*Fam Proc 9:51-68, 1970*

# Dimensions of Early Marriage.

ROBERT G. RYDER, PH.D.[1]

Marriage research has by and large taken a narrow view of variation among marriages. One major orientation has focused on an evaluative dimension, contrasting "successful" marriages or "happy" marriages with less desirable alternatives (c.f. the review by Tharp, 1963). The various dimension labels resulting from this orientation have shared the view that marriages can be ordered on some continuum with one clearly positive extreme and one clearly negative extreme. While it might be noted that an evaluative dimension is too gross and ill defined for usefully describing the complexity of differences among marriages (Ryder, 1967), a more basic criticism is that such research tends to pretend that evaluations are descriptive facts, i.e., such research "factualizes" (Ryder, 1966).

The second major research orientation to individual differences among marriages has focused on power (see for example Herbst, 1952; Heer, 1963a, 1963b; Blood, 1963; Hoffman, 1960). Husband dominance has been contrasted with wife dominance, and authoritarian families have been contrasted with egalitarian or democratic families. Authority patterns have been studied in relationship to social class (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Rollins, 1963), stages of the family life cycle (Schlesinger, 1962; Rollins, 1963; Hill, 1964), working status of the wife (Axelson, 1963; Rollins, 1963), and cultural differences (Michel, 1967; Safilios-Rothschild, 1967; Buric and Zecevic, 1967). The power orientation is however weakened by arbitrary definition and by abstractness. Careful attention to actual conversations between husbands and wives quickly reveals the arbitrary nature of a dominance ranking. For example, does power reside in the person who wins in a disagreement, or in the person who decides who wins, or in the person who decides who decides? In dyadic (or higher order) interaction, power does not necessarily reside with anyone; the interactional system may just operate as a system. On the other hand, a marriage interactional system may, or may not, include attributions or assumptions about power that are salient characteristics of the marriage.

While important differences between groups have been demonstrated from family interaction using the "who wins" characterization of dominance, notably by Strodtbeck (1951, 1954, 1958), there is little evidence of such a variable having the internal consistency reliability one would desire for individual difference studies. In Goodrich and Boomer's (1963) *Color Matching Test* (CMT), the split-half reliability of who wins has been found to be .12 (Ryder and Goodrich, 1966). There seems also to be little basis for assuming that observed family interaction is related to self-reports of interaction (Olson, 1969; Hill, 1965; Kenkel, 1963).

Adumbrations of a third orientation toward describing marriages can be found in the clinical literature. Martin and Bird (1959) and Bird and Martin (1959) describe the "lovesick wife and the cold, sick husband." Here wives are seen as violently distressed over husbands seen (by their wives, but not by Martin and Bird) to be cold and unfeeling. DuPont and Gruenbaum (1968) find that married women with "paranoid states" are usually upset about husbands whose acquiescent agreeableness also succeeds after a time in frustrating the therapist. Sampson, Messinger and Towne (1964) report that for four out of a series of 17 women inpatients, hospitalization was precipitated by a rupturing of usual ties between the wife and an overinvolved mother or mother surrogate. For 11 of the 17, hospitalization was preceded by a syndrome in which wives acted more and more upset and husbands acted more and more uninvolved.

Substantial similarity exists among some of the descriptions given by Martin and Bird, DuPont and Grunebaum, and Sampson, Messinger and Towne: there is a reasoning and reasonable appearing husband, and an irrationally behaving wife who feels emotionally short-changed. Possibly the apparent similarity reflects restrictions on what kinds of couples attract this kind of psychiatric attention, or perhaps these are highly popular attributes for husbands and wives. To exaggerate a bit, it is not clear whether what commonality there is among these descriptions refers to particular kinds of marriages, or to marriage. The writers' impression, after considering a large series of non-clinic research couples, tends to the latter view. There seem to be very many couples widely differing from each other in most respects, but similar in fitting some attenuated version of a "lovesick wife" syndrome. The popularity of some variation of this pattern seems enough to justify labeling it "the" marriage syndrome, where the wife is frustrated and distressed in her efforts to spark some life from her husband, and the husband acts deliberately calm and reasonable in an effort to pacify his wife.

In sum, for the purpose of defining and describing different kinds of marriages, the characterizations emerging from academic work seem abstract, oversimplified at points, and sometimes confused between evaluation and description. Clinical descriptions on the other hand seem to be too restrictive in scope for present purposes. They pay insufficient attention to the range of differences among couples.

There is also some relevant work using quasi-clinical methods but with research intentions. Hess and Handel (1959) interviewed and tested 33 families obtained from nonclinic sources, and present detailed statements about six of these. Cuber and Haroff (1965) talked with over 200 couples or spouses and present their impressions of various trends

appearing in that group. The results of these two inquiries are strikingly different. Hess and Handel emphasize the range of diversity among "normal" marriages, as do Cuber and Harroff, the latter providing a number of typological descriptions. But Cuber and Harroff are primarily interested in sexual behavior, and so are far more concerned with marriage as such, as compared to a concern with the family. They emphasize romantic feelings (although not with that label), intensity of relationships, sexual faithfulness, and the absence of these attributes, but seem to have heard almost nothing from their subjects about what goes on between them and their children. The couples described by Hess and Handel are much poorer as a group than the Cuber and Harroff sample, and possibly that helps to explain why they seem to live such relatively unadventurous lives, and to appear so much more involved with their children.

The differing constructions presented by Cuber and Harroff and by Hess and Handel represent some unknowable blend of differences in population, in research interests, and in the biases arising from an essentially clinical methodology. But the differences do clearly underline the importance of well defined sampling, intentions and methodology. The present study, while using a necessarily biased sample, has attempted to keep sampling procedures as well defined as possible. Methodology, while eclectic, exploratory and at points ad hoc, is also quantitative and objective. The problem of what content to cover has been approached with an attempt at comprehensiveness. Questions survey seven content areas, but are not restricted to these areas. All couples in the present study were recently married and had no children, so questions in that particular content area refer exclusively to prospects for the future.

The immediate goal of the present analysis is to adumbrate a descriptive dimensional framework appropriate to the beginnings of marriage. Off in the distance is the prospective goal of trying to predict future couple attributes, and attributes of their children, from measures applied shortly after marriage.

## METHOD

### The Sample

Names and addresses of recently married couples were obtained from local marriage records. Letters requesting participation were sent to couples who were thought to reside within a half hour drive from the NIH research facilities in Bethesda, Maryland, who were beginning their first marriage, who were white, and who fit within a specified age range. Wives were required to be between 18 and 26, and husbands were required to be between 19 and 27 at the time of marriage. Full time students were not included. A couple was eligible only if the wife asserted that at the time (three months after marriage) she was not as yet knowingly pregnant. Accurate volunteering rate could not be obtained for the group presently reported on; but data obtained for another similar group suggests that positive responses were received from about 60 percent of those receiving our letters who would have turned out to be eligible to participate. All couples were told they would be paid for participating.

The final sample consisted of 50 couples, although missing data leave an effective sample size of 49 or 48 for most analyses. Mean and median age for the husbands was 24, with a range from 20 to 27. Mean and median age of the wives was 22, with a range from 18 to 25. Median education was 2-3 years of college, for both sexes. Husbands' education ranged from less than a high school degree to a post graduate degree. Wives' education ranged from high school graduation to college graduation. The mean family income for these couples was $670 a month, with a median of $663 and a range from $352 to $1,000.

### Procedures

Each accepted volunteer couple was telephoned, and an evening meeting was arranged at the couples' residence. An interview lasting about 1 1/2 to 2 hours was conducted at that meeting, with the two spouses together.

A second evening was arranged at the NIH research center. Immediately after their arrival the couple was administered the CMT. They were then each interviewed individually. Each spouse filled out questionnaires while the other spouse was being interviewed. These individual interviews took about 1 hour to 1« hours.

The beginning of a third evening consisted of another pair of individual interviews, of similar duration, at the research center, and more questionnaires to be filled out while one's spouse was being interviewed. After the interviews the couple participated in a set of role playing procedures called *Improvisations.* Since Improvisations have not been used in any of the present analyses, they will not be described further.

Finally, there was a fourth evening, which was held in the couples' home. A second joint interview, of about 1 1/2 to 2 hours duration, was conducted.

*Interviews.* The intent of the interviews was to survey the background and development of each spouse and of the courtship, as well as to obtain a detailed image of the contemporary marriage. Interviews were semi-structured, in that a fixed series of questions and probes were to be used; but interviewers were to explore vague or shallow responses as much as possible. Interview content was arranged to survey seven content areas that had been postulated as salient for early

marriage. These were: prospective parenthood, sex, relatives, occupation, friends, food, and housekeeping. Their order of prominence in the interviews was about that of the foregoing list.

After each interview, the interviewer completed a series of ratings.

*CMT.* The CMT consists of 20 trials where each trial represents an attempt by the two spouses to reach a consensus. For each trial, E shows the spouses a piece of colored paper. Each spouse is to decide silently what color he has been shown, in terms of a set of numbered standard colors on a display. Each of the two spouses has a display of standard colors visible only to him. After both spouses have indicated reaching a choice, E removes the colored paper from view. The spouses are then to reveal their choices to each other and to try to resolve any disagreements. There are modally 10 disagreements, as for 10 of the 20 trials the correct color is numbered differently on the husband's display than it is on the wife's display.

The chief features of the CMT are the standardization and novelty of disagreements. All couples disagree concerning the same content, and all disagreements are in the present. None can be reconstructions of discussions previously engaged in by the spouses. Also, the modestly large number of disagreements per couple yields the possibility of satisfactory internal consistency reliability.

*Questionnaires.* There was one large omnibus questionnaire (called the *Supplementary Questionnaire,* or SQ) which included a conglomerate of factual and attitudinal items on socioeconomic status, contacts with relatives, premarital and current sexual activities, use of leisure time, and other matters. The Locke and Wallace (1959) marriage satisfaction items were included as a portion of the SQ.

*Daily Routines* Daily Routines was a report of how "frequently" each spouse *does* or *decides* things in each of the seven content areas. There were three versions: *Current* (DRC), *Imaginative* (DRI), and *Parental* (DRP). DRC omitted items on child care. In DRI S was instructed to imagine being the parent of a three month old child. DRP was similar to DRI in content, but was intended as a report of the S's recollections of decision making and activity by his own parents when he was a child. The Daily Routines questionnaires were largely inspired by the work of Herbst (1952).

*Daily Dilemmas* (DD) consisted of a series of hypothetical situations pitting one of the seven content areas against another. For example, S was to decide whether to visit with a friend or be with his child. There were two responses for each item: what S said he would *prefer* to do, and what S said he would *actually* do.

*Problem Inventory* (PI) consisted of 14 items (2 per area) where each item posed some hypothetical interspouse disagreement. The four alternatives S could choose for each item were coded as "agree, being reasonable"; "agree, not being reasonable"; "disagree, being reasonable"; and "disagree, not being reasonable". The PI was modelled after the Yale Marital Interaction Battery (Buerkle, 1959).

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

In order to have statistically sound results one should only have a large number of variables when one has a large sample; but the economics of research work the other way. One can only manage to collect a great deal of information per case when the number of cases is relatively small. Thus the present study achieved a modest sample size but a great array of information for each couple from different kinds of procedures and a variety of content areas. Much of the material, primarily in the interviews, was in a form not easily rendered quantitative. If all or even the bulk of the information obtained could be made quantitative, the number of variables scored would rapidly exceed the sample size, many times over.

The plan for utilizing such an amount of information was by way of an iterative series of procedures that at points included analyses of over-large sets of variables, but which gradually worked down to more reasonably sized variable sets. Thus the final matrix of interrelations included only 15 variables.

The first step in the analysis process was to separate variables in terms of methodology. Analyses were first done within types of methods, rather than between, in a strategy designed ultimately to avoid so-called method factors, as have been found in a number of studies (Cartwright and Roth, 1957; Cartwright, Kirtner and Fiske 1963; Gibson, Snyder and Ray 1955; Forsythe and Fairweather, 1961; and Nichols and Beck 1960). Resultant method types were:

1) Questionnaires
2) Objective test (the CMT)
3) Interviewer Ratings
4) Interview Codes

Interview content was included in two categories not only because of the differences between ratings and codings, but also to give relatively greater weight to interview content in later phases of analysis. Each questionnaire was treated separately; interview codes were classified by content. No subdivisions of this sort were used with the CMT or interview ratings. Questionnaire items and interview codes were examined for covariations and conceptual sense, in order to combine them into a small number of variables with relatively large variance and conceptual consistency. Factors based on these reduced sets of variables were then obtained for each of the four data sets separately. Considering results from all four data sets, a total of 15 factors was retained. These 15 were then themselves jointly factored.

Four roughly interpretable factors emerged from this final, or *synthesis*, analysis, and were expressed in terms of the variables earlier scored from the questionnaires, CMT, interview ratings and interview codes.

Factors from the various analyses were rotated; but not in the usual attempt to achieve simple structure of variables. The objective of this research has been to describe and identify kinds of couples. In terms of dimensions, it would be ideal if the extremes of any dimension could be thought of as a syndrome or type. Extremes of dimensions could most conveniently be thought of as types if each couple had an extreme score on one and only on one dimension. In other words, research interests dictated rotation not to a simple structure of variables, but to a simple structure of couples.

Using previous nomenclature (Ryder, 1964), *profile rotation* treats profiles of factor scores in the way vectors of factor loadings are usually treated, i.e., the factor score matrix is rotated so as to maximize variance of squared factor scores over factors. A more complete rationale and description of profile rotation can be found in Ryder (1966).

Profile rotation was particularly appropriate in the synthesis analysis. Since the variables at this point were factors themselves, rotation by customary procedures would be very difficult to interpret.

In all analyses, profile rotation was used as a vehicle for deciding how many factors to retain: The number of retained factors was kept small enough that each profile rotated factor included the most extreme factor score for at least nine couples.[2]

## RESULTS

Four factors were retained. Since a matrix of factor loadings is fairly abstruse when the variables factored are themselves factors, the results of this final analysis are presented in a different way. Each of the final four factors was correlated with each of the original variables with which this series of analyses began, i.e., 10 "Attitude" scales, 37 interview code clusters, etc. Table 1 presents selected factor loadings (that is, correlations with factors) in terms of these variables. To construct Table 1 the 10 or 11 highest loaded variables for each factor were determined, and of these all variables which loaded at least .45 on some factor were retained.

Table 1
*Profile Rotated Factor Loadings from Synthesis Analysis*

| | Factor | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| *Interview Code Clusters* | | | | |
| H Negative Recall of Upbring | -04 | 49 | -16 | -35 |
| H Lived Home until Marriage | 49 | 10 | 13 | 25 |
| Interactive Ties with H Family | 56 | 21 | 16 | 19 |
| H High Ambition | 08 | 52 | -28 | -11 |
| W Negative Recall of Upbringing | -27 | 14 | 55 | -34 |
| Interactive Ties with W Family | 11 | 40 | 22 | 48 |
| Difficulties with W Family | -05 | 12 | 30 | -54 |
| Prospective Preference for Breast (vs. Bottle) Feeding | 32 | 02 | -08 | -53 |
| *Interview Ratings* | | | | |
| Easy Decision Process | -17 | -21 | -57 | 15 |
| Couple (vs. Individual) Identification | 35 | -06 | -59 | -03 |
| Overall Evaluation of Marriage | -08 | -09 | -58 | -30 |
| H Liked by Interviewer | -45 | -16 | -42 | -13 |
| H Communication with Interviewer | -48 | -24 | -35 | -25 |
| Spontaneity with Interviewer | -45 | -23 | -35 | -17 |
| H Empathy | -40 | 15 | -72 | -14 |
| H Support | -34 | 02 | -68 | -02 |
| W Support | -11 | -08 | -55 | -20 |
| *Questionnaires* | | | | |
| H Report of Contacts with H Family | 51 | 07 | 09 | 40 |
| W Report of Contacts with H Family | 48 | 19 | -03 | 46 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| W Report of Contacts with W Family | 16 | 12 | 04 | 51 |
| W Report of Anticipated Future Contact with W Family | 06 | 00 | -02 | 50 |
| W Recall of Parents' Involvement with Relatives | 18 | 18 | 09 | 48 |
| W Recall of Parents' Involvement with Friends | 24 | 29 | -01 | 48 |
| H Involvement in Housework | 10 | -47 | -02 | 12 |
| H Anticipated Future Housework Involvement | 20 | -48 | -04 | 11 |
| W Job Involvement | 14 | -53 | 19 | 05 |
| W Anticipated Future Job Involvement | 03 | -48 | 25 | 05 |
| W's Mother Job Involvement | 10 | -48 | 26 | 17 |
| H Report of Unhappiness and Doubts re Marriage | -24 | -01 | 59 | 03 |
| W Report of Unhappiness and Doubts re Marriage | -36 | 19 | 58 | -04 |
| W Report of Disagreements with Spouse | -10 | 04 | 61 | 04 |
| W Report of Yielding to H when H Complains | 30 | 30 | -56 | 05 |
| W Self-restraint | 18 | -10 | -02 | 50 |
| *Color Matching Test* | | | | |
| H Eliminating Disagreements by Making Errors | -15 | -49 | 05 | 07 |
| W Rational Discussion of Task | 27 | 52 | 23 | 12 |
| H Laughter | -25 | 08 | 23 | -54 |
| W Laughter | -43 | 17 | -07 | -45 |
| W Disapproval of Spouse | -16 | 16 | 13 | -56 |

Factor I is clearly tied in with attachment to the husband's family and the absence of certain communication skills. Factor IV is related to contacts with both families but with the highest loading having to do with the wife's family. The low contact end of Factor IV is related to both positive and negative affect expression on the CMT, and to difficulties with the wife's family, along with preference for breast feeding.

Factor III is a dimension of complaints and low interviewer evaluation. Husbands report doubts about the marriage, wives cite many arguments, interviewers characterize husbands as nonsupportive and unempathic, and judge that high scoring pairs of spouses see themselves less as a couple than do low scoring spouses.

Factor II contrasts husband job involvement and wife job involvement, while wife job involvement goes along with husband housework involvement. There is also the added suggestion that these differences in job and housework role orientation correspond to differences in interactional style. The wife is more matter of fact on the CMT at the more traditional (husband job involvement) end of Factor II. At the nontraditional end, the husband tends to get out of disagreements by making convenient errors on the CMT, which in effect yield to the wife.

The husband job involvement end of Factor II includes H Negative Recall of Upbringing, while W Negative Recall of Upbringing correlates positively with Factor III. That is, wife negative recollections go along with current complaints about the marriage, while husband negative recollections are related to job involvement.

## DISCUSSION

Comprehensiveness of variables and elaboration of data analyses do not by themselves generate useful dimensions for ordering phenomena. The dimensions generated depend on type and size of sample, anomalies and vagaries of certain variables, inclusion of material that may turn out to be of secondary interest, and chance. One may hope that there are interesting or important dimensions on which marriages may be ordered, dimensions that are conceptually meaningful and which differentiate couples on nontrivial bases. But in a way it is not correct to say that such dimensions may actually exist. That may depend upon whether or not one is willing to let the mathematics of factor analysis define reality, and if so, for what set of variables, what population of subjects, what rotational procedure and so on. It is more exact to say that certain dimensions are possible, in terms of a particular set of analyses. Quantitative data can indicate a pattern of relationships that is roughly consistent with a given set of dimensions, but not that the dimensions are required, and certainly not that they are conceptually meaningful. To obtain dimensions that make conceptual sense, one might wish to stray a bit from the outpourings of computers. Calculations might best be used to inform rather than to determine dimensions, to guide conceptual thought rather than to substitute for it.

What then, with this orientation in mind, are the prominent features of these factors? Clearly, closeness to the family of origin, in terms of numbers of contacts and in terms of using goods (such as money) or services (such as advice), has

central significance. Factor I involves closeness with the husband's family, and Factor IV involves closeness with both families, and in particular with that of the wife. The other most prominent feature of Factors I and IV is variation in terms of statements coded for affect, ratings of free and spontaneous communication (for the husband), and lack of questionnaire measure self-restraint (for the wife). It appears that couples who are more removed from one or the other set of parents have a more spontaneous, more affective and freer interaction style. "Removed," by the way, need not necessarily mean "uninvolved," but might indicate intense—and perhaps temporary—negative involvement.

The prominance of affectivity in Factors I and IV is reminiscent of what is perhaps the chief axis to be found in Cuber and Haroff's (1965) descriptions of variation among couples, namely the contrast between affective, mutually involved couples and couples who are relatively dispassionate and businesslike. It would be interesting to determine if, in Cuber and Haroff's sample, such a dimension is related to family ties.

Perhaps dimensions defined in terms of family ties *versus* spontaneity and affectivity would be of assistance in ordering contrasting marriage and family data. Cuber and Haroff's couples apparently would fall along the full range of such dimensions, while the sample studied by Hess and Handel (1959) might concentrate at the poles related to family ties.

If family ties are dependably and negatively related to spontaneity and affectivity, it becomes of some importance to determine the causal elements in the relationship. Some evidence from a reanalysis (Ryder, 1967) of the *Birth to Maturity* (Kagan and Moss, 1962) longitudinal data suggests that the dimensions may be continuations of patterns established as early as pre-adolescence. That is, a pattern of nonconformity to adult standards, pugnaciousness and physical risk taking in pre-adolescence was rather highly related to certain kinds of later, adult adventurousness.

Parallels between Factors I and IV are rough, but more or less obvious; but is there anything to be made of a comparison between Factors II and III? Factor II appears basically to be a dimension of role orientation, ranging from a traditional end, at which husbands are occupationally ambitious, to a nontraditional end at which wives are involved in job activities, and husbands are more involved in housework. Factor III seems quite unrelated, in being a dimension of reported arguments, couple complaints, and interviewer evaluations. There is, however, at least one point of comparison: both factors include negative recollections about a family of origin. Wives who report negative things about the families in which they grew up are found in marriages where both spouses complain about the marriage. Husbands who report negative things about their families of origin are found to be occupationally ambitious, and also to have wives who are exceptionally unconcerned with occupational matters. The finding for the husbands is consistent with much earlier work discussed by Strodtbeck (1958), who reaches the general impression "that striving for achievement is more frequently noticeable among boys who perceive their parents as reserved and their relationship with their parents as unsatisfying."

One possible interpretation is that disruptive childhood leads to internal conflict, which in turn has typically different consequences for men and women. According to this view, conflicted women tend to generate stormy marriages, and conflicted men tend to be ambitious (c.f. Goodrich, Ryder, and Raush, 1968). Setting aside the question of whether it is useful to assume internal conflict, what might be the consequences of seeing negative recollections, complaints and ambitiousness as all variants of dissatisfaction, dissatisfaction with significant aspects of one's environment in the past and in the immediate present? It is quite a conceptual leap to view the fragile variable of ambitiousness in this way, but the consequences of such a construction could turn out to be intriguing. There may be then a dimension of husband dissatisfaction with a significant aspect of his world (his current job status), and a factor of wife dissatisfaction with a significant aspect of her world (her marriage). Regarding role orientation, Tharp (1963), after reviewing the available literature on self reports of marriage satisfaction, concludes that the most important source of variance is the husband fitting well the culturally defined stereotype, i.e., the traditional role assigned to husbands. To judge from clinical experience the most pertinent part of that stereotype is surely the propensity of husbands to be interested, understanding and supportive regarding their wives. In the present data, husband Support loads -.68 on Factor III, and husband Empathy loads -.72 (the single highest loading in the entire matrix).

What is being contructed then is a view of Factor II as rooted in male kinds of concerns and Factor III as rooted in female kinds of concerns, as these are usually phrased in our culture. Factor II indexes husband dissatisfaction with part of his environmental setting, and Factor III indexes wife dissatisfaction with part of her environmental setting. At the same time, both factors also index the degree to which couples fit conventional role expectations, i.e., primarily the degree to which husbands seem to fit conventional role expectations vis a vis their particular wives. On Factor II the role expectations concern occupational matters, while on Factor III they concern interpersonal understanding.

There is another partial parallel in the obtained Factors II and III that is consistent with the present view, one that touches on the matter of "dominance." On Factor II the high wives are seen to use a high level of task discussion on the CMT. They apparently go to unusual lengths to persuade their husbands logically into acquiescence. It is probably not the case, however, that such wives are "dominating" or exercising unusual power over their husbands. These husbands tend to be low on Eliminating Disagreements by Making Errors, suggesting that they do not have a propensity for giving in easily. It is likely that these wives are high in acts of persuasion not because they are so interested in persuading their husbands, but because their husbands are seen to be so hard to persuade (c.f. the empirical distinction between "assertiveness" and

"effective power" described by Olson, 1969, and Strauss and Olson, 1968). The parallel to these data on Factor III is from questionnaire material. High scoring wives state they will not yield to husband's complaints.

A series of inferential liberties has thus taken us from the empirical factor loadings to a pair of conceptualized or constructed dimensions which are at least consistent with the observed data, which have a great deal in common with each other, and which also have some interesting distinctions between them. One dimension combines husband dissatisfaction with his past environment and a significant aspect of his present environment (occupation) with a traditional role orientation. Such husbands stick to their jobs and their wives tend to stay home and (presumably) do the housework. Vis a vis their wives, they play the role of one who is not easily made to yield under pressure. The other dimension combines wife dissatisfaction with her past environment and a significant aspect of her present environment (marriage) with a *non*traditional role orientation. The husbands of such wives are seen in the role of unsupportive and distinctly unempathic men—vis a vis these wives. Here is the portion of the dimensional space where "the marriage syndrome" described earlier is most exaggerated (c.f. Martin and Bird, 1959; Bird and Martin, 1959; DuPont and Grunebaum, 1968; Sampson, Messinger and Towne, 1964). Here too are the husbands indicated by Tharp (1963) who violate cultural role expectations.

The thing to emphasize in these two dimensions is that dissatisfaction is consistent with conventional societal expectations for husbands; but dissatisfied wives are found in the context of direct contradictions to such expectations, and therefore may be much more noticeable to the couples themselves, to their friends and associates, and to marriage researchers.

Listening to CMT tapes of high and low scoring couples on synthesis Factors II and III lends subjective support for the pair of conceptual dimensions being suggested. A particular kind of stereotyped interaction is heard at the high end of Factor II: the wife tends to act foolish, while the husband responds with elaborate patience. There is also the impression of sex role stereotypy at the low end of Factor III. For example, in one piece of interaction the wife cutely teased her husband. He reacted in apparent mock anger, which in turn seemed to titillate his wife. By contrast, at the low end of Factor II the wife seems prone to speak roughly with her husband, and the husband seems prone to take it. The impression is that neither spouse thinks very much of the husband. At the high end of Factor III, wives criticize their husbands and often receive only laughter in return.

Clearly a large task is at hand if the questions raised by these data and by the ensuing conceptualizations are to be at all resolved. The matter of primary importance is to determine if further empirical support can be found for dimensions like these. Such a task should be simpler in principle than the work done with the present sample, since many variables can be discarded as irrelevant. Comprehensive as the present data set has been, however, new variables must also be added. By far the most speculative point in the thinking about these dimensions is the assumption that husband ambitiousness can be construed as a dissatisfaction variable. Fuller data concerning husband job involvement and satisfaction must be gathered to either strengthen or discredit that assumption.

All four dimensions constructed out of the synthesis factor data can themselves be ordered in a simple two facet space, one facet being sex of spouse and the other referring to kind of content (family ties-spontaneity and role orientation-reported satisfaction). So one methodological issue should be explored: are the four dimensions suggested here simply two that would result from considering wife data and two that would result from considering husband data, or is something gained by using couples as the observational unit. Numerous other methodological issues and problems are intrinsic to collecting analogous data on a large enough sample to establish dimensions securely; but at least one methodological issue of some importance has been resolved in the present study: it is demonstrably possible to derive factors that coordinate, rather than segregate, data from widely different kinds of information gathering procedures.

Of course, should some confirmation be obtained for the dimensional framework presently adumbrated, then the more difficult but exciting work begins of tracing the antecedents, concomitants and consequences of locations within that framework. What childhood experiences or other background variables lead one to be the kind of person who is found in a particular kind of marriage? Are there distinctive developmental courses over the years for couples in different dimensional locations, and if so, why? And what kind of children will come from various kinds of marriages? Data on this last question is already being obtained for the present sample by other investigators.[3] Hopefully, work presently underway with a larger second sample will resolve at least some of the other questions and problems mentioned above.

## REFERENCES


1. Axelson, L., The marital adjustment and marital role definitions of husbands of working and non-working wives. *Marriage and Family Living, 25,* 189-195, 1963.
2. Bird, H. W. and Martin, P. A., Further consideration of the "cold, sick" husband. *Psychiatry, 22,* 250-254, 1959.
3. Blood, R. O., Jr., The measurement and bases of family power rejoinder. *Marriage and Family Living, 25,* 475-478, 1963.

4. Blood, R. O. and Wolfe, D. M., Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.
5. Buerkle, J. V. and Badgley, Robin F., Couple role-taking: The Yale Marital Interaction Battery. *Marriage and Family Living, 21,* 53-58, 1959.
6. Buric, O. and Zecevic, A., Family authority, marital satisfaction, and the social network in Yugoslavia. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29,* 325-336, 1967.
7. Cartwright, D. S., Kirtner, W. L. and Fiske, D. W., Method factors in changes associated with psychotherapy. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66,* 164-175, 1963.
8. Cartwright, D. S. and Roth, I., Success and satisfaction in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 13,* 20-26, 1957.
9. Cuber, J. F. and Harroff, Peggy B., *The Significant Americans*: A study of sexual behavior among the affluent. New York: Appleton-Century, 1965.
10. DuPont, R. L., Jr. and Grunebaum, H. U., Willing victims: The husbands of paranoid women. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 107,* 151-159, 1968.
11. Forsythe, R. P. and Fairweather, G. W., Psychotherapeutic and other hospital treatment criteria: The dilemma. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62,* 598-604, 1961.
12. Gibson, R. L., Synder, W. U. and Ray, W. S., A factor analysis of measures of change following client-centered therapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 2,* 83-90, 1955.
13. Goodrich, D. W. and Boomer, D. S., Experimental assessment of marital modes of conflict resolution. *Family Process, 2,* 15-24, 1963.
14. Goodrich, D. W., Ryder, R. G. and Raush, H. L., Patterns of newlywed marriage. *Family Process, 30,* 383-391, 1968.
15. Heer, D. M., The measurement and bases of family power: an overview. *Marriage and Family Living, 25,* 133-139, 1963a.
16. Heer, D. M., Reply to "the measurement and bases of family power: a rejoinder." *Marriage and Family Living, 25,* 477-478, 1963b.
17. Herbst, P. G., The measurement of family relationships. *Human Relations, 5,* 3-35, 1952.
18. Hess, R. D. and Handel, G., Family Worlds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
19. Hill, R., Decision making and the family life cycle. In G. F. Streib (Ed.), Social Structure and the Family, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965 pp. 113-139.
20. Hoffman, Lois W., Effects of the employment of mothers on parental power relations and the division of household tasks. *Marriage and Family Living, 22,* 27-35, 1960.
21. Kagan, J. and Moss, H. A., Birth to maturity: A study in psychological development. New York: Wiley, 1962.
22. Kenkel, W. F., Observational studies of husband-wife interaction in family decision-making. In Marvin B. Sussman (Ed.), Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., pp. 144-156.
23. Locke, H. J. and Wallace, K. M., Short marital adjustment prediction tests: their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living, 21,* 251-255, 1959.
24. Martin, P. A. and Bird, H. W., A marriage pattern: The "lovesick" wife and the "cold, sick" husband. *Psychiatry, 22,* 245-249, 1959.
25. Michel, A., Comparative data concerning the interaction in French and families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29,* 337-344, 1967.
26. Nichols, R. C. and Beck, K. W., Factors in psychotherapy change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24,* 288-399, 1960.
27. Olson, D. H., The measurement of power using self-report and behavioral methods. *Journal of Marriage and the Family., 31,* 545-550, 1969.
28. Rollins, J. M., Two empirical tests of a parsonian theory of authority patterns. *Family Life Coordinator, 12,* 5-79, 1963.
29. Ryder, R. G., Compatibility in marriage. *Psychological Reports, 20,* 807-813, 1967.
30. Ryder, R. G., Husband-wife dyads versus married strangers. *Family Process, 7,* 233-238, 1968.
31. Ryder, R. G., Profile factor analysis and variable factor analysis. *Psychological Reports, 15,* 119-127, 1964.
32. Ryder, R. G., Rotating principal axes into approximately mutually exclusive categories. In the Final Report: Conference on Cluster Analysis of Multivariate Data, New Orleans, December 1966.
33. Ryder, R. G., The factualizing game: a sickness of psychological research. *Psychological Reports, 19,* 563-570, 1966.
34. Ryder, R. G., Two replications of color matching factors. *Family Process, 5,* 43-48, 1966.
35. Ryder, R. G. and Goodrich, D. W., Married couples responses to disagreements. *Family Process, 5,* 30-42, 1966.
36. Sampson, H., Messinger, S. L. and Towne, R. D., Schizophrenic women. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

37. Safilios-Rothschild, C. A., A comparison of power structure and marital satisfaction in urban Greek and French families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29,* 345-352, 1967.
38. Schlesinger, B., A survey of methods used to study decision making in the family. *Family Life Coordinator, 11,* 8-14, 1962.
39. Strauss, M. A. and Olson, D. H., Direct observation of family roles as a diagnostic tool in marriage and family therapy. Paper read at 1968 annual meeting of American Psychiatric Association, Boston, Mass., 1968.
40. Strodtbeck, F. L., Family interaction values, and achievement. In McClelland, D. C., et. al., (Eds.), Talent and Society. Princeton, N. J., Von Nostrand, 1958, 177-178.
41. Strodtbeck, F. L., Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences. *American Sociological Review, 16,* 468-473, 1951.
42. Strodtbeck, F. L., The family as a three person group. *American Sociological Review, 19,* 23-29, 1954.
43. Tharp, R. G., Psychological patterning in marriage. *Psychological Bulletin, 60,* 97-117, 1963.

[1]In early 1961, a study of early marriage was begun at the National Institute of Mental Health. The original strategy and goals of information gathering were formulated by a group consisting of Wells Goodrich, Harold L. Raush, Richard Q. Bell, Paul Blank, John Campbell, Arden A. Flint, Sidney Salus, Walter R. Sceery and Sidney Werkman. During the time that the present data were collected, the study was directed by Wells Goodrich and Harold Raush. Robert Ryder joined the study late in 1961, and subsequently began the analyses reported here. Much is owed Wells Goodrich and Harold Raush for the support and consultation which have influenced both the present analyses and the shape of events since their departure from the project. We wish also to thank Richard Q. Bell for his careful critical readings of this paper. Others whose thoughts and assistance have been most helpful include Paul Blank, John C. Campbell, Arden A. Flint, Howard A. Moss, and Walter R. Sceery. All interviews were conducted by Paul Blank and Walter Sceery. Finally, special thanks are in order for those who administered experimental procedures, coded data, and did the basic hard work that turns protocols into results. They include Josephine Arasteh, Gail Baker, Kay Beckett, Naomi Costello, Elaine Diepenbrock, Donna Erdahl, Blanche Jacobs, and Sylvia Korchin. Gayle Heuston deserves particular gratitude for her work in the computer programming essential to this project.

[2]A more detailed statement of analysis procedures and results, method by method, as well as the interview rating form and a partial listing of interview codes, are included in a series of appendices which are attached to reprints of this paper, and also are filed with ADI.

[3]By Richard Q. Bell, Howard A. Moss and Charles Halverson.