was determined by husbands and wives having the same classification, that is, both being intrinsic or both being extrinsic. Using this procedure, 13 couples were classified as congruently extrinsic, 19 couples were classified as congruently intrinsic, and 21 couples were classified as being incongruent. The results indicated that there were no significant differences in marital satisfaction (DAS scores) for couples who were congruently extrinsic, congruently intrinsic or incongruent. Therefore, because no significant differences were found and this procedure involved only 53 couples (total sample = 140), it was decided that in the additional analyses, intrinsic religiosity will be classified as scores on the intrinsic subscale and extrinsic religiosity as scores on the extrinsic subscale.

Because the primary interest was how congruent religious orientations and congruent religious problem-solving styles moderate marital satisfaction, 4 congruency measures were developed by subtracting the husband and wife scores and then taking the absolute value of these difference scores. This type of congruency measure was developed for the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS), as well as the Religious Problem Solving measure and the 3 subscales. Finally, husband and wife scores on the Life Distress Inventory were summed to create an index of marital stress. Dyadic

Adjustment Scale scores for husbands and wives were summed as an index of marital satisfaction, and the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale scores were summed to create an index of social desirability. Means, standard deviations and zero-order correlations for the congruency measures are presented in Table 6. It should be noted that the means in this table reflect absolute different scores, not simple difference scores, this is, subtracting the means in Table 4 from Table 5 will not result in these values.

The major hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analyses. Because hypothesis 1 proposed that congruency in religious orientations would predict marital satisfaction, the congruency score of both intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations were regressed on the combined Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) score. Because it was also predicted that congruent religious orientations would modulate the effects of marital stress on marital satisfaction, these scores were entered next into the equation. The relationship between marital stress and marital satisfaction was expected to be significantly attenuated.

Findings for this hypothesis were not as predicted. Congruency on religious orientations did not significantly predict marital satisfaction. Neither an intrinsic nor extrinsic religious orientation were significantly predictive of marital satisfaction. Moreover, marital stress remained a significant predictor of marital satisfaction and accounted for 17.9% of the variance in marital satisfaction $t(2, 135) = -5.41, p < .001$. The results indicated that religious orientation was not a significant predictor of marital satisfaction in this sample of religious couples.

Table 6
Zero Order Correlation Coefficients for Congruency Measures

Variables	Mean	(sd)	MARDAS	MARRPSS	MARRPSD	MARRPSC	RE	RI	MARSTRS	TSDS	RELCOM
MARDAS	229.44	25.97	1.0	-.08	-.03	-.10	-.02	-.04	-.42**	.45**	-.14
MARRPSS	7.68	6.25		1.0	.09	.41**	.04	.12	.02	-.01	.17*
MARRPSD	7.06	5.31			1.0	.26**	-.02	-.04	.00	-.05	.15
MARRPSC	6.58	5.29				1.0	.02	.14	.18*	-.01	.00
RE	6.64	4.10					1.0	.09	.16	.02	.14
RI	4.03	3.41						1.0	.02	.02	.08
MARSTRS	81.82	20.15							1.0	-.31**	.10
TSDS	33.49	9.84								1.0	-.08
RELCOM	.90	.95									1.0

Note: MARDAS = combined Dyadic Adjustment Scale scores; MARRPSS = congruency measure for the self-directed subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; MARRPSD = congruency measure for the deferring subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; MARRPSC = congruency measure for the collaborative subscale of the Religious Problem Solving Scale; RE = congruency measure for Extrinsic Religious Orientation scale; RI = congruency measure for the Intrinsic Religious Orientation scale; MARSTRS = combined Life Distress Inventory scores; TSDS = combined Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale scores; RELCMCON = congruency measure for the Religious Commitment Scale.

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Hypothesis 2 predicted that congruent religious problem solving styles as measured by absolute value scores on the self-directing, deferring and collaborative subscales of the Religious Problem Solving Scale (RPSS) would predict marital satisfaction as measured by combined Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) scores of both husbands and wives, and that congruence on the collaborative problem solving style would be the best predictor of marital satisfaction of all three styles.

Findings on this hypothesis were not as predicted. Congruent problem solving styles did not significantly predict marital satisfaction. The results also indicated that congruence on the collaborative problem solving scores in particular were not a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that congruency on the intrinsic religious orientation and the collaborative problem solving style would be the best predictor of marital satisfaction. A hierarchical multiple regression analyses was conducted to determine whether congruent religious orientations, congruent problem solving coping strategies, and/or their interaction would significantly predict combined DAS scores. The findings for this hypothesis were not as predicted.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that combined LDI scores would not account for a significant portion of the variance after controlling for congruent intrinsic religious orientation and collaborative problem solving. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict marital satisfaction using the congruency measure for religious problem solving, the congruency measure for religious orientation, and the combined measure of marital stress. The findings for this hypothesis were not as

predicted. Marital stress scores remained a significant predictor, $t = -5.41$, $p < .001$, even after entering the congruent religious problem solving and the congruent religious orientation measures. An additional finding was a significant interaction between religious problem solving styles and marital stress (Table 7). After controlling for the religious problem solving styles and their interaction with marital stress, marital stress did not account for a significant portion of the variance for the interaction between marital stress and self directed, and marital stress and deferring problem solving.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that hypotheses 1 to 4 would maintain themselves even after controlling for social desirability. The Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (SDS) scores were summed to create an index of social desirability. The previous multiple regression analyses were repeated controlling for social desirability. This was accomplished by regressing the social desirability scores on each of the variables and using the resulting residuals in the analyses.

Findings for this hypothesis were not as predicted. After controlling for social desirability, congruency on religious orientation including intrinsic religious orientation, congruency on religious problem solving styles including collaborative problem solving, and the interaction of congruent intrinsic religious orientation and congruent collaborative problem solving did not significantly predict marital satisfaction. The results indicated that after controlling for social desirability, neither congruent intrinsic religious orientation scores, congruent collaborative problem solving scores, nor their interaction predicted marital satisfaction. Results also

Table 7

Hierarchical Regression Analysis using Religious Problem Solving Styles to Predict Marital Satisfaction

Religious Problem Solving Variables and Marital Stress	B	R2	R2 Change	t	p
Self Directed Problem Solving	.08	.01	-	.97	.334
Interaction	-1.20	.20	.19	-5.63	.001
Marital Stress	-.20	.21	.01	-1.58	.117
Deferring Problem Solving	-.04	.01	-	-.41	.680
Interaction	-1.09	.16	.15	-5.03	.001
Marital Stress	-.31	.18	.02	-1.98	.049
Collaborative Problem Solving	.10	.01	-	-1.15	.250
Interaction	-.82	.10	.09	-3.74	.001
Marital Stress	-.60	.19	.09	-3.76	.001

indicated that after controlling for social desirability, neither congruent deferring problem solving scores nor congruent self directing problem solving scores predicted marital satisfaction. However, marital stress scores continued to be a significant predictor of marital satisfaction accounting for 11.33% of the variance $t(4, 129) = -3.85, p < .001$.

When separate regression analyses were done for husbands and wives controlling for social desirability, several significant findings emerged. For husbands, marital satisfaction scores were significantly predicted by intrinsic religious orientation scores accounting for 2.72% of the variance $t(1, 134) = 1.93, p < .05$, collaborative problem solving scores accounting for 8.11% of the variance $t(1, 134) = 3.44, p < .001$, and deferring problem solving scores accounting for 3.51% of the variance $t(1, 134) = 2.21, p < .03$. Self directed problem solving scores did not predict marital satisfaction.

For wives, marital satisfaction scores were significantly predicted by intrinsic religious orientation scores accounting for 2.78% of the variance $t(1, 137) = 1.98, p < .05$, collaborative problem solving scores accounting for 9.10% of the variance $t(1, 137) = 3.70, p < .001$, and self directed problem solving scores accounting for 4.15% of the variance $t(1, 137) = -2.44, p < .02$. Deferring problem solving scores did not predict marital satisfaction.

Additional analyses (One way ANOVA) were done to determine the relationship between denominational affiliation and marital satisfaction.

Denominations were divided into 3 major groups based on theological beliefs: group 1

is fundamentalistic (Assembly of God, Charismatic, and Nondenominational); group 2 is conservative or evangelical (Baptist, Brethren, Church of Christ, Evangelical Presbyterian, Evangelical Free, Free Methodist, and Nazarene); group 3 is less conservative and more main-line (Catholic, Lutheran, Mennonite, Mormon, Presbyterian, and United Methodist). Separate analyses were done for husbands and wives. For husbands, group 1 had significantly higher marital satisfaction than groups 2 and 3 at the .05 level. For wives, there were no significant differences in marital satisfaction between the 3 groups (Table 8).

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations on DAS for Denominational Groups for Husbands and Wives

Wives

Denominations Groups	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	27	116.85	18.90
Group 2	63	114.92	15.64
Group 3	43	111.46	15.36

Note: Group 1: Assembly of God, Charismatic, and Nondenominational; Group 2: Baptist, Brethren, Church of Christ, Evangelical Presbyterian, Evangelical Free, Free Methodist, and Nazarene; Group 3: Catholic, Lutheran, Mennonite, Mormon, Presbyterian, and United Methodist.

Husbands

Denominations Groups	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	26	124.31	12.69
Group 2	63	113.95	13.41
Group 3	43	111.58	10.83

Note: Group 1: Assembly of God, Charismatic, and Nondenominational; Group 2: Baptist, Brethren, Church of Christ, Evangelical Presbyterian, Evangelical Free, Free Methodist, and Nazarene; Group 3: Catholic, Lutheran, Mennonite, Mormon, Presbyterian, and United Methodist.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicated that marital stress was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction and was negatively correlated with marital satisfaction. This finding is quite clear and fits with the literature and with social exchange theory. As marital stress rises, marital satisfaction falls, and vice versa. This is consistent with not only the marriage literature but also general coping theory.

A major finding of this study was the remarkable similarity between wives and husbands. Wives and husbands did not significantly differ on religious orientation, religious problem solving styles, level of marital stress, and marital satisfaction. While the literature (Deal et al., 1992, Murstein & Beck, 1972, Pickford et al., 1966)) confirms that similarity on independent variables are expected to predict the dependent variable, in this study similarity of responding did not result in a significant effect.

The hypothesized relationships between religious orientation, religious problem solving and marital satisfaction were not very well supported. Neither individual nor congruent measures of religious orientation and religious problem solving mediated the effects of marital stress on marital satisfaction. Congruent religious orientations and the interaction between congruent religious problem-solving styles were not significant predictors of marital satisfaction with this particular sample. In terms of the calculation of congruence, White and Hatcher (1984) noted that there may be methodological difficulties using absolute value scores because a couple in which both

spouses score high on one variable (e.g religious orientation) cannot be distinguished from a couple in which both spouses scored low on that same variable, or a couple with two moderate range scores. Another observation is that this study did not investigate the pro-religiosity and anti-religiosity dimensions of the ROS and perhaps examining those dimensions of the ROS may clarify the results. The findings of this study also do not fit with social exchange theory that emphasizes how similarity in a relationship improves the satisfaction in the relationship.

In particular, congruent intrinsic religious orientation did not predict marital satisfaction. One possible explanation for this finding may be found in Donahue's (1985b) observation that Allport's measure of intrinsic religiosity measures religious commitment, but is largely uncorrelated or inconsistently correlated with a number of indicators of nonreligious positive psychological or attitudinal traits. Perhaps marital satisfaction is one of these positive psychological traits. There also appears to be some discrepancy between Dudley and Kosinski's (1990) findings and the present findings. Their sample consisted of married individuals, not couples, and religious spousal congruence was determined by responses to 2 questions, and not absolute value scores. Different measures were also used to determine intrinsic religious orientation. Dudley and Kosinski used the Validated Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972) whereas this study used Allport's ROS. The ROS has been criticized by Donahue (1985a) because it is denomination-specific and embodies a "Southern Baptist" theology which could have affected the results in this study. Indeed, over 17 different denominations were represented with Baptist being only one

of them. It appears that for this sample, being intrinsically religious or being congruently religious was not a significant factor affecting the satisfaction in their marriage. For these couples being congruent in the religious orientations or being intrinsic in their religious orientation did not contribute substantially to their marital satisfaction. These findings, however, are similar to Booth, Johnson, Branaman, and Sica's (1995) findings in a sample of 1008 married persons. Religiosity was assessed with 4 questions relating to frequency of Bible reading, prayer, church attendance, and participation in church's social activities. Marital satisfaction was measured with an 11-item scale. Findings were that an increase in religiosity had little effect on marital happiness, and an increase in marital satisfaction was associated with slight increases in religious activities (e.g. church attendance). They concluded that the link between religion and marital satisfaction is reciprocal and weak.

Congruence on religious problem solving styles was not found to be a significant predictor of marital satisfaction. It is quite clear from the literature that problem solving is a significant predictor of marital satisfaction. However, a study by Caceres (1989) found that the differences in problem solving ability between distressed and nondistressed couples were far less marked than had been demonstrated in published studies.

Perhaps another problem with these findings was that the problem solving styles had more to do with religion than problem solving, or more on religious coping than actual problem solving strategies. Friedel and Pargament (1995) used the religious problem solving scales to measure religious coping in a sample of emergency

health care workers. Moreover, when these problem solving styles are categorized as religious coping, the data seems to make more sense because the interaction between religious problem solving and stress significantly predicted marital satisfaction.

Controlling for social desirability did not significantly affect the major hypotheses. However, several significant findings emerged when husbands and wives were examined separately. These findings clearly showed that social desirability significantly influenced the scores on the variables for husbands and wives. After controlling for social desirability, intrinsic religious orientation, the religious problem solving styles, and marital stress all significantly predicted marital satisfaction. It is quite clear from these results that social desirability is a significant covariate with religion in predicting marital satisfaction in a religious sample. This conclusion is supported by Leak and Fish (1989) who examined the relationship between intrinsic religiosity and social desirability, in particular, conscious impression management and unconscious self-deception, and found a positive relationship between the two variables. Although studies done by Watson et al. (1986) found similar results between intrinsic religiosity and social desirability (using the Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale [SDS]), they noted that a substantial number of items on the SDS were confounded by a religious relevance dimension. They concluded that, "positive correlations between End religiosity and the SDS may partly reflect the attempt of religious persons to live, however unsuccessfully, according to the normative values of their belief system, and that these values are in turn recorded by the Crowne and Marlowe instrument" (p. 231).

Other reasons for these insignificant results are numerous. Perhaps there were too many (18) denominations represented in the sample and consequently only a few denominations were adequately represented while most were insufficiently represented, which resulted in effects being attenuated. Alternatively, the measures may have been too similar and thus unable to determine differences in the sample. For instance, there are positive correlations between intrinsic religious orientation, deferring religious problem solving, and collaborative problem solving (Pargament et al., 1988). There is also a positive correlation between intrinsic religious orientation and social desirability (Leak & Fish, 1989). Consequently, the marital stress variable was the only variable distinctly different from the others and it significantly predicted marital satisfaction. Perhaps the sample responded in such a similar manner to the religious variables that marital stress was the only distinctly different variable.

There are no published studies where the problem solving measure was used with couples and this measure was not predictive of couples' marital satisfaction in this study. Although previously used by Seegobin, Moody, and Ronan (1995) with couples, there may be questions about its relevance with couples.

Theoretical Implications

Although significant relationships were not found between congruent religious orientations and marital satisfaction with this sample, a review of the literature clearly substantiates the significant relationship between religious variables, in particular, intrinsic religiosity and marital satisfaction. Therefore, in one's work with couples,

one needs to continue to examine the relationship between a religious commitment and marital satisfaction. A similar investigation needs to be carried out with religious problem solving and marital satisfaction, with perhaps, operationally defining religious problem solving as a coping response rather than a specific problem solving approach.

These results suggest that individuals working with religious couples need to understand that religious couples also experience marital stress and that their religious experience may not necessarily mediate the effects of stress on marital satisfaction. Therefore, issues related to marital stress and stress management need to be addressed with couples to increase marital satisfaction. Another observation is that although religious couples may behave more similarly in their daily lives, this does not mean that they are pathological.

In their work with religious couples, therapists must be aware of the influence social desirability has on the therapeutic relationship. It is quite clear from this study that religious couples often present themselves in socially desirable ways and these issues need to be addressed in order to ascertain the quality of therapeutic change.

Limitations

There are several limitations associated with this study. First, this study was not a true experiment and subjects were not randomly assigned to the various conditions. Thus, it becomes difficult to determine the factors that have predictive ability. Secondly, there was low variability for the religious commitment measure - the entire sample reported engaging in a high rate of activities associated with

religious commitment. Thirdly, this study may not have used the best measures to determine the variables studied with this sample. Other measures such as the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982) to measure religiosity and the Problem Solving Inventory (Heppner & Petersen, 1982) to measure problem solving may work better. Fourthly, the data needed to be collected in a more uniform manner instead of several different settings. Some couples were recruited by their pastors after a church meeting, and stayed after the meeting to complete the questionnaires. Others were called by their church and requested to participate. Yet others completed it as part of a group such as a Sunday School class. The procedures used in collecting the data were not uniform and consequently could have resulted in different ways of responding. Perhaps collecting the data during the summer months when only highly religiously committed couples usually attend church affected the nature of the sample in terms of their religious commitment and religious orientation. Fifthly, the population was primarily caucasian. Having greater ethnic diversity will result in a more generalizable study. Sixthly, the marital stress variable needs to be looked at more seriously because it accounted for a significant portion of the variance and was the only significant predictor of marital satisfaction. Finally, these data are best viewed as tentative and perhaps suggestive of avenues for future research.

APPENDIX:
Questionnaires

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Directions: Please complete this form and return it to the researcher before receiving a packet of survey forms.

You are invited to participate in this survey research study led by Winston Seegobin which examines how religious beliefs affect marital relationships. The researcher is conducting this study toward the fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Psychology degree at Central Michigan University. Dr. George F. Ronan, Ph.D., is supervising the project. The following information is provided to assist you in making an informed decision whether or not to participate.

You will be asked to complete some questionnaires which will take about 45 minutes of your time. Participation in this survey research project is entirely voluntary and you may decline to answer any question or withdraw from the project at any time. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete a sheet of demographic information, and six surveys that measure (a) your attitudes toward religion, (b) your perception of how you solve problems, (c) your current level of distress, and (d) perception of your marital relationship.

Even though your participation in this study will not result in you receiving any direct benefits, the information we obtain through your participation may help professionals better understand how religious beliefs affect marital relationships. There are no known risks associated with participation in this study.

If you decide to participate, it is important to answer the questions as honestly as possible. All of the information you will be asked to provide will be identified solely by number and will not be associated with your name. Thus, I will not be able to identify how individuals responded to items on the questionnaires and this ensures your responses will remain confidential and anonymous.

If you decide to participate, you also give permission to use the data you provide in this research study for presentations at professional meetings and in professional publications. You need to know that I am interested only in group data and your name will not be used in any such presentations and/or publications, thus again assuring your confidentiality and anonymity.

If any questions or concerns arise while completing the questionnaires, please feel free to ask. If you have questions or concerns about the survey research study, you can contact Winston Seegobin at 517-774-6916 or Dr. George F. Ronan at 517-774-6476. In the case where these individuals are unavailable and your concerns are urgent and require immediate attention, you may contact either of the following crisis centers:

Midland/Gladwin Mental Health
24-hour Crisis Telephone Service
517-631-4450 (Midland)

Listening Ear Crisis Center
24-hour Crisis Telephone Line
517-772-2918 (Mt. Pleasant)

By signing this letter, you acknowledge that: (a) you were advised of the above, (b) your questions about this study have been satisfactorily answered, (c) all personal information will be held strictly confidential, (d) you give permission for data collected to be used for presentation in professional meetings and/or publications, assuring your confidentiality and anonymity, and (e) you are free to withdraw from this study at any time.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

In my judgment, the subject is voluntarily and knowingly giving informed consent to participate in the survey research study.

Investigator's signature
Winston Seegobin, M.A.

Date

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

To assure that your responses to this research study will be anonymous and confidential, please do not put your name on this paper or on any of the survey forms. Thank you for taking the time to complete this sheet and the surveys.

1. AGE: _____ years
2. GENDER: _____ husband
(check one) _____ wife
3. LEVEL OF SCHOOL COMPLETED:
(check one)
 - _____ less than seventh grade
 - _____ junior high school (9th grade)
 - _____ partial high school (10th or 11th grade)
 - _____ high school graduate (whether private, preparatory, parochial, trade, or public school)
 - _____ partial college (at least one year) or specialized training
 - _____ standard college or university graduation
 - _____ graduate professional training (graduate degree)
3. ETHNIC BACKGROUND:
(check one)
 - _____ Caucasian _____ Other
 - _____ Asian
 - _____ African American
 - _____ Hispanic
 - _____ Native American
 - _____ Pacific (Non Asian)

4. MARRIAGE: Number of years married: _____ years
Is this your 1st marriage _____ 2nd marriage _____
3rd marriage _____ Other: _____
5. CHILDREN: Number of children: _____ children
6. FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE:
(check one)
_____ times weekly
_____ times monthly
_____ times yearly
_____ other
7. BIBLE READING:
(check one)
_____ times daily
_____ times weekly
_____ times monthly
_____ other
8. PRAYER:
(check one)
_____ times daily
_____ times weekly
_____ times monthly
_____ other

9. DENOMINATIONAL AFFILIATION:

(check one)

- ☐ Assembly of God
- ☐ Baptist
- ☐ Brethren
- ☐ Catholic
- ☐ Charismatic
- ☐ Church of Christ
- ☐ Church of God
- ☐ Episcopal
- ☐ Evangelical Presbyterian
- ☐ Evangelical Free
- ☐ Free Methodist
- ☐ Lutheran
- ☐ Mennonite
- ☐ Methodist
- ☐ Mormon
- ☐ Nazarene
- ☐ Nondenominational
- ☐ Presbyterian
- ☐ United Methodist
- ☐ Other

Life Distress Inventory

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle one of the numbers (1-7) beside each area. Numbers toward the left end of the seven-unit scale indicate higher levels of distress, while numbers toward the right end of the scale indicate lower levels of distress. Try to concentrate on how distressed you currently feel about each area. Please circle one number for each item.

7 = The most distress I've ever felt
 6 = Extremely distressed
 5 = Very distressed
 4 = Moderately distressed
 3 = Somewhat distressed
 2 = Very little distress
 1 = No distress

1.	Marriage	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Sex	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Relationship to spouse	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Relationship to children	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Relationship to other relatives	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Household management	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Financial situation	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Employment	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Education	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Recreation/leisure	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

7 = The most distress I've ever felt
 6 = Extremely distressed
 5 = Very distressed
 4 = Moderately distressed
 3 = Somewhat distressed
 2 = Very little distress
 1 = No distress

11.	Social life	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Religion	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Management of time	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Physical health	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Personal independence	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Role of alcohol in home	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Satisfaction with life	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Expectations for future	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Religious Problem-Solving Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the choice that best indicates how often each of the following statements applies to you.

1 = Never
2 = Seldom
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Always

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | When it comes to deciding how to solve a problem, God and I work together as partners. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | God solves problems for me without my doing anything. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | When thinking about a difficulty, I try to come up with possible solutions without God's help. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | When considering a difficult situation, God and I work together to think of possible solutions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | I don't spend much time thinking about troubles I've had; God makes sense of them for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | I act to solve my problems without God's help. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | When a hard time has passed, God works with me to help me learn from it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | When faced with a decision, I wait for God to make the best choice for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1 = Never
 2 = Seldom
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Always

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | When a difficult period is over, I make sense of what happened on my own without involvement from God. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | The Lord works with me to help me see a number of different ways that a problem can be solved. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Rather than trying to come up with the right solution to a problem myself, I let God decide how to deal with it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | When I run into trouble, I simply trust in God knowing that He will show me the possible solutions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | In carrying out solutions, I work hard at them knowing God is working right along with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | After I've gone through a rough time, I try to make sense of it without relying on God. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | I do not think about different solutions to my problems because God provides them for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | I don't worry too much about learning from difficult situations, since God will make me grow in the right directions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Together, God and I put my plans into action. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1 = Never
 2 = Seldom
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Always

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. | When faced with trouble, I deal with my feelings without God's help. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | When I feel nervous or anxious about a problem, I work together with God to find a way to relieve my worries. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | When I run into a difficult situation, I make sense out of it on my own without divine assistance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. | After solving a problem, I work with God to make sense of it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | When I have a problem I try not to think about it and wait for God to tell me what it means. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | In carrying out solutions to my problems, I wait for God to take control and know somehow He'll work it out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | When deciding on a solution, I make a choice independent of God's input. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | When faced with a question, I work together with God to figure it out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. | When I have a problem, I talk to God about it and together we decide what it means. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. | When a situation makes me anxious, I wait for God to take those feelings away. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1 = Never
 2 = Seldom
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Always

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. | When I feel nervous or anxious, I calm myself without relying on God. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. | God and I talk together and decide upon the best answer to my question. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. | When I have difficulty, I decide what it means by myself without help from God. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. | When a troublesome issue arises, I leave it up to God to decide what it means for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. | God doesn't put solutions to my problems into action, I carry them out for myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. | When I'm upset, I try to soothe myself, and also share the unpleasantness with God so He can comfort me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. | I do not become upset or nervous because God solves my problems for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. | When I am trying to come up with different solutions to troubles I am facing, I do not get them from God but think of them myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. | When faced with a decision, I make the best choice I can without God's involvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate below the appropriate extent of the agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

- 5 = Always agree
- 4 = Almost always agree
- 3 = Occasionally disagree
- 2 = Frequently disagree
- 1 = Almost always disagree
- 0 = Always disagree

- ___ 1. Handling family finances
- ___ 2. Matters of recreation
- ___ 3. Religious matters
- ___ 4. Demonstration of affection
- ___ 5. Friends
- ___ 6. Sex relations
- ___ 7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)
- ___ 8. Philosophy of life
- ___ 9. Ways of dealing with in-laws
- ___ 10. Aims, goals, and things believed important
- ___ 11. Amount of time spent together
- ___ 12. Making major decisions
- ___ 13. Household tasks
- ___ 14. Leisure time interests
- ___ 15. Career decisions

Please indicate below approximately how often the following items occur between you and your partner.

- 0 = All the time
- 1 = Most of the time
- 2 = More often than not
- 3 = Occasionally
- 4 = Rarely
- 5 = Never

- ___ 16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating the relationship?
- ___ 17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?
- ___ 18. In general, how often do you think things between you and your partner are going well?

- 0 = All the time
 1 = Most of the time
 2 = More often than not
 3 = Occasionally
 4 = Rarely
 5 = Never

- ___ 19. Do you confide in your mate?
 ___ 20. Do you ever regret that you married?
 ___ 21. How often do you and your partner quarrel?
 ___ 22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?"
 ___ 23. Do you kiss your mate?

	Every day	Almost every day	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
	4	3	2	1	0

- ___ 24. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?

All of them	Most of them	Some of them	Very few of them	None of them
4	3	2	1	0

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

- 0 = Never
 1 = Less than once a month
 2 = Once or twice a month
 3 = Once or twice a week
 4 = Once a day
 5 = More often

- ___ 25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas
 ___ 26. Laugh together
 ___ 27. Calmly discuss something
 ___ 28. Work together on a project

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

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|-------------------------|
| Yes | No | 29. | Being too tired for sex |
| Yes | No | 30. | Not showing love |

31. The numbers 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 number that best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____
 Extremely Fairly A little Happy Very Extremely Perfect
 unhappy unhappy unhappy happy happy happy

32. Please circle the number of one of the following statements that 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 that 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 it succeeded, but I *can't do much more than I am doing* now to make 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.

Religious Orientation Scale

Directions: Please circle the choice that best indicates how each of the following statements applies to you. If none of the choices expresses exactly how you feel, then indicate the one which is closest to your own views. If no choice is possible you may omit the item. There are no "right" or "wrong" choices.

1. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.
 - a) I definitely disagree
 - b) I tend to disagree
 - c) I tend to agree
 - d) I definitely agree
2. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
 - a) I definitely disagree
 - b) I tend to disagree
 - c) I tend to agree
 - d) I definitely agree
3. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
 - a) definitely not true
 - b) tends not to be true
 - c) tends to be true
 - d) definitely true
4. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
 - a) definitely not true
 - b) tends not to be true
 - c) tends to be true
 - d) definitely true
5. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
 - a) I definitely disagree
 - b) I tend to disagree
 - c) I tend to agree
 - d) I definitely agree

6. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.
 - a) I definitely disagree
 - b) I tend to disagree
 - c) I tend to agree
 - d) I definitely agree
7. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
 - a) this is definitely not so
 - b) probably not so
 - c) probably so
 - d) definitely so
8. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
 - a) definitely not true of me
 - b) tends not to be true
 - c) tends to be true
 - d) clearly true in my case
9. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
 - a) almost never
 - b) sometimes
 - c) usually
 - d) almost always
10. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.
 - a) more than once a week
 - b) about once a week
 - c) two or three times a month
 - d) less than once a month
11. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.
 - a) I definitely disagree
 - b) I tend to disagree
 - c) I tend to agree
 - d) I definitely agree
12. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life.
 - a) I definitely disagree
 - b) I tend to disagree
 - c) I tend to agree
 - d) I definitely agree

13. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible Study group or (2) a social fellowship.
 - a) I would prefer to join (1)
 - b) I probably would prefer (1)
 - c) I probably would prefer (2)
 - d) I would prefer to join (2)
14. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
 - a) definitely true of me
 - b) tends to be true
 - c) tends not to be true
 - d) definitely not true of me
15. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
 - a) definitely disagree
 - b) tend to disagree
 - c) tend to agree
 - d) definitely agree
16. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.
 - a) definitely not true of me
 - b) tends not to be true
 - c) tends to be true
 - d) definitely true of me
17. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
 - a) definitely disagree
 - b) tend to disagree
 - c) tend to agree
 - d) definitely agree
18. I read literature about my faith (or church).
 - a) frequently
 - b) occasionally
 - c) rarely
 - d) never

19. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
- a) I definitely agree
 - b) I tend to agree
 - c) I tend to disagree
 - d) I definitely disagree
20. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.
- a) frequently true
 - b) occasionally true
 - c) rarely true
 - d) never true

Crowne Marlowe Social Desirability Scale

Directions: Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you.

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|--|
| T | F | 1. | Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. |
| T | F | 2. | I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. |
| T | F | 3. | It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. |
| T | F | 4. | I have never intensely disliked anyone. |
| T | F | 5. | On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. |
| T | F | 6. | I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. |
| T | F | 7. | I am always careful about my manner of dress. |
| T | F | 8. | My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. |
| T | F | 9. | If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. |
| T | F | 10. | On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. |
| T | F | 11. | I like to gossip at times. |
| T | F | 12. | There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. |
| T | F | 13. | No matter who I'm talking to I'm always a good listener. |
| T | F | 14. | I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. |
| T | F | 15. | There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. |
| T | F | 16. | I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. |

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| T | F | 17. I always try to practice what I preach. |
| T | F | 18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loudmouthed, obnoxious people. |
| T | F | 19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. |
| T | F | 20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. |
| T | F | 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. |
| T | F | 22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. |
| T | F | 23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. |
| T | F | 24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings. |
| T | F | 25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. |
| T | F | 26. I have never felt annoyed when people expressed ideas very different from my own. |
| T | F | 27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. |
| T | F | 28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. |
| T | F | 29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. |
| T | F | 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. |
| T | F | 31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. |
| T | F | 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. |
| T | F | 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. |

Bibliography

- Albrecht, S. L. (1979). Correlates of marital happiness among the remarried. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 857-867.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). The individual and his religion. New York: MacMillan Company.
- Allport, G. W. (1966). The religious context of prejudice. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 5, 447-457.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-443.
- Batson, C. D. (1976). Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 15, 29-45.
- Batson, C. D., Naifeh, S. J., & Pate, S. (1978). Social desirability, religious orientation, and racial prejudice. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17, 31-41.
- Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). The religious experience. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 4, 561-571.
- Behrens, B. C., Sanders, M. R., & Halford, W. K. (1990). Behavioral marital therapy: An evaluation of treatment effects across high and low risk settings. Behavior Therapy, 21, 423-433.
- Belsky, J. (1986). Transition to parenthood. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 20, 56-59.
- Bergin, A. E. (1983). Religiosity and mental health: A critical reevaluation and meta-analysis. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14, 170-184.
- Birchler, G. R., Weiss, R. L., & Vincent, J. P. (1975). Multimethod analysis of social reinforcement exchange between maritally distressed and non-distressed spouse and stranger dyads. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 349-360.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.

- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., Branaman, A., & Sica, A. (1995). Belief and behavior: Does religion matter in today's marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57, 661-671.
- Booth, A., & Welch, S. (1978). Spousal consensus and its correlates: A reassessment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 23-32.
- Brehm, S. S. (1992). Intimate relationships (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bufford R. K., Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1991). Norms for the spiritual well-being scale. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19, 56-70.
- Burchinal, L. G. (1957). Marital satisfaction and religious behavior. American Sociological Review, 22, 306-316.
- Burgess, E. W. & Wallin, P. (1953). Engagement and marriage. Chicago: Lippincott.
- Caceres, J. (1989). Experimental study of couples' problem solving skills: Are we striving in the right direction? Sexual and Marital Therapy, 4, 161-175.
- Carey, R. C. (1966). Religion and happiness in marriage. Review of Religious Research, 8, 104-112.
- Chan, L. Y. W., & Heaton, T. B. (1989). Demographic determinants of delayed divorce. Journal of Divorce, 13, 97-112.
- Chi, S. K., & Houseknecht, S. K. (1985). Protestant fundamentalism and marital success: A comparative approach. Sociology and Social Research, 69, 351-375.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24, 385-396.
- Croake, J. W., & Lyon, R. (1987). Religion and measured marital adjustment in army aviation officers. Psychological Reports, 60, 722.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Deal, J. E., Wampler, K. S., & Halverson, C. F. (1992). The importance of similarity in the marital relationship. Family Process, 31, 369-382.

- DeJong, G. F., Faulkner, J. E., & Warland, R. H. (1976). Dimensions of religiosity reconsidered: Evidence from a cross-cultural study. Social Forces, 54, 866-889.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1977). The SCL-90 Manual I: Scoring, administration and procedures for the SCL-90. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An introductory report. Psychological Medicine, 13, 595-605.
- Donahue, M. J. (1985a). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: The empirical research. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 418-423.
- Donahue, M. J. (1985b). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 400-419.
- Dudley, M. G., & Kosinski, F. A., Jr. (1990). Religiosity and marital satisfaction: A research note. Review of Religious Research, 32, 78-86.
- Edmonds, V. H. (1967). Marital conventionalization: Definition and measurement. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 681-688.
- Edmonds, V. H., Withers, G., & DiBatista, B. (1972). Adjustment, conservation and marital conventionalization. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 96-102.
- Elliott, D. J., Trief, P. M., & Stein, N. (1986). Mastery, stress, and coping in marriage among chronic pain patients. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 9, 549-558.
- Feagin, J. R. (1964). Prejudice and religious types: A focused study of southern fundamentalists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4, 3-13.
- Fenell, D. L. (1993). Characteristics of long-term first marriages. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 15, 446-460.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 522-527.
- Filsinger, E. E., & Wilson, M. R. ((1984). Religiosity, socioeconomic rewards, and family development: Predictors of marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 663-669.

- Floyd, F. J., O'Farrell, T. J., & Goldberg, M. (1987). Comparison of marital observational measures: The marital interaction coding system and the communication skills test. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55 (3), 423-429.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: A study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 150-170.
- Fowers, B. J. (1991). His and her marriage: A multivariate study of gender and marital satisfaction. Sex Roles, 24, 209-221.
- Fowers, B. J., & Applegate. (1995). Do marital conventionalization scales measure a social desirability response bias? A confirmatory factor analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57, 237-241.
- Friedel, L. A., & Pargament, K. I. (1995, August). Religion and Coping with Crises in the Work Environment. Paper presented at 103rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Genia, V. (1993). A psychometric evaluation of the Allport-Ross I/E Scales in a religiously heterogeneous sample. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 32, 284-290.
- Genia, V., & Shaw, D. G. (1991). Religion, intrinsic-extrinsic orientation, and depression. Review of Religious Research, 32, 274-283.
- Glenn, N. D., & Weaver, C. N. (1978). A multivariate, multisurvey study of marital happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 269-282.
- Glenn, N. D. (1982). Interreligious marriage in the United States: Patterns and recent trends. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 555-566.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1984). Measurement: The boon and bane of investigating religion. American Psychologist, 39, 228-236.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-Revised and single-item scales. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28, 348-354.
- Gotlib, I. H., & Whiffen, V. E. (1989). Stress, coping, and marital satisfaction in couples with a depressed wife. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 21, 401-418.

- Gottman, J. M. (1990). How marriages change. In G. R. Patterson (Ed.), Depression and aggression in marital interaction (pp. 153-181). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gruner, L. (1985). The correlation of private, religious devotional practices and marital adjustment. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 16, 47-59.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. (1960). Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books.
- Hadaway, C. K. (1978). Life satisfaction and religion: A reanalysis. Social Forces, 57, 637-643.
- Hahlweg, K., Revenstorf, D., & Schindler, L. (1984). Effects of behavioral marital therapy on couples' communication and problem-solving skills. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 553-566.
- Hansen, G. L. (1981). Marital adjustment and conventionalization: A reexamination. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 855-862.
- Hansen, G. L. (1987). The effect of religiosity on factors predicting marital adjustment. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 264-269.
- Hatch, R. C., James, D. E., & Schumm, W. R. (1986). Spiritual intimacy and marital satisfaction. Family Relations, 35, 539-545.
- Hathaway, W. L. & Pargament, K. I. (1990). Intrinsic religiousness, religious coping, and psychosocial competence: A covariance structure analysis. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 29, 423-441.
- Heaton, T. B. (1984). Religious homogamy and marital satisfaction reconsidered. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 729-733.
- Heaton, T. B., & Goodman, K. L. (1985). Religion and family formation. Review of Religious Research, 26, 343-359.
- Heaton, T. B., & Pratt, E. L. (1990). The effects of religious homogamy on marital satisfaction and stability. Journal of Family Issues, 11, 191-207.
- Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29 (1), 66-75.
- Herron, R. W. (1976). A study of couple congruency in religiosity and its relationship to marital satisfaction. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 3942A-3943A.

- Heyman, R. E., Sayers, S. L., & Bellack, A. S. (1994). Global marital satisfaction versus marital adjustment: An empirical comparison of three measures. Journal of Family Psychology, 8, 432-446.
- Hoge, D. R. (1972). A validated intrinsic religious motivation scale. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 369-376.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- Hood, R. W. (1970). Religious orientation and the report of religious experience. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 9, 285-291.
- Horney, K. (1932). Zur Problematik der Ehe. (A contribution to the problem of marriage). (Abstract) Psychoanal. Bewegung, 4, 212-223.
- Hunt, R. A. & King, M. B. (1978). Religiosity and marriage. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17, 399-406.
- Jacobson, N. S. (1981). Behavioral marital therapy. In A. S. Gurman & D. P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (pp. 556-591). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Jacobson, N. S. (1984). A component analysis of behavioral marital therapy: The relative effectiveness of behavior exchange and communication/problem-solving training. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52 (2), 295-305.
- Jacobson, N. S., Follette, W. C., & McDonald, D. W. (1982). Reactivity to positive and negative behavior in distressed and nondistressed married couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 706-714.
- Jacobson, N. S., & Margolin, G. (1979). Marital therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers.
- Jacobson, N. S., Waldron, H., & Moore, D. (1980). Toward a behavioral profile of marital distress. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48, 696-703.
- Kaiser, D. L. (1991). Religious problem-solving styles and guilt. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30, 94-98.
- Kilbourne, B., & Richardson, J. T. (1984). Psychotherapy and new religions in a pluralistic society. American Psychologist, 39, 237-251.

- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1989). A psychometric analysis of the Allport-Ross and Feagin measures of intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation. In M. L. Lynn & D. O. Moberg (Eds.), Research in the social scientific study of religion, (Vol. 1) (pp. 1-31). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press
- Kirkpatrick, L.A., & Hood, Jr., R. W. (1990). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation: The boon and bane of contemporary psychology of religion. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 29, 442-462.
- Kunz, P. R., & Albrecht, S. L. (1977). Religion, marital happiness, and divorce. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 7, 399-406.
- Larson, L. E., & Goltz, J. W. (1989). Religious participation and marital commitment. Review of Religious Research, 30, 387-400.
- Leak, G. K., & Fish, S. (1989). Religious orientation, impression management, and self-deception: Toward a clarification of the link between religiosity and social desirability. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28, 355-359.
- Lewis, R. & Spanier, G. (1979). Theorizing about the quality and stability of marriage. In W. Burr, R. Hill, F. Nye, & I. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family (Vol. 1) (pp. 268-293). New York: The Free Press
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 251-255.
- Margolin, G., & Wampold, B. E. (1981). A sequential analysis of conflict and accord in distressed and nondistressed marital partners. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 554-567.
- McCutcheon, A. L. (1988). Denominations and religious intermarriage: Trends among white Americans in the twentieth century. Review of Religious Research, 29, 213-227.
- McIntosh, D., & Spilka, B. (1990). Religion and physical health: The role of personal faith and control beliefs. Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 2, 167-194.
- Medling, J., & McCarrey, M. (1981). Marital adjustment over segments of the family life cycle: The issue of spouses' value similarity. Journal of Marriage and the family, 43, 195-203.
- Minuchin, S. & Fishman, H. C. (1981). Family therapy techniques. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Mitchell, R. E., Cronkite, R. C., & Moos, R. H. (1983). Stress, coping, and depression among married couples. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 92, 433-448.
- Moos, R. (1981). Work environment scale manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Moos, R. H., Cronkite, R. C., Billings, A. G., & Finney, J. W. (1983). The health and daily living form manual. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University and Veterans Administration Center.
- Moos, R., & Moos, B. (1981). Family environment scale manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Moos, R., & Moos, B. (1986). Family environment scale manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Morris, R. J., Hood, Jr., R. W., & Watson, P. J. (1989). A second look at religious orientation, social desirability, and prejudice. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 27, 81-84.
- Murstein, B. I., & Beck, G. D. (1972). Person perception, marriage adjustment, and social desirability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 396-403.
- Newman, J. S., & Pargament, K. I. (1990). The role of religion in the problem-solving process. Review of Religious Research, 31, 390-404.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1982). Family inventories. St. Paul: Family Social Sciences, University of Minnesota.
- Olson, D. H., Fournier, D. G., & Druckman, J. M. (1983). PREPARE/ENRICH counselor's manual. PREPARE/ENRICH Inc., P. O. Box 190, Minneapolis, MN 55440.
- Paloutzian, R. R., & Ellison, C. W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy. New York: Wiley.
- Pargament, K. I., Kennell, J., Hathaway, W., Grevengoed, N., Newman, J., & Jones, W. (1988). Religion and the problem-solving process: Three styles of coping. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27, 90-104.

- Pasley, K., Ihinger-Tallman, M., & Coleman, C. (1984). Consensus styles among happy and unhappy remarried couples. Family Relations, 33, 451-457.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.
- Pearlin, L. I. (1975). Status inequality and stress in marriage. American Sociological Review, 40, 344-357.
- Pearlin, L. I., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-21.
- Pickford, J. H., Signori, E. J., & Rempel, H. (1966). Similar or related personality traits as a factor in marital happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 190-192.
- Pratt, G. K. (1930). Some of the psychopathology of marital adjustment. (Abstract) American Journal of Psychiatry, 9, 861-870.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychological Measurement, 3, 385-401.
- Richards, P. S. (1994). Religious devoutness, impression management, and personality functioning in college students. Journal of Research in Personality, 28, 14-26.
- Rosenbaum, M. (1980). A schedule for assessing self-control behaviors: Preliminary findings. Behavior Therapy, 11, 109-121.
- Ross, C. E. (1990). Religion and psychological distress. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 29, 236-245.
- Roth, P. D. (1988). Spiritual well-being and marital adjustment. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 16, 153-158.
- Sabourin, S., Laporte, L., & Wright, J. (1990). Problem-solving self-appraisal and coping efforts in distressed and non-distressed couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 16, 89-97.
- Satir, V. (1964). Conjoint family therapy: A guide to theory and technique. Palo Alto CA: Science and Behavior Books
- Scanzoni, L., & Scanzoni, J. (1976). Men, women and change: A sociology of marriage and family. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Schaefer, C. A., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1991). Psychological adjustment and religiousness: The multivariate belief-motivation theory of religiousness. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30, 448-461.
- Schaefer, M., & Olson, D. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The PAIR inventory. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 7, 47-60.
- Schumm, W. R., Bollman, S. R., & Jurich, A. P. (1982). The marital conventionalization argument: Implications for the study of religiosity and marital satisfaction. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 10, 236-241.
- Schumm, W. R., Jeong, G. J., & Silliman, B. (1990). Protestant fundamentalism and marital success revisited. Psychological Reports, 66, 905-906.
- Schumm, W. R., Obiorah, F. C. , & Silliman, B. (1989). Marital quality as a function of conservative identification in a sample of Protestant and Catholic wives from the midwest. Psychological Reports, 64, 124-126.
- Seegobin, W., Moody, R., & Ronan, G. F. (1995, August). Stress Related Marital Dissatisfaction: The Role of Noncongruent Religious Beliefs. Paper presented at 103rd Annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Shrum, W. (1980). Religion and marital instability: Change in the 1970s? Review of Religious Research, 21, 135-147.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.
- Spanier, G. B., & Filsinger, E. E. (1983). The dyadic adjustment scale. In E. E. Filsinger (Ed.), Marriage and family assessment: A sourcebook for family therapy (pp. 155-168). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Stack, S. (1983a). The effect of religious commitment on suicide: A cross-national analysis. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24, 362-374.
- Stack, S. (1983b). The effect of the decline in institutionalized religion on suicide 1954-78. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22, 239-252.

- Stark, R. , Doyle, D. P., & Rushing, J. L. (1983). Beyond Durkheim: Religion and suicide. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22, 120-131.
- Taitel, M., Kooistra, W., & Hathaway. (1987). Unpublished manuscript. Bowling Green State University.
- The Guilford-Zimmerman temperament survey. (1949). Beverly Hills, CA: Sheridan Supply Company.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.
- Thomas, S. P., Albrecht, K., & White, P. (1984). Determinants of marital quality in dual-career couples. Family Relations, 33, 513-521.
- Thomas, S., & Shoun, S. (1981). The career-marital stress of women inventory (CMSWI). Unpublished manuscript, The University of Tennessee at Knoxville.
- Thomas, E. J., Yoshioka, M. R., & Ager, R. D. (1993). The life distress inventory: Reliability and validity. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.
- Toops, L. C. (1929). The measurement of success in marriage and parenthood. (Abstract) Teachers College Record, 30, 579-588.
- Vincent, J. P., Weiss, R. L., & Birchler, G. R. (1975). Dyadic problem solving behavior as a function of marital distress and spousal vs. stranger interactions. Behavior Therapy, 6, 475-487.
- Wallin, P. (1957). Religiosity, sexual gratification, and marital happiness. American Sociological Review, 22, 300-305.
- Wallin, P., & Clark, A. L. (1964). Religiosity, sexual gratification, and marital satisfaction in the middle years of marriage. Social Forces, 42, 303-309.
- Wampler, K., & Powell, G. (1982). The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory as a measure of marital satisfaction. Family Relations, 31, 139-145.
- Watson, P. J., Hood, R. W., Morris, R. J., & Hall, J. R. (1984). Empathy, religious orientation, and social desirability. The Journal of Psychology, 117, 211-216.
- Watson, P. J., Morris, R. J., Foster, J. E., & Hood, Jr., R. W. (1986). Religiosity and social desirability. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 25, 215-232.

- Weisfeld, G. E., Russell, R. J. H., Weisfeld, C. C., & Wells, P. A. (1992). Correlates of satisfaction in British marriages. Ethology and Sociobiology, 13, 125-145.
- Weiss, R. L. & Margolin, G. (1986). Assessment of marital conflict and accord. In A. R. Ciminero, K. S. Calhoun, & H.E. Adams (Eds.), Handbook of Behavioral Assessment (pp. 561-600). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- White, S. G., & Hatcher, C. (1984). Couple complementarity and similarity: A review of the literature. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 12, 15-27.
- Wills, T. A., Weiss, R. L., & Patterson, G. R. (1974). A behavioral analysis of the determinants of marital satisfaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 802-811.
- Wilson, M. R. & Filsinger, E. E. (1986). Religiosity and marital adjustment: Multidimensional interrelationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 147-151.
- Winger, D., & Hunsberger, B. (1988). Clergy counseling practices, christian orthodoxy and problem solving styles. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 16, 41-48.
- Zung, W. W. K. (1965). A self-rating depression scale. Archives of General Psychiatry, 16, 543-547.