To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Brian Denis Clifford entitled "Personal Stress and Marital Adjustment of Married Graduate and Professional School Students." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Psychology and Guidance.

Charles L. Thompson, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

PERSONAL STRESS AND MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF MARRIED GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENTS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Brian Denis Clifford

August 1976

1288303

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people and experiences make up my history prior to this study. Realizing the impossible task of mentioning all, I will attempt to thank those most responsible for assisting with my recent efforts. To Dr. Charles Thompson, thanks are due for his service as my chairman. To Dr. Fran Trusty, Dr. Karen Swander and Dr. Larry DeRidder go thanks for serving as committee members. To Dr. Chuck Comeaux goes special thanks for his continued affective support. To Jan Curley, I offer thanks for unlocking the mysteries of data analysis via computer.

A fond place in my memory is reserved for Larry Carpenter, who started me in my current direction, and for Dr. Don Gregg who "facilitated" my movement along the way by friendship and example. Many thanks to all my friends whose willingness to listen and/or write helped me with much needed perspective. Special thanks and love to my wife, partner, colleague and fellow student, Debbie, who gave the support, criticism and love which were necessary for the completion of this study. Lastly, thanks are due to Dr. Richard Nash of the Student Counseling Center whose partial funding of this research was greatly appreciated.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the personal stress—self-reported problems weighted by intensity—of married graduate and professional school students. It also looked at marital adjustment of this group, and at the effect of personal stress upon marital adjustment. The secondary area of investigation was the effect of training for the helping professions—counseling, social work, and clinical psychology—upon personal stress and marital adjustment. The effects of various demographic variables upon personal stress and marital adjustment were tested.

Participants in the study were forty-six married couples and six single persons. The groups were fifteen couples with the identified student member enrolled in a helping professions program, twenty-five couples with the identified student member enrolled in other graduate and professional programs, six nonmarried graduate students, and six non-student married couples with the identified participant having formerly been a graduate student. All identified participants were, or had been, students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Each participant was mailed a modified Mooney Problem Checklist, Form C; a Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test; and a Biographical Data Form. Each participant also gave her/his consent for use of the data relating to them. Data collection took place during the Spring academic quarter of 1976.

Findings related to personal stress, as evidenced by composite Mooney Problem Checklist scores, included no significant difference between married and nonmarried graduate students, and between those graduate students studying for the helping professions and those graduate students in other fields. Self-reported personal stress did not correlate significantly with marital adjustment. Personal stress was not significantly related to sex, number of years married, number of children, or age.

Findings related to marital adjustment, as evidenced by Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test scores, were that students in training for the helping professions were less well adjusted in their marriages than their peers in other fields, and that nonstudent married people were less well adjusted in their marriages than were current students. There was no significant effect for age or sex upon marital adjustment. Significance was found for the effects of years married and number of children. Those with one or two children were least well adjusted, while those with zero or three children exhibited higher scores. Students were generally well adjusted in their marriages.

Other findings related to problem areas causing students and spouses most difficulty. These areas were selected from the subscores on the Mooney Problem Checklist, modified to reflect intensity of the selected problems. Recreation, finances, psychological concerns, and academic concerns showed the highest mean weighted scores.

Implications for those student personnel workers and counselors who deal with graduate students were included. Recommendations to those considering similar research were made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Rationale for Studying the Problem	2
	Definition of Terms	4
	Limitations of the Study	5
	Overview of the Study	6
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	Overview of Research Dealing with Married Undergraduates	7
	Research Concerned with Married Graduate Students	14
	Summary	21
III.	DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	22
	Participants	22
	Instruments	23
	Procedure	27
	Analysis	27
	Summary	28
IV.	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	29
	Report of Analyses	29
	Characteristics of the Participants	42
	Summary	45

CHAPTER PAGE

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46

Discussion and Conclusions 46

Recommendations 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY 61

APPENDICES 66

APPENDIX A 67

APPENDIX B 68

APPENDIX C 69

APPENDIX D 70

APPENDIX E 71

APPENDIX F 72

APPENDIX G 73

APPENDIX H 74

VITA 77

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	T-test: Married Students with Nonmarried Students on the Mooney Problem Checklist	30
2.	T-test: Helping Professions Students and Spouses with other Graduate Students and Spouses on the Mooney Problem Checklist	31
3.	T-test: Married Graduate Students and Spouses with Nonstudent Marrieds and Spouses on the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test	32
4.	T-test: Helping Professions Students and Spouses with other Graduate Students and Spouses on the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test	33
5.	T-test: Male Married Graduate Students and Male Spouses with Female Married Graduate Students and Female Spouses on the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test	34
6.	T-test: Male Graduate Students and Male Spouses with Female Graduate Students and Female Spouses on the Mooney Problem Checklist	34
7.	T-tests: Identified Female Students with Identified Male Students on the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test	35
8.	T-tests: Male Spouses with Female Spouses on the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test	36
9.	T-tests: Spouses who are Enrolled either as Full- or Part-time Students with Spouses not Enrolled on the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test	36

TABLE PAGE

10. One-way ANOVA for the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test by Number of Children for Helping Professions Students and Spouses and Other Graduate Students and Spouses with Newman-Keuls Multiple Comparison Test 37

11. One-way ANOVA for the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test by Years Married for Helping Professions Students and Spouses and Other Graduate Students and Spouses with Group Means by Years Married 38

12. Statistics for Mooney Problem Checklist Composite Subscores for all Participants 39

13. Descriptive Statistics for the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test for all Appropriate Participants 40

14. Responses to Follow-up Questions on the Mooney Problem Checklist 41

15. Age of the Participants 43

16. Statistics for Some Demographic Variables on the Biographical Data Form 43

17. Frequencies and Percentages of Some Demographic Variables on the Biographical Data Form 44

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Montgomery (1972), Loewenberg (1969), Baird (1966), and Jones (1958) found that problems faced by married students are stressful. However, Christopherson, Vandiver and Krueger (1960), Chambliss (1961) and others offered findings that these problems have little effect upon students' marital happiness. Therefore, it was the intent of this study to resolve these opposing views by investigating the effect of self-reported personal stress upon marital adjustment.

It was predicted that (a) married graduate students will report more personal stress than nonmarried graduate students, (b) married graduate students and spouses will have lower Marital-Adjustment Test scores than will nonstudent married persons and spouses, (c) married graduate students and spouses in the helping professions will report more personal stress and lower Marital-Adjustment Test scores than will married graduate students and spouses in other fields, and (d) there will be a significant correlation between self-reported personal stress and marital adjustment. Hypotheses will be stated in the null form for statistical testing.

Rationale for Studying the Problem

"A major social change is revealed in the presence on college campuses . . . of married students in large numbers" (Chambliss, 1961, p. 409). The great number of married students in the post World War II period was due to postponed education, wartime marriages and veteran's benefits. Since that period, the percentage of married students has held fairly constant at approximately 25%.

Considering the availability of study participants, surprisingly little research has been done on married students. Busselen and Busselen (1975), in their review of literature concerning married undergraduates, list only forty-four studies from 1942-1975. The research available fell primarily into two categories—needs assessment of married student problems and the effect of marriage upon student performance.

Many studies have discovered that married students are able to view problems as being only temporary. Preliminary analysis of the client population using The University of Tennessee Student Counseling Center for the seven-month period of June to December in 1975, show that 13% of the clients were seen as couples. Chambliss (1961) reported that few married students seek counseling, and Horne and Graff (1973) reported that married graduate students are more likely to seek counseling than are married undergraduates. These findings led this author to suspect that the 13% figure may not be representative of all those couples having problems. Success of marital enrichment programs at the Student Counseling Center at The University of Tennessee and discussion of

of expressed client needs with staff counselors further suggested that the married student population at The University of Tennessee does need assistance in dealing with problems currently affecting their lives.

This study investigated those problem areas which concern students most, reported the intensity of those problems and tested hypothesized relationships between those problems and marital adjustment. It was the author's intent that the results of this study would be useful to counselors and student personnel workers in planning programs of a preventive nature. Mueller (1960) felt that married students needed assistance from the educational institution, or their work, health or development might suffer. Although this idea might sound somewhat paternalistic in 1976, programs for married students designed for enrichment, exploration and education seem to fit nicely into the developmental/preventive segment of counseling and student personnel work.

Although research on married students was surprisingly limited, it was even more limited when only married graduate students are investigated. Montgomery (1972) suggested further research into student anxiety and graduate study. Graff and Horne (1973) concluded that married students do have concerns which require counseling assistance, and that appropriate programs should be provided to meet these needs. The current area of inquiry was suggested by the above studies, the limited research specific to married graduate students and this writer's personal and professional experiences while engaged in graduate training at The University of Tennessee.

The effect of training for the helping professions—social work, counseling and clinical psychology—upon number and intensity of problems and associated marital adjustment formed the secondary research of this study. Research by Butler (1972) and Loewenberg (1969) suggested that professional graduate training places the student in a regressive role —a situation which is stressful. Close contact with married students training for careers in the helping professions at The University of Tennessee led the researcher to suspect that they would report a greater number of problems—i.e., stress—and poorer marital adjustment than graduate students in other fields.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will apply to this study.

Married Student

Unless otherwise stated, married students are graduate or professional (i.e., law) school students in attendance at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville during the Spring academic quarter of 1976. Their enrollment status may be full or part-time. Spouses of the identified student participants may or may not be students. Graduate and professional school students will both be referred to as graduate students.

Helping Professions

Helping professions are those occupations concerned with assisting people with their emotional concerns. Students training for these

professions will be enrolled in Social Work: Social Treatment, Educational Psychology and Guidance: Counseling, or Clinical Psychology.

Personal Stress

The phrase personal stress will be used to denote self-reported problems weighted by self-reported intensity. This information will be reported as a composite score derived from the modified Mooney Problem Checklist, Form C.

Marital Adjustment

Locke and Wallace (1959) state that, "marital adjustment is accomodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time" (p. 251). In the present study, this accommodation will be reported by use of Marital-Adjustment Test scores.

Limitations of the Study

For various pragmatic concerns, the sample size was limited to married students, nonmarried students and married former students of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Conclusions were therefore stated only as they relate to the larger population at The University of Tennessee. Although measures have been taken to score the instruments anonymously, scores on both the Marital-Adjustment Test and the Mooney Problem Checklist should be viewed with some reservation due to possible participant concern for social desirability and idiosyncratic answering style.

Overview of the Study

Chapter I has included a statement of the problem, the rationale for studying the problem, the definition of basic terms and limitations of the study. Chapter II will present a review of background and related literature. In Chapter III the design and procedures will be explained. Findings will be presented in Chapter IV and Chapter V will continue with a summary, discussion and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As mentioned in Chapter I, few studies have been done which look exclusively at married graduate students. Much of the prior research was concerned with undergraduates, yet can provide background for the study of graduate married students. An overview of this past research on undergraduates will be followed by studies concerned with graduate students.

Overview of Research Dealing with Married Undergraduates

Research reviewed in this section will deal with those studies using married undergraduates, or those using an unspecified group of married students as participants. "A major social change is revealed in the presence on college campuses since 1946 of married students in large numbers" (Chambliss, 1961, p. 409). Considering that these married students constitute approximately one-quarter of the student population (Busselen & Busselen, 1975), there has been little research done on a group so easily accessible. What research has been done fell primarily into two categories—the effect of marriage upon the student's academic situation, and needs assessment and problem investigation.

Marriage and Academic Situation

Marchand and Langford (1952) discovered that many women, particularly mothers, were forced to take a reduced course load—few husbands

found it necessary to do so. Mueller (1960) stated that without institutional assistance in meeting student concerns of a personal, financial and emotional nature, that, "his health or his classwork, or his personal development—or all three—will suffer" (p. 30). Mueller felt particularly strongly about the possible loss of talented students —often women—if marital and academic roles cannot be combined. Lee (1960) mentioned the need for flexible scheduling to facilitate the combination of these roles.

Although the view of the married male student as more mature and disciplined was offered as an introduction by Samenfink and Milliken (1961), they found that unmarried men had a slightly higher, though not statistically so, grade point average than married men. They further suggested a reappraisal of the post World War II feeling that marriage fostered academic success. Chambliss (1961) investigated a large group of married students and questioned them as to the effect of marriage upon academic grades. Following marriage, 61% reported a grade increase, 33% no effect, 4% uncertain, and 2% a decline. The classic Riemer study about the success of married veterans gave a priori support to Chambliss' findings. In his study, Riemer (1947) suggested that maturity and direction probably helped married students overcome the problems facing them. In Aller's (1963) study, she discovered that married students had a higher grade point average than nonmarrieds, but that there was a negative correlation between GPA and marital adjustment for student women. Her suggestion that student couples get "family rates" on tuition reflected the financial strain felt by couples where both

partners are students. Different conclusions were shown in the comparison of academic work of married and nonmarried students done by Falk (1964). He discovered no significant difference between grade averages of the two groups and no significant relationship between marital happiness and grade average.

A view of the possibility of increased interest in, decreased interest in, or confusion about academic work among marrieds was offered by Mason (1966). He proposed the possibility of education meaning more to married students, as well as it perhaps being diluted by marital demands. Ibsen's (1967) study explored the possible role conflict.

Hepkner and Cloyd (1974) discovered no significant differences between grades or improvement in grade average between married and nonmarried students. When the ages were divided—18-23 and 24 and older—a significant difference was still not achieved between the groups for grades. Significance was achieved, though, on grade improvement for older students. Significance was also found on integration of student and spouse roles for older students—suggesting possibly that problems faced by younger students had been "worked out." For those students scoring high on integration, there was a significant correlation between marital adjustment and grade point increase—possibly indicating acceptance and support from both the spouse and the educational institution. Although Hepkner and Cloyd's study did not set forth any clear relationship between marriage and academic performance, it did further amplify the effects of role integration or conflict.

Busselen and Busselen (1975) in their extensive literature review suggested that marital happiness correlates positively with academic

adjustment, and that the effect of children upon academic achievement is negative. They felt that the inconsistencies in the research findings reported could possibly be related to the changing social mores of the past thirty years.

The preceding studies have been predominantly institutional in nature as they have been primarily concerned with whether or not marriage would effect academic quality. Most authors suggested ways in which the institution could facilitate the combination of student and spouse roles.

Needs Assessment and Problem Investigation

Many of the problems that married students face could be easily predicted. The literature, though, showed mixed findings as to whether or not these expected problems are, in fact, perceived as problem areas by the students who were studied.

Thorpe (1951) found that students are able to effectively manage money and suggested that a couple's mutual solving of their monetary situation may well be a growthful experience. Marchand and Langford (1952) investigated couples where both spouses were students and found that the husbands were happier because of the reduced time demands by the wives, and that the wives were happier due to their college attendance. Nygreen (1954) offered three pertinent findings: husbands are significantly more critical of their marital adjustment than are wives, the wife's employment is positively associated with her marital happiness and married students who are parents have significantly poorer marital adjustment scores than nonparents. Jones (1958) sought the effects of the demands of school combined with the pressures of marriage as regards

the ability to deal with affective tensions or emotional problems. He discovered more affective tolerance among married undergraduate students than among those not married. Additional findings were that unmarried students expressed having more problems and that they were of a future nature. Married students reported problems related more to the present.

Similarities and differences between married college and married noncollege couples were investigated by Christopherson, Vandiver and Krueger (1960). An unexpected similarity was that husbands of both groups tended to assist with the housework to the same degree—even though the student wives were more often employed. The authors also suggested an acceptance by the student couples of a number of years of "material deprivation." Somewhat surprising was the fact that the student group's expectations about future salary were lower than the non-student group. It was suggested that the students were more willing to "settle" for positions at a lower salary in an attempt to achieve the financial security they had been lacking. Other possible reasons for this choice might have included desire for a particular position, limited geographical mobility and concern for occupational considerations other than money. Gerson (1960) explored the relationship between leisure and marital satisfaction. Most couples seemed satisfied with their leisure time activities; although husbands tended to be less satisfied and female married students to have the least leisure time. Time spent together or quantity of leisure time was not significantly related to marital satisfaction. What did seem important was the type of leisure activities for men and the feeling of being left out for women. Gerson made it

clear that leisure and marital satisfaction are related, but not in a cause and effect way. Lee (1960) proposed that the effect of time pressures on the wife—if also a student—is that she drops out of school. Chambliss' (1961) study elicited some of the more obvious difficulties facing married students: poor housing, rigid schedules, limited and unrewarding jobs for spouses, social activities geared mostly to singles and a wide variety of lesser problems like parking. Only 2% of the participants felt a desire to seek professional counseling—most choosing to "make it on their own."

Chilman and Meyer (1966) reported that "the great majority of married undergraduates, especially males, rated their marriages as happy and expressed somewhat higher satisfaction with their life situation than did the single undergraduates" (p. 67). Falk's (1964) study reported similar findings. He discovered significant differences between married and nonmarried students—in favor of the marrieds—in the areas of housing satisfaction, acceptable financial situation and finding a suitable study locale. Mason (1966) elaborated upon married student problems in the areas of marital adjustment, finances, academic demands, family difficulties and health, and suggested remedial institutional measures to help student couples deal with them. Ibsen (1967) cited Chambliss, Aller, Lee, Falk and others regarding the aforementioned problem areas but felt that they were not so different from those faced by married couples in general. The possible lack of role congruence between the student and spouse roles seemed to be the problem area which differed most from non-student marrieds. Part of Ibsen's research dealt with the role conflict

difficulties faced by the student/husband-father and the worker/wife-mother. The existence of children added to male role difficulties, regardless of whether or not the expectations of the spouse and children conflict with those of the male student. Although showing more role problems, the couple with a working wife appeared to exhibit a mutual "deferred gratification" and family support for the married student. The least positive combination was that of student husband and nonworking wife. One area of difficulty for older couples in the study was that of using nonstudent peers as a reference group and therefore appearing deficient in material goods, etc. Since graduate students are usually older, this may suggest that acceptance of deferred gratification wanes with time. Dangerfield (1972) discussed the need for the clarification of expectations and the dissemination of information about available resources to incoming students since it was during this stressful period that marital dissatisfaction was most often seen.

Price-Bonham (1973) hypothesized that student couples—where both partners are students—would exhibit marital adjustment scores significantly different from those couples with only one student. Although the scores for the student couples were lower, she suggested that this may be due to the fact that traditional marital adjustment tests do not fairly evaluate these nontraditional couples. Weigel, Weigel and Richardson (1973) in their investigation of married couples who were not students discovered another potential difficulty in evaluating marital satisfaction—that of divergent personal constructs possibly being complimentary.

Research Concerned with Married Graduate Students

Studies of graduate students, for the most part, have been concerned with affective variables such as anxiety, role conflict, communication and happiness. These foci differ from much of the research on undergraduate marrieds and their affective nature poses difficulties in doing definitive research. Studies reviewed will be in the areas of role conflict, needs assessment and problem investigation, and professional training and problems.

Role Conflict

Baird (1966) investigated problems faced by graduate students. He felt that some of the difficulties faced by graduate students were caused by the interim nature of the graduate school experience—being between undergraduate training and professional employment. The role of graduate student required certain behaviors, but what these are was often ambiguous, causing stress for the student. Unclear demands, ambiguous evaluations and psychologically distant professors tended to cause the most problems. It was found that stress from competition cannot be reduced, but that clarity of demands made academic rigors less problematic. Baird discovered that graduate students experienced greater stress if they were married, had children, were of low ability, or had conflicting outside demands—such as employment. Suggestions for reducing ambiguity and conflict in academic demands were made.

LeFevre (1972) studied women thirty-two and older who had returned to school to pursue graduate degrees. She investigated students at

various stages of their graduate career—beginning students, middle students and those who had graduated. The beginning students perceived support from their husbands and most often their children. They did feel some guilt at not handling their mother/wife roles at the same level as in the past, but this was balanced by the excitement of returning to school. Middle students were less happy than beginning students and were starting to wear under the demands of school and home. At this stage, women tended to feel more guilt over unfinished academic work than about unfinished household tasks. During the latter part of the middle stage study for the comprehensive examination caused difficulties. Since regular ties with the university had lessened, family demands increased, causing role stress. Upon receipt of the degree and/or employment, conflict lessened as the student role was replaced by an adult one and family support and respect increased.

Feldman (1973a) also looked at the difficulties facing married female students in pursuit of advanced degrees. He suggested that they are most often married to men with advanced degrees—the ethic of not surpassing one's husband still seemed in effect. Role conflict was evidenced most by women who often put their family first and are, "less likely to be enrolled full-time than men" (p. 984). Feldman also discussed the necessity of socialization with colleagues. Time for this socialization is often denied female students with homemaking responsibilities, thereby hampering their full professional development. He concluded that women feel the student/spouse conflict more than men, a finding conflicting with Ibsen's (1967) research. Cashion (1973)

disagrees with Feldman in her rebuttal. She felt that married female students often have financial support and help with the housework from their spouses, therefore lessening the time demands at home. She suggested that limited publication by women may be due to prejudice in the protégé system, rather than to time demands of a family. In his reply to Cashion, Feldman (1973b) stated that financial support from the husband without a corresponding reorganization of sex roles will cause more, rather than less, conflict. In addition, he reported that divorced women with no family demands tend to publish more. He cited research as regards the need for anticipatory professional socialization. He also stated that women, although certainly discriminated against, receive more fellowships, though less assistantships, than men.

Pearlin (1975) reported that status inequality between spouses may tend to organize the pattern of their lives. This can cause a disruption in affection, communication, value consensus and reciprocity, and then, the chances of there being personal stress are greatly increased. The fact that one spouse is a student, and the other the source of financial support, can be the beginning of this inequality. Postponed education for the working marital partner may also have the effect of creating distance—inequality—between the spouses.

The above studies all suggested the possibility—if not the certainty—of difficulties arising when student and spouse, or student, spouse, and parent roles are combined. Institutional knowledge of this possibility is evidenced by the limited existence of re-entry counseling, day care facilities, flexible scheduling and other "considerations" for

nontraditional students. Expansion of, or creation of, these kinds of programs would help reduce difficulties faced by married students.

Needs Assessment and Problem Investigation

Mechanic (1962) investigated stress felt by graduate students who were studying for their comprehensive examinations. He included information about their spouses and their marital relationships. He stated that ability to deal with the stresses of this difficult period is dependent upon a number of variables: the abilities and capacity of a person; skills and limitations produced by group practices and traditions; the means provided to an individual by the social environment; and the norms that define where and how an individual may utilize these means. The graduate student role often allows one only limited means for affecting change in stress producing situations—this may be particularly true during periods of academic evaluation. At these times students are expected to perform as knowledgeable, capable individuals and to "survive" the same rigors as students preceding them. Mechanic reported that spouses were most often understanding and that those who enjoyed their job, classwork or their homemaking, tended to "weather" this stressful period better than those spouses who felt locked into an unpleasant situation. Spouse employment can cause problems due to the fact that it is often a necessity and that the job market in university communities may be limited and/or glutted. An unrewarding job—financially or emotionally—does not aid the working spouse to be understanding with his/her student partner.

Mohr (1965) polled student men and women as to the advisability of marrying during graduate school. She divided responses by age: under 21 years and over 21 years. For both groups, 90% of the women responded favorably. For the men, the results were also positive, with the older group being slightly more favorable. The majority of the married students replied favorably. Mohr suggested that the emotional security of marriage tended to outweigh the problems for most respondents.

Selby (1972) researched the effect of doctoral study upon marital communication and marital adjustment. When comparing student couples with nonstudent couples over time, he found no change or significant difference in marital adjustment scores. Nonstudents scored lower on communication scores on both pre-and posttests. He did not find any significant correlation between marital communication and age, length of marriage, number of children, income or wife's employment. Mootz (1972) studied anxiety among male married graduate students. He investigated occupational and biographical factors as they related to anxiety. Findings were that: (a) wives had higher anxiety scores and husbands had higher occupational aspirations; (b) there were no differences in ability, achievement or occupational aspirations among low, middle or high anxious males; and (c) that anxiety was not related to demographic variables.

Montgomery (1972) hypothesized that graduate education is stressful. Most pertinent here is her thought that, "Resistance to, or failure to see graduate education as a process of establishing professional identity contributes to anxiety-evoking experiences" (p. 26). This problem may be caused by professors treating people only as students, by the student

thinking only as a student, or both. She concluded that students and professors should work together to discover and remove areas of non-productive anxiety.

Graff and Horne (1973) and Horne and Graff (1973) discussed the counseling needs of married students. Women rated child-rearing and personal concerns highest, while men rated academic concerns and child-rearing highest. Women reported more role conflict than men. Graduate students were concerned with role conflict, while undergraduates were more concerned with incompatible needs. Respondents felt that a physician would be best to help with child-rearing or sexual difficulties; a psychologist best for academic, vocational, or communication difficulties and a member of the clergy best for religious or philosophical differences. Comparing graduate and undergraduate students, the authors found that graduate students have more awareness of psychologists and would seek them out, while undergraduates would seek out friends, parents or clergy members. Wives tended to be more positive about seeking counseling help than husbands.

Professional Training and Problems

In their study of the student culture in medical school, Becker, Geer, Hughes and Strauss (1961) discussed potential role conflicts for the professional-in-training.

> A prolonged professional training is part of the experience of a large and increasing number of young people in our society, young people who are—physically and in most social respects—fully adult. They may be married and have children; they may have served in the armed services; and they may have worked in various jobs in which they have taken the full responsibilities

> of an adult. Yet in their chosen professions, they still have ahead of them a long period of a sort of adolescence during which they are asked to show adult competence and learning, without being given full adult responsibility. (p. 5)

Loewenberg (1969) dealt with the emotional effects of the unequal relationship of student and professor. He approached this relationship psychoanalytically and suggested a transference phenomenon between the graduate student and the major professor. The relationship was seen as regressive for both returning students and those who have never left the educational milieu. This hypothesized regression and its effects upon decision making can cause intense frustration, anger and anxiety. Seeking support from fellow students can be unrewarding due to inter-student competition. Spouse support can be equally disappointing due to his/her discounting of the student's doubts and concerns (Mechanic, 1962). Mechanic felt that the above is probably related to the familiar campus process of complaining to anyone who will listen. He was clear about the stress felt by the graduate student's family, particularly if the spouse was not able to pursue her/his interests or to be employed in a satisfying position.

Butler (1972) also looked at student stresses in those training for a profession in occupational therapy. She, like Loewenberg, suggested that a regressive role is often part of this training. The training professional is forced into a student role, as preparation for a later professional role. Although these roles are not mutually exclusive, the practitioner role requires different skills and behaviors than the student role. "Payoffs for the student role may be relatively independent of those for the ultimate role" (p. 402).

It is the opinion of the author that the students in Butler's, and Becker, Geer, Hughes and Strauss' studies had, in addition to the stress arising from the regressive student role and ambiguity, emotional demands from their clients and patients. It was this suspected additional demand or stress that led this writer to include the helping professions participants in this study.

Summary

Section I of this chapter dealt with the research concerning married undergraduates. For the most part, marriage did not have a negative effect upon academic work. Nygreen's (1954) findings that men were more critical than women of marital adjustment, that women's employment was positively related to marital happiness and that married students with children were less well adjusted than nonparents sums up much of the research in the needs assessment section. An additional finding was that women experience student/spouse/parent role conflict to a greater degree than do men. Studies concerning graduate students in Section II showed that they experience role conflict when student and spouse and/or parent roles are combined. The "prolonged adolescence" that occurs in graduate and professional training made it regressive and stressful for the graduate student. The above findings create expectations that the stated areas of investigation will prove significant when tested.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Participants

Participants contacted to investigate the major hypotheses were 55 married graduate students enrolled at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. These married students were randomly selected from all graduate and professional programs at the University with the exception of those programs investigated in the secondary hypotheses. All were selected from the University student lists for the Spring academic quarter of 1976. Spouses of these identified students were also participants in the study. A return of materials from 40 students and spouses was expected.

Marshall and King (1966) suggested that much of the research on college marriage is weak in sample selection and design. It was felt that the careful sampling procedure used will facilitate generalizability to the larger population at The University of Tennessee. Samples of similar size were used in research by Marchand and Langford (1952), Gerson (1960), Samenfink and Milliken (1961) and Falk (1964).

Participants serving as comparison groups included 10 married graduate students currently attending The University of Tennessee. Use of a nonmarried comparison group was found in research by Aller (1963) and others. These students were also randomly selected from the Spring quarter, 1976 student lists. The other comparison group consisted of

10 married people who had been, but were not currently, graduate students at the University. Spouses of the former students were also included in the study. Use of a former student comparison group was suggested by research done by Ibsen (1967), and Christopherson, Vandiver and Krueger (1960).

Participants to test the secondary hypotheses were 30 randomly selected graduate students currently enrolled in graduate programs in Counseling, Social Treatment and Clinical Psychology. These participants were selected from current departmental lists. Spouses of these students were also included.

Instruments

Participants were asked to complete a short biographical data form, the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test and the Mooney Problem Checklist, Form C.

Biographical Data Form (BDF)

This short biographical data form, found in Appendix F, was constructed by the author to investigate variables suggested in the research literature and as a way to have available various personological information for flexibility in data analysis. Items investigated were sex, age, number of children, educational status, occupational objective, projected graduation date and distance from parents. Inclusion of these items was suggested by research cited in Chapter II.

Marital-Adjustment Test (LWMAT)

The Marital-Adjustment Test was developed by Locke and Wallace in the late fifties as a short form test which would have reliability and validity equivalent to the longer marital adjustment instruments in use at the time. In constructing the LWMAT, the authors took into consideration that the length of marital adjustment instruments was a disadvantage and that use of only basic or fundamental items could considerably shorten the evaluation time (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The authors selected items from instruments previously researched which showed high levels of discrimination, did not duplicate other items and which covered important areas of marital adjustment. The latter judgement was made by the authors, who are acknowledged as experts in the area of marital adjustment and prediction.

The 15 items selected will produce scores ranging from 2 to 158, with higher scores reflecting better marital adjustment. Locke and Wallace selected a sample for testing the instrument that was primarily young, native-white, educated, Protestant, white collar, professional and urban. Most couples had one or no children. Mean length of marriage was approximately 5 1/2 years.

Locke and Wallace found that the LWMAT produced a split-half reliability coefficient of .90, when corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. They felt that this score substantiated the reliability of the instrument. Validity was checked by matching couples who were known to have marital difficulties with those who did not. The former were judged by divorce, separation or the seeking of marital counseling, the

latter by observations of close friends. The test clearly discriminated between those whose marriages were well adjusted and those whose marriages were not.

The authors of the LWMAT state that this study suggests that short form instruments—e.g., the LWMAT—can be used to determine marital adjustment with approximately the same results as longer instruments. Locke and Wallace caution that the LWMAT should be used primarily with middle class samples. Norms were not given, except for the research sample which consisted of nonstudents.

Use of the LWMAT was suggested in research on college populations done by Selby (1972) and Price-Bonham (1973) and Weigel, Weigel and Richardson (1973). The length of the instrument and suggestions for use with educated middle-class participants made it a viable choice for this study. The LWMAT is found in Appendix G.

Mooney Problem Checklist, Form C (MPC)

Use of the Mooney Problem Checklist is suggested by Jones' (1958) research with married and nonmarried college students and by the fact that the MPC covers many of the problem areas investigated in prior research. For this study, Form C of the 1950 revision was used—Form C is designed for use with college students. Although an adult form is also available, Form C was used with all participants to facilitate direct comparisons. Bedell (in Buros, 1949), in his review of the MPC stated that suggested use of the MPC is, "as an aid to research workers (to determine) the influence of specific educational programs on the problems of pupils" (p. 67). Bedell also suggested that analyzing how

problems appear in conjunction with one another can be fruitful. Mooney and Gordon (1950) discussed validity and reliability of the MPC. In reference to validity, they stated that the MPC is not a test and that its use in a variety of ways makes validity hard to measure. In devising the MPC, the authors wanted an instrument that participants would respond well to, one which they would approach with a constructive attitude and one which covered the range of problems fairly well. Research cited by Mooney and Gordon (1950) supported these premises. The authors stated that 92% of respondents reported that the MPC items they checked gave a fairly complete picture of their problems.

Reliability is also difficult to determine, since problems change over time. Gordon has done research, though, which showed that consistency of item choice by the group on two administrations of the MPC yielded a correlation greater than .90 (Mooney & Gordon, 1950).

Suggestions by Mooney and Gordon that the MPC does not measure problem intensity led this author to modify the MPC by adding a rating scale for each item—see Appendix H. Composite scores—number of problems weighted by intensity—will be reported for both subscores and total score. Hopefully this will allow a more precise total look at how individuals perceive problems as affecting them. In addition, data concerning problem areas will be reported as composite subscores for each problem area. The problem areas are: (a) Health and Physical Development, (b) Finances, Living Conditions and Employment, (c) Social and Recreational Activities, (d) Social-Psychological Relations, (e) Personal-Psychological Relations, (f) Courtship, Sex and Marriage, (g) Home

and Family, (h) Morals and Religion, (i) Adjustment to College Work, (j) The Future: Vocational and Educational, and (k) Curriculum and Teaching Procedure. The MPC contains 330 problems, with 30 in each problem area.

Procedure

1. Permission to conduct a study concerning human participants was requested from the Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance and the Student Counseling Center, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (see Appendix A).

2. Participants were randomly selected as reported in "Participants."

3. Each identified married student and nonstudent was mailed a packet containing a cover letter (see Appendices B and C), two LWMAT's, two MPC's, two BDF's, two Participant Release Forms (see Appendix D), and a return envelope. Nonmarried students received a cover letter (Appendix C) and one of each form with the exception of the LWMAT. Upon return, a short thank you postcard was sent. After two weeks of non return, a reminder, as in Appendix E, was sent. After an additional two weeks, no further attempt at follow-up was made. All materials returned were included in the data analysis.

Analysis

Analyses were concerned with comparisons of the various groups of participants on the LWMAT and the MPC. For some analyses, spouses and students were viewed separately; for others, they were processed together. Other independent variables used were years married, number of

children and age. Descriptive statistics were used to report MPC subscores and demographic data. Correlation of MPC and LWMAT and a regression equation predicting LWMAT from MPC were computed.

Summary

Data were collected as stated in the procedures for each of the four samples of participants. Analyses performed on each of the instruments as outlined above will be reported in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter will state the hypotheses in the null form and report analyses computed for each of them. Related analyses and characteristics of the participants will be reported.

Report of Analyses

Hypotheses tested were that: (a) married graduate students will report more personal stress than nonmarried graduate students, (b) married graduate students and spouses will have lower Marital-Adjustment Test scores than will nonstudent married persons and spouses, (c) married graduate students and spouses in the helping professions will report more personal stress and lower Marital-Adjustment Test scores than will married graduate students and spouses in other fields, and (d) there will be a significant correlation between self-reported personal stress and marital adjustment. All statistical analyses were tested at the .05 confidence level. Two-tailed tests were used to detect relationships other than those predicted.

Hypothesis 1

Married graduate students will not report significantly greater personal stress, as evidenced by composite MPC scores, than will non-married graduate students. This analysis included all married students

compared with nonmarried students. Result: do not reject Ho_1 (see Table 1).

Table 1

T-test: Married Students with Nonmarried Students on the Mooney Problem Checklist

Group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
Married students	40	68.38	65.51	
Non-married students	6	100.50	74.90	-1.10

*p < .05.
**p < .01.

The t-test computed to test hypothesis one showed no significant difference between the two groups. Follow-up investigation of this hypothesis, reported in Chapter V, suggests possible nonstatistically significant differences.

Hypothesis 2

Married graduate students training for the helping professions and their spouses will not differ significantly from students and spouses in training for other fields as to self-reported personal stress, evidenced by MPC composite scores. Result: do not reject Ho_2 (see Table 2).

Table 2

T-test: Helping Professions Students and Spouses with other Graduate Students and Spouses on the Mooney Problem Checklist

Group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t-value
Helping professions students and spouses	30	60.30	45.20	-.31
Other graduate students and spouses	50	64.22	66.78	

*p < .05.
**p < .01.

The t-value of .31 was not significant suggesting that married graduate students and spouses report equal amounts of personal stress regardless of major field of study.

Hypothesis 3

Married graduate students and their spouses will not show significantly different LWMAT scores from nonstudent marrieds and their spouses. All married graduate students were included in this analysis. Result: reject Ho_3 (see Table 3).

This t-test showed a significant difference between married students and spouses, and nonstudent marrieds and spouses. The married graduate student group showed the higher mean Marital-Adjustment Test scores.

Table 3

T-test: Married Graduate Students and Spouses with Nonstudent Marrieds and Spouses on the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test

Groups	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
Married students and spouses	80	119.63	19.33	2.07*
Nonstudent marrieds and spouses	12	106.92	23.43	

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

Hypothesis 4

Married graduate students training for the helping professions and their spouses will not show significantly different LWMAT scores from married graduate students in training for other fields and their spouses. Result: reject Ho_4 (see Table 4).

The t score of -2.15 was indicative of a significant difference between the students training for the helping professions and their spouses, and spouses and students in other graduate majors. The other students group exhibited the higher level of marital adjustment.

Hypothesis 5

A significant correlation will not exist between self-reported personal stress and marital adjustment for the married graduate students

Table 4

T-test: Helping Professions Students and Spouses with other Graduate Students and Spouses on the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test

Group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
Helping professions students and spouses	30	113.77	17.23	-2.15*
Other graduate students and spouses	50	123.14	19.81	

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

and spouses when using MPC and LWMAT scores. Result: do not reject Ho_5. Analysis yielded a Pearson correlation coefficient of -.928, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Related Analyses

A number of other analyses were performed to investigate effects of various demographic variables on MPC and LWMAT. Rationale for these analyses came from previous studies discussed in Chapter II.

The following tables report results of t-tests run by sex on the variables MPC and LWMAT. Table 5 does not include nonmarried graduate students, while Table 6 does.

Table 5

T-test: Male Married Graduate Students and Male Spouses with Female Married Graduate Students and Female Spouses on the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test

Group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
Males	40	117.63	19.48	-.92
Females	40	121.63	19.20	

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

Table 6

T-test: Male Graduate Students and Male Spouses with Female Graduate Students and Female Spouses on the Mooney Problem Checklist

Group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
Females	43	68.02	54.89	-.40
Males	43	62.74	66.72	

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

Tables 5 and 6 do not show a significant difference on either marital adjustment or personal stress scores when men and women are compared. The results were also nonsignificant when identified students only and spouses only are compared by sex. Tables 7 and 8 show the findings.

Table 7

T-tests: Identified Female Students with Identified Male Students on the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test

Variable/ group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
MPC				
Females	47	65.72	53.67	
				-.33
Males	45	61.58	65.61	
LWMAT				
Females	44	119.55	21.17	
				-.50
Males	42	117.36	19.06	

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

T-tests were done comparing spouses who were also students with spouses who were not students on MPC and LWMAT scores. The results are shown in Table 9. There was no significant difference between the groups when comparing student versus nonstudent status of the spouses.

Table 8

T-tests: Male Spouses with Female Spouses on the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test

Variable/group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
MPC				
Males	47	61.40	65.09	
Females	45	66.00	54.56	- .37
LWMAT				
Males	44	116.86	20.23	
Females	42	121.24	18.84	-1.04

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

Table 9

T-tests: Spouses who are Enrolled either as Full- or Part-time Students with Spouses not Enrolled on the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test

Variable/group	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	t value
MPC				
Spouse/student	11	77.45	52.16	
Spouse/nonstudent	29	49.41	51.64	1.53
LWMAT				
Spouse/student	11	114.91	26.30	
Spouse/nonstudent	29	123.04	21.23	-1.01

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

Six one-way analyses of variance were computed on the helping professions students and spouses and the other graduates and spouses combined as one group. For three ANOVA's, MPC was the dependent variable while age, number of children and years married were the independent variables. The three ANOVA's run on LWMAT used the same independent variables. Significance was found on two analyses. These were LWMAT by number of children and LWMAT by years married. They appear in Tables 10 and 11. No significance was found in any of the analyses for MPC, nor for LWMAT by age. For the significant ANOVA's, homogeneity of variance tests were also done using Bartlett's Test. Both analyses fell within acceptable limits.

Table 10

One-way ANOVA for the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test by Number of Children for Helping Professions Students and Spouses and Other Graduate Students and Spouses with Newman-Keuls Multiple Comparison Test

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio
Between groups	3	3606.00	1202.00	3.528 *
Within Groups	76	25897.00	340.75	
TOTAL	79	29503.00		

Newman-Keuls Procedure

Group	2 children	1 child	0 children	3 children
Mean	109.78	112.60	123.83	131.00

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

Table 11

One-way ANOVA for the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test by Years Married for Helping Professions Students and Spouses and Other Graduate Students and Spouses with Group Means by Years Married

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F ratio
Between groups	16	10988.06	686.75	2.34 **
Within groups	63	18514.94	293.89	
Total	79	29503.00		

Years Married	Mean
0	128.50
1	104.67
2	124.63
3	145.25
4	125.67
5	118.50
6	113.50
7	121.40
8	111.25
9	128.50
10	101.00
11	127.67
12	91.40
13	111.00
15	119.00
21	125.00
22	132.50
All	119.63

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

Mooney Problem Checklist composite subscores were tabulated so as to define problem areas of greatest concern. Table 12 presents statistics for each of the subscores.

Table 12

Statistics for Mooney Problem Checklist Composite Subscores for all Participants

Subscore	Mean	Standard deviation	Range of scores for sample	
			Minimum	Maximum
HPD, Health and physical development	8.49	6.59	1.00	30.00
FLE, Finances living conditions, and employment	11.93	11.69	1.00	70.00
SRA, Social and recreational activities	12.01	11.61	1.00	52.00
SPR, Social-psychological relations	9.81	9.39	1.00	42.00
PPR, Personal-psychological relations	11.18	13.39	1.00	69.00
CSM, Courtship, sex and marriage	5.85	5.71	1.00	31.00
HF, Home and family	6.96	5.88	1.00	25.00
MR, Morals and religion	7.12	7.26	1.00	38.00
ACW, Adjustment to college	8.63	8.43	1.00	43.00
FVE, The future: educational and vocational	8.19	11.91	1.00	75.00
CTP, Curriculum and teaching procedure	10.19	10.93	1.00	42.00

In Table 13, descriptive statistics for MPC and LWMAT scores are given. For MPC statistics, all participants were included, for LWMAT, all except nonmarried students. For LWMAT, the distribution of scores approaches normality, with a slight negative skew, -.889.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for the Mooney Problem Checklist and the Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test for all Appropriate Participants

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
MPC	62.17	58.69	2.00	294.00
LWMAT	117.97	20.23	50.00	156.00

As planned, a regression equation predicting LWMAT from MPC was computed. Due to the very limited correlation of these variables, the equation is of no use as a predictor.

Since the author is interested in marital difficulties and ways to help couples solve them, responses to two of the follow-up questions on the MPC were tabulated. Of the participants who answered the question, "Whether you have or have not enjoyed filling out the list, do you think it has been worth doing?" From 60 to 100%, depending on the group, felt that this type of guided self-evaluation was helpful. Less than one-third of participants stated a desire to discuss problems chosen with a

member of the University staff. Complete findings are reported in Table 14.

Table 14

Responses to Follow-up Questions on the Mooney Problem Checklist

Question/ group	Frequency yes	Percent yes for group	Frequency no	Percent no for group
#3*				
Helping professions students and spouses	17	60.7	11	39.3
Other graduate students and spouses	29	69.0	13	31.0
Nonmarried students	6	100.0	0	0.0
Nonstudent marrieds and spouses	5	71.0	2	29.0
#4+				
Helping professions students and spouses	8	28.6	20	71.4
Other graduate students and spouses	9	20.5	35	79.5
Nonmarried students	2	33.3	4	66.7
Nonstudent marrieds and spouses	0	0.0	8	100.0

* Whether you have or have not enjoyed filling out the list, do you think it has been worth doing?

+ If the opportunity were offered, would you like to talk over any of these problems with someone on the college staff?

Characteristics of the Participants

The total number of possible participants was 200. Completed returns were received for 98 participants, a 49% return rate. Return rates for the subgroups were: (a) helping professions, 50%, (b) other graduate fields, 45%, (c) nonmarried, 60%, and (d) nonstudents, 60%. Kerlinger (1965) states that those using mailed questionnaires should attempt to insure returns of 80 to 90%, but that they often have to be content with a return rate of 50 to 60%. Considering a variety of factors hindering a larger return, the current return rate was considered acceptable.

The three subsequent tables, Table 15, Table 16, and Table 17, present descriptive data concerning the participants. All participants were included, with adjustment for missing cases. Since the instructions for the BDF stated that one should only answer the applicable items, missing cases are probably due to non-applicable questions. Mean participant age was 28.66, with the greatest number of participants being 26. Mean number of years married was approximately 6, suggesting that most students have been married throughout their graduate career—using 22 as the general age for completion of a bachelors degree. Mean distance from parents was 569.24 miles. Although a few large distances affect this mean, it does imply that most married students probably do not interact regularly with their parents. More than half of the participants had no children, a factor which should auger well for marital adjustment. The greatest number of participants, including

Table 15

Age of the Participants

Age	Frequency	Percent
21	1	1.0
22	7	7.0
23	2	2.0
24	7	7.0
25	10	10.2
26	11	11.2
27	9	9.2
28	10	10.2
29	8	8.2
30	4	4.0
31	6	6.0
32	5	5.0
33	2	2.0
34	4	4.0
35	5	5.0
37	2	2.0
39	1	1.0
43	3	3.0
44	1	1.0
Mean	28.66	
Standard deviation	4.95	
Median	27.70	
Mode	26.00	

Table 16

Statistics for Some Demographic Variables on the Biographical Data Form

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Number of years married	0	22	5.97	5.08
Distance in miles from parents	0	5000	569.24	708.15

Table 17

Frequencies and Percentages of Some Demographic Variables on the Biographical Data Form

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percent
College major (same for identified student and spouse)	Counseling	20	20.4
	Social Work	4	4.1
	Clinical Psychology	6	6.1
	Other	56	57.1
	Nonstudent	12	12.2
Sex	Male	49	50.0
	Female	49	50.0
Number of children	None	60	61.2
	One	12	12.2
	Two	22	22.4
	Three	4	4.1
Educational level	High school	4	4.1
	Some college	4	4.1
	Associate degree or LPN	2	2.0
	RN	1	1.0
	BA or BS	41	41.8
	Masters	35	35.7
	Doctorate	11	11.2
Enrollment status	Not enrolled	39	39.8
	Part-time	20	20.4
	Full-time	39	39.8
Plan to enroll for future schooling	Yes	15	42.9
	No	20	57.1
Primarily a homemaker	Yes	9	10.5
	No	77	89.5
Employment status	Part-time	28	28.6
	Full-time	53	54.1
	Not employed	17	17.3
Enjoy job	Yes	74	91.4
	No	7	8.6
Feel underpaid for experience	Yes	44	55.0
	No	36	45.0
Dislike job, but need the money	Yes	7	10.8
	No	58	89.2
University employment	Yes	25	25.5
	No	73	74.5

spouses, had completed an undergraduate degree. Only 39 of the participants were not enrolled in school. Of this number, 15 had plans to enroll in the future. Only a small number of participants saw themselves as a homemaker with no paid employment. Only 17 of the participants were not employed, suggesting that financial support of a graduate student family usually requires that both spouses work. Surprisingly, 74% of those employed enjoyed their job, suggesting that the Knoxville area has satisfying jobs available. In terms of remuneration, though, 55% felt underpaid for their experience. Only 7 participants disliked their jobs, but felt it necessary to keep them for financial reasons. Twenty-five people were employed by the University in some capacity.

Summary

Chapter IV has stated the hypotheses, given the characteristics of the participants and reported analyses performed. Hypotheses rejected were: (a) that there is no significant difference between LWMAT scores —marital adjustment—of helping professions students and spouses and other graduate students and spouses, and (b) that married graduate students and their spouses will not show significantly different LWMAT scores from nonstudent marrieds and their spouses. Students and spouses not in the helping professions showed higher marital adjustment scores. Married graduate students and spouses showed higher marital adjustment scores than nonstudent marrieds and spouses.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will discuss the findings reported in Chapter IV. General conclusions will be stated. Implications for those who help students will be stated and recommendations to subsequent researchers will be made.

Discussion and Conclusions

Discussion will cover each of the hypotheses tested as well as related analyses so as to parallel the report of findings in Chapter IV. A general discussion will be followed by an overview of conclusions.

Hypothesis 1

Ho_1: Married graduate students will not report significantly greater personal stress, as evidenced by composite MPC scores, than will nonmarried graduate students. Result: do not reject hypothesis one.

The t-test carried out on these data included all married graduate student participants compared with nonmarried graduate students. Although not significant, the wide difference in mean composite score prompted further investigation. This consisted of looking at the responses to follow-up questions three and four on the MPC (see Appendix H). Nonmarried students unanimously felt that completing the MPC was worthwhile—no other group unanimously did. One-third of the nonmarried students expressed a desire to speak with someone on the University

staff regarding problems reported. In answer to follow-up question two, a number of nonmarried students expressed that their social lives were not what they would like. Mohr (1965) discussed the emotional security that married students reported. Chilman and Meyer (1966) reported that married students expressed somewhat higher satisfaction with their life situation than did nonmarrieds. Although society is more supportive of singles than in the past and college social life is geared to nonmarrieds, the nonmarried participants still reported concerns about interpersonal social relations. The unmet desire to share deep feelings with someone close is possibly related to the fact that the college social scene is not set up to meet the needs of single persons who are not undergraduates. Jones' (1958) research comparing married and nonmarried college students on nonmodified MPC scores showed that nonmarried students are more concerned with problems in the Courtship, Sex and Marriage category than are marrieds. He also reported that nonmarried students report more serious problems, ones underlined on the nonmodified MPC, than married students. Both differences were statistically significant. Jones' finding that married students showed more affective tolerance is possibly related to a greater percentage of nonmarried students expressing a desire for help with their problems. The fact that the problems of nonmarried students may not have changed much in the almost 20 years since Jones' study seems to belie the "swinging singles" phenomenon.

Hypothesis 2

Ho_2: Married graduate students training for the helping professions and their spouses will not differ significantly from students and spouses

in training for other fields as to self-reported personal stress, evidenced by MPC composite scores. Result: do not reject hypothesis two.

Butler (1972), in speaking of professional education stated that it

> . . . imposes certain stressful conditions on students which do not arise in earlier schooling; one of these conditions is associated with integration, that is, the perception of relatedness; a second with enforced and prolonged dependency. These psychosocial factors are in turn affected by the situational factors of ambiguity and conflict which characterize large complex organizations such as professional schools. (p. 401)

Although this researcher felt that the affective demands of training for the helping professions produce an additional stress upon students in those fields, this analysis seems to disprove his view.

Research by Mootz (1972) found that anxiety was not related to college major. Although the MPC does not measure anxiety, it does measure problems and their intensity, which are related to anxiety. The nonsignificance found on hypothesis two is possibly due to the fact that people select graduate programs based upon their abilities and needs. The apparently stressful components of the various programs, as seen by people not in them, may well be taken for granted by those persons who are enrolled. For example, while statistical analyses may cause problems for those used to reporting data subjectively, they may be just a day-to-day expectation for statistics majors.

Hypothesis 3

Ho_3: Married graduate students and their spouses will not show significantly different LWMAT scores from nonstudent marrieds and their spouses. Result: reject hypothesis three.

Selby (1972) found no significant difference on LWMAT scores when comparing married students with married nonstudents. He did find that married students showed higher marital communication scores. The latter finding may be related to the difference found in this study, as the current married student group showed higher marital adjustment scores than the former student group. Communication and mutual working toward the goal of a degree, or degrees, is probably required if that goal is to become a reality.

Once relieved of the challenges of graduate school, it is possible that the marital partners communicate less, and therefore accomodate each other less. If this is so, marital adjustment might be affected. Communication is a highly weighted item on the LWMAT and would therefore affect scores significantly.

The concept of temporary material deprivation discussed by Christopherson, Vandiver and Krueger (1960) could be related to having high expectations about "what it will be like when we're finished." Although willing to settle for lower salaries, couples may become quite disappointed if, over time, other expectations are not met. The combination of lessened mutual cooperation and unmet expectations could explain the lower LWMAT scores for the former student group. Another possible explanation relates to the sampling procedure. Nonstudent participants were selected randomly from the Fall 1974 student lists. These choices were then compared with the Fall 1975 lists. If a participant appeared on the former, and not the latter, they were included in the study. This method includes some nonstudents who have been out

of school less than a year and could therefore possibly still be experiencing adjustment difficulties.

Hypothesis 4

Ho_4: Married graduate students training for the helping professions and their spouses will not show significantly different LWMAT scores from married graduate students in training for other fields and their spouses. Result: reject hypothesis four.

As stated earlier, this author's experience and interaction with others in training for the helping professions led him to think that the affective demands of this training make it more problematic than other major fields. The literature on role conflict, i.e., student/spouse, which graduate students face suggested another difficulty for those training for the helping professions—the heavy emotional drain caused by working with clients or patients. It is possible that this drain leaves less emotional energy to be invested in the marital relationship and in accomodating the spouse. In his research, Mootz (1972) discovered no significance when studying anxiety using college major as the independent variable. Kimmel and van der Veen (1974) in studying the LWMAT found that lack of tension, related to reduced anxiety, is a large component of the score related to sex questions for men and compatibility questions for women. The fact that anxiety does not differ by major field suggests that participants in both groups have an equal chance of receiving high scores since both sex and compatibility are heavily weighted compared to other areas of inquiry on the LWMAT.

A number of possibilities exist which may explain the significance found in this analysis. Identified students in Counseling and Social Treatment tend to be students who have had work experience before returning for the graduate degree. This fact suggests that these students will be older and therefore married longer. This study has shown that there is significance when an ANOVA is run for LWMAT by years married. It is possible that the "glow" of the early married years has been replaced by a more realistic view of the marital relationship. Another possibility is that those in the helping professions are sensitized to marital difficulties through training and experience. This sensitivity may cause them to make "tougher" evaluations of their own marriages. The fact that the mean score for the helping professions' participants and spouses is 113.77 and that it differs significantly from that of students and spouses in other fields, suggests that it is in an area worthy of further investigation.

Aller (1963) found in her research that those married students who reported one or more serious problems had a mean LWMAT score of 117.05. She also found that the total mean score was 124.2, suggesting that the other graduate students and spouses in this study exhibit average marital adjustment for a college sample. The couples reporting no serious problems had a mean LWMAT score of 134.95 in Aller's study.

For this study, the mean LWMAT score for all marrieds—helping professions, other graduate students and nonstudents—was 117.97 with a standard deviation of 20.23. This places both groups tested in the "normal" range. Locke and Wallace (1959), when investigating marital

adjustment of nonstudents, found that the well-adjusted group had a mean score of 135.9. The maladjusted group mean LWMAT score was 71.7. The above studies lead to the conclusion that although both groups tested fall into a range of less than one standard deviation from the mean, there is a possible negative effect upon marital adjustment for those in training for the helping professions since their group mean score falls below the total sample mean.

Hypothesis 5

Ho_5: A significant correlation will not exist between self-reported personal stress and marital adjustment for the married graduate students and spouses when using MPC and LWMAT scores. Result: do not reject hypothesis five.

"Lay persons and many professionals have exerted . . . pressure to prevent student marriages, on the grounds that the attempt to combine marriage and undergraduate study will put too great a strain on the marital relationship" (Chilman & Meyer, 1966, p. 67). In their findings, though, they reported that the great majority of married students reported themselves as happy, problems notwithstanding. Christopherson, Vandiver and Krueger also report that fact in their 1960 study.

The current analysis yielded a Pearson correlation coefficient of -.928, which was not significant at the .05 level. This lack of significance may be explained by the fact that a number of participants felt that the MPC was geared more to undergraduates and that the problems they experienced were not on the list. It may further be explained by varying

interpretations of the rating scale used to modify the MPC (see Appendix H). Even with these considerations, it is probable that other variables must be considered in addition to personal stress when studying marital adjustment. These include such considerations as affective tolerance, length of time under stress, one's perceptions of spouse support and the support of others, the presence of children and long-term goal orientation.

Related Analyses

Although LeFevre's (1972) research suggested that women have difficulties when combining spouse and student roles and Ibsen (1967) reported the same problem for men, this study discovered no significant differences in self-reported personal stress or marital adjustment when participants were compared by sex. When only the identified students were compared by sex, there was also no significant difference found. These findings suggest the possibility of a breakdown of sex roles. Since many spouses are the source of at least part of the financial support, it may be assumed that the student partner aids with household chores. This may be particularly true for the couples where both are students. The fact that a number of spouses have plans to attend school in the future may positively affect their perception of the current difficulties faced, yet spouses who are also students do not differ from spouses who are not students with regard to MPC and LWMAT scores. This could be due to knowledge that future schooling is in the offing or to the enjoyment of current employment or homemaking. The fact that spouses

seem to like their current pursuits is probably related to the generally favorable LWMAT scores.

All married students and spouses were included as one group in six one-way ANOVA's computed to investigate the effect of years married, number of children and age, upon personal stress and marital adjustment. None of the ANOVA's computed for personal stress was significant, nor was the ANOVA for LWMAT by age. Significance was found for marital adjustment by number of children and marital adjustment by years married. Those with three children had the highest LWMAT scores, followed by those with no children. Baird (1966) found that those with no children experienced fewer difficulties than those with children and Nygreen (1954) found that those with children have poorer marital adjustment scores than nonparents. The current finding that those with three children have the highest mean LWMAT score should be viewed cautiously as only two couples fall into that category. Those with two children report the lowest mean LWMAT score, with couples having one child only slightly higher. There is not a significant difference between those with one or two children. A possibility exists that those having two children tended to have entered marriage in a traditional way and that involvement with higher education has caused them to question that arrangement. There is no empirical support for this premise.

The analysis of variance on LWMAT scores by years married showed significant differences. People married one, five, six, eight, ten, twelve, thirteen and fifteen years obtained mean scores lower than the mean for all participants taken as one group. Those married for one

year were probably just leaving the "honeymoon" stage and their developing awareness of the reality of the marital situation could have caused the lower scores. Participants married for five, six or eight years could have been becoming aware of serious differences in their relationship or could be indicative of emotional resources strained during involvement in graduate school. Those married 10, 12, 13 or 15 years could have been reporting that they have accepted a less than ideal marital situation, or serious life-style changes caused by return to school or children entering adolescence. Those married the longest, 21 and 22 years, seem to be experiencing a pleasant return to the marital dyad as their children leave the home.

Investigation of MPC subscores for problem areas showed that Social and Recreational Activities cause most difficulty. Time pressures faced by the graduate student couple, limited finances and social activities geared to undergraduates make this finding not surprising. Finances, Living Conditions and Employment was the next area of difficulty. As most people seemed pleased with their jobs, it would seem that housing and monetary worries are the cause of difficulties in this category. Personal-Psychological Relations is the next most troublesome area. Problems in this area are apparently not intense enough to make it necessary to seek help in solving them as evidenced by responses on MPC follow-up question four. Other reasons for not seeking counseling help at the University were possibly that participants were not ready, that they did not choose to share their concerns with a staff member, that they preferred to seek other resource people or simply that they felt

that they could handle their problems alone. Curriculum and Teaching Procedure was also an area of high concern as would be expected with a student population.

General Discussion

Although all participants were invited to contact the author regarding their MPC and LWMAT scores and/or the general findings of the study, none chose to do so. This can possibly be taken as further evidence that most married students are fairly satisfied with their marital situation and their knowledge of it.

This study did not end the controversy as to whether or not the problems that married graduate students face are causal factors in poor marital adjustment. This author now feels that the marital adjustment of married students is affected by a complicated interaction of problems faced, personal characteristics, demographic variables and developmental level. From a counseling point of view, the positive findings are a pleasant discovery, albeit they do not greatly clarify the original problem.

Conclusions

1. Married graduate students were generally well adjusted in their marriages.

2. Married and nonmarried graduate students did not differ as to self-reported personal stress.

3. Former students were less well adjusted in their marriages than were current students.

4. Self-reported personal stress did not differ significantly between students in the helping professions and students in other fields.

5. There was not a significant correlation between self-reported personal stress and marital adjustment.

6. Married graduate students in training for the helping professions were less well adjusted in their marriages than were married graduate students in other fields.

7. Number of children affects marital adjustment. Those with one or two children scored lower than those with zero or three children.

8. There was a significant effect when marital adjustment is analyzed by number of years married. Those married one, five, six, eight, ten, twelve, thirteen or fifteen years showed lower LWMAT scores than the total group mean score.

9. Gender was not related to marital adjustment or personal stress.

10. Participants most often selected problems in the areas of recreation, finances, psychological concerns and academic concerns.

Recommendations

This section will be in two parts: Implications for those staff members who work to aid students will be followed by recommendations for future researchers.

Implications for Practice

Although most of the students and spouses reported acceptable levels of marital adjustment, student personnel workers and counselors should continue their efforts to aid married students. One way of determining

specific areas of need would be to do an item analysis on the MPC for all 330 items, weighted for intensity.

Enrichment and skills programs developed by counselors for married students should be continued or developed in areas such as career decision making and re-entry for spouses who postpone their education, marital communication and negotiation of time structuring. The possibility of developing programs designed to facilitate the transition from graduate school to professional employment should be explored.

Student personnel workers should contine or innovate programs about budgeting, part-time employment and financial aids. An attempt ought to be made to create a student-faculty committee designed to investigate unnecessary stresses caused by the University and the faculty, and work toward removing these undue pressures. Development of adequate, well-staffed day, and possible night, care facilities for children is urged. Social needs of married graduate students and nonmarried graduate students differ from undergraduates. Attempts should be made to offer free or inexpensive opportunities for the nonmarried student to socialize. In addition, married students, often far from home and friends (see Table 2, page 31), could benefit from opportunities to socialize and talk with one another in a relaxed setting. These interactions would probably help student couples to get the perspective so often lacking in the isolated nuclear family today.

Varied methods might be used to involve students in programs designed for growth and enrichment. Those programs could possibly be offered as part of a course or for course credit. They could possibly

be offered "on site" in married student housing. Programs could be offered in conjunction with a "required" process. These programs might include counseling for leaving school being offered in conjunction with placement meetings or premarital counseling being offered in conjunction with the campus clergy programs. Orientation counseling could be done during a student's first registration. Programs should be offered, when possible, in ways and places that make them highly visible.

Faculty involved in the training of helping professionals should be cognizant of the possible negative relationship between this training and marital adjustment. Development of encounter type support groups for students and/or spouses might be one approach helpful in changing this negative relationship.

Recommendations to Future Researchers

Investigators interested in doing similar research should be aware of the following considerations. Sample selection should be random rather than fortuitous, but the sample size should be increased at least for initial investigations. Inclusion of students from a number of institutions would greatly increase generalizability and probably the application of findings. Mailed questionnaires should be avoided, with the exception of their use as a pilot or to develop norming data. If a pilot is used to develop norms, it is strongly suggested that a carefully selected small sample be used for the actual study. This would allow administration of instruments and an interview follow-up. This small sample should be selected with consideration for the demographic variables found to affect marital satisfaction (see Chapters IV and V).

A researcher constructed instrument incorporating oft selected MPC items and significant demographic variables is suggested. The large number of MPC problems makes interparticipant comparison difficult. If a mail-questionnaire-type study must be conducted, a short form such as a postcard should be included so that nonrespondents can state their reasons for not participating. This author is unable to substantiate reasons for nonreturn in this study, but suspects that the time of year and the length of the instruments were important factors. Data collection should not be attempted toward the end of the academic year as people are rushed, with many in the process of leaving. Although time needed to complete the instruments was less than one-half hour, the combined materials in the packets may have looked formidable. A note of importance is that the recent rulings concerning privacy of records make sample selection for mailing quite complicated.

Further research in the area of personal stress and marital adjustment is merited. Large numbers of students are married and this will probably continue to be the case. Aiding them with their concerns and their marital difficulties will not only help the students, but also benefit the institution and after graduation, the larger society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aller, F. D. Some factors in marital adjustment and academic achievement of married students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 4, 609-616.

Baird, L. L. Role stress in graduate students (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts, 27, 3929A.

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, L., & Strauss, A. Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bedell, R. C. Review of the mooney problem checklist. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), Mental measurements yearbook. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1949.

Busselen, H. J., & Busselen, C. K. Adjustment differences between married and single undergraduate university students: An historical perspective. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 27(3), 281-287.

Butler, H. F. Student role stress in education for the professions. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 1972, 26(8), 399-405.

Cashion, B. G. Comments on the analysis of role conflict in the married student. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 79(2), 435-436.

Chambliss, R. Married students at a state university. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1961, 34, 409-416.

Chilman, C. S., & Meyer, D. L. Single and married undergraduate measured personality needs and self-rated happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 67-76.

Christopherson, V. A., Vandiver, J. S., & Krueger, M. N. The married college student, 1959. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 122.

Clarke, C., Ryan, B., Haskins, L. Cosby, B., & Stebbins, L. Marriage and college life project (Project bulletins 1, 3, 4-8). Gainesville, Florida, Department of Student Health, University of Florida, May 1968.

Dangerfield, D. E. The effects of attendance at the University of Utah on the marital satisfaction of full-time students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 1229A.

Falk, L. L. A comparative study of problems of married and single students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26(2), 207-208.

Feldman, S. D. Impediment or stimulant? Marital status and graduate education. American Journal of Sociology, 1973(a), 78(4), 982-994.

Feldman, S. D. Reply to Cashion. American Journal of Sociology, 1973b, 79(2), 436-437.

Gerson, W. M. Leisure and marital satisfaction of college married couples. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 360-361.

Graff, R. W., & Horne, A. M. Counseling needs of married students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 15(5), 438-442.

Hepkner, W., & Cloyd, J. S. Role relationships and role performance: The male married student. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36(4), 688-696.

Horne, A. M., & Graff, R. W. Married student concerns: Who counsels the married populations? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20(4), 384-385.

Ibsen, C. A. The married college student: A problem in role congruence. The Family Life Coordinator, 1967, 16, 21-27.

Jones, W. R. Affective tolerance and typical problems of married and unmarried college students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 37(2), 126-128.

Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Kimmel, D., & van der Veen, F. Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's marital adjustment test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 57-63.

Lee, A. M. A study of married women college students. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, 1960, 24, 132-137.

LeFevre, C. The mature woman as graduate student. School Review, 1972, 80(2), 281-298.

Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. Short marital-adjustment and prediction test: Their relationship and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.

Loewenberg, P. Emotional problems of graduate students. Journal of Higher Education, 1969, 40(8), 610-623.

Marchand, J., & Langford, L. Adjustment of married students. Journal of Home Economics, 1952, 44, 113-114.

Marshall, W. H., & King, M. P. Undergraduate student marriages: A compilation of research findings. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 350-359.

Mason, W. R. Problems of married college students: Health education implications. Journal of the American College Health Association, 1966, 14, 270-276.

Mechanic, D. Students under stress. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Mohr, S. College marriages. Journal of Home Economics, 1965, 57, 461-462.

Mooney, R. L., & Gordon, L. V. The Mooney problem checklists. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950.

Mootz, J. A. Academic and biographical factors related to anxiety among married male graduate students (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 3301A. (University Microfilms No. 73-1565)

Montgomery, L. J. Student anxiety and graduate study. Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 2(3), 24-26.

Mueller, K. H. Married student on campus. Educational Digest, 1960, 25, 29-31.

Nygreen, G. T. Marital adjustment in the University of Washington married student community (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1954). Dissertation Abstracts, 1954, 14, 1273. University Microfilms No. A54-1869)

Pearlin, L. I. Status inequality and stress in marriage. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40(3), 344-357.

Price-Bonham, S. Student husbands versus student couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35(Fall), 33-37.

Riemer, S. Married veterans are good students. Marriage and Family Living, 1947, 9, 11.

Samenfink, J. A., & Milliken, R. L. Marital status and academic success: A reconsideration. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23(3), 226-227.

Selby, J. E. Marital adjustment and marital communication of doctoral students and their wives (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 5502A.

Thorpe, A. C. How married college students manage. Marriage and Family Living, 1951, 13, 104-105; 130.

Weigel, R. G., Weigel, V. M., & Richardson, F. C. Congruence of spouses' personal constructs and reported marital success: Pitfalls in instrumentation. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33, 212-214.

APPENDICES

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE
APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH
INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

April 11, 1976

I. Identification of Project
Experimenter: Brian Clifford
Title of Project: Personal Stress and Marital Adjustment of Married Graduate and Professional School Students
Department: Educational Psychology and Guidance
Dates of data collection: Spring quarter, 1976

II. Objective
To determine if the graduate school experience is personally stressful upon the identified student and his/her spouse. To see what effects, if any, this stress has upon marital adjustment of the identified student and her/his spouse. To investigate the stress and marital adjustment of students in training as counselors, clinical psychologists and social workers (social treatment), and compare those results with those of students in other programs at The University of Tennessee.

III. Description of Subjects
a. 40 married graduate and professional school students randomly selected from The University of Tennessee student lists.
b. 40 spouses of the above "identified" students ("a")
c. 10 married Ed.D. candidates in Counseling-Educational Psychology and Guidance (randomly selected)
d. 10 spouses of the students in "c"
e. 10 married Ph.D. candidates in Clinical Psychology (randomly selected)
f. 10 spouses of those students in "e"
g. 10 married M.S.S.W. candidates in Social Treatment (randomly selected)
h. 10 spouses of those students in "g"
i. 10 randomly selected nonmarried graduate and professional students from the student lists of The University of Tennessee
j. 10 recent University of Tennessee alumni (former graduate and professional school students) who are married—randomly selected from past University of Tennessee student lists
k. 10 spouses of those alumni in "j"

IV. Methods of Procedure
Identified students and spouses (with the exception of those nonmarried students in III, i) will be sent via mail the following: (a) cover letter explaining the research project, (b) two biographical data forms (see attached), (c) two Locke-Wallace Marital-Adjustment Test (see attached), (d) two Mooney Problem Checklists, Form C, (e) two informed consent forms, and (f) a return envelope. Approximate time for the completion of all instruments is one hour.

V. Protection Measures
No individual or couple scores will be reported. To assure confidentiality, instruments will be coded upon their return. The experimenter will keep a master list to check for non-return and to identify instruments for those participating requesting their scores.

VI. Method of Obtaining "Informed Consent" from Participants
Subjects will sign a form embodying all the basic elements of informed consent (see attached).

VII. Responsibility of the Experimenter
The experimenter understands the objectives and methods of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare procedures concerning research involving human subjects. He will abide by them. Data for the dissertation, as well as any future research, will be kept confidential.

Signature of experimenter: Brian Clifford
Date: April 12, 1976

VIII. Departmental Review
This application has been subjected to departmental review and has been approved.

Signature of Department Head: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Chairperson: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B

804 Volunteer Boulevard
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dear_____:

I would appreciate the participation of you and your spouse in my doctoral dissertation research. Your participation would require completing the enclosed forms (approximately one hour) and returning them. No further participation will be requested.

I am investigating the problems facing married graduate students and their spouses. The research in this area is inconclusive and I hope that my study can add some clarity, at least for the students at U-T. Additionally, I am interested in the effects of these problems upon marital satisfaction. The data from this study will hopefully aid the University in better meeting the needs of graduate students and their spouses.

As a student, I am well aware of the time demands we all face, but I would greatly appreciate your help. I will be glad to discuss your individual results and/or the study findings during the summer quarter. You can contact me then at 974-2196 to request that information. Information concerning individuals or couples will not be reported in any identifiable way, thereby insuring your anonymity.

Hopefully you and your spouse can spare an hour and will choose to participate. If so, read the Participant Release Forms and sign them. Then complete the other forms individually and return them in the enclosed envelope. After mailing, feel free to discuss your answers with your partner—please do not do so while answering. If you have any questions, please contact me at 974-2196.

If you do not choose to participate, please mail everything back in the return envelope.

Many thanks for your help!

Sincerely,

Brian Clifford

Brian Clifford

P. S. To insure confidentiality, DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON ANY FORM EXCEPT THE "PARTICIPANT RELEASE FORM"

804 Volunteer Boulevard
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dear_____:

I would greatly appreciate your participation in my doctoral dissertation research. Your involvement would require completing the enclosed forms (about 45 minutes) and mailing them back in the enclosed envelope. No further participation will be required.

My research involves exploring the pressures upon graduate students. Additionally, I will be investigating the effect of these pressures upon marital satisfaction. As a single student, your participation will allow me to compare the problems experienced by single and married students. To date, the research in this area is inconclusive and I hope that my study will add some clarity, at least for students at U-T. The results of my research will hopefully aid the University in better meeting the needs of graduate students.

Hopefully, you can spare the time to participate. If so, please fill out the "Participant Release Form" and then complete the remaining forms. Return them in the enclosed envelope. Should you have any questions, you may contact me at 974-2196. Should you wish, I will be willing to discuss your results, as well as the results of the study during the Summer Quarter. You may contact me at the above number.

If you choose not to participate, please return everything in the return envelope.

Many thanks for your help,

Sincerely,

Brian Clifford

P. S. To insure confidentiality, please do not put your name on any form except the "Participant Release Form"

804 Volunteer Boulevard
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dear_____:

I would greatly appreciate the participation of you and your spouse in my doctoral dissertation research. Your involvement would require completing the enclosed forms (about one hour) and returning them in the enclosed envelope. No further participation will be requested.

My research involves exploring the problems faced by married graduate students. Additionally, I will be investigating the effects of these pressures upon marital satisfaction. As a married person no longer in school, your participation will provide important comparison data. To date the research in this area is inconclusive and I hope that my study will add some clarity—at least for students at U-T. The results of my research will hopefully aid the University to better meet the needs of married graduate students.

I realize that time is a valuable commodity, but hope that you will choose to participate. If so, please fill out the "Participant Release Form" and then the other forms. Upon completion of the forms, feel free to discuss your answers with your partner—please do not do so while answering. I will be glad to discuss your individual scores and/or the study findings during the Summer Quarter. Should you wish this information you may contact me at that time at 974-2196. If you have any questions about the study you may contact me at the above number. Please return the completed forms in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible.

If you choose not to participate, please mail everything back in the return envelope.

Many thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Brian Clifford

P. S. To insure confidentiality, please do not put your name on any forms except the "Participant Release Form."

APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT RELEASE FORM

I would like to request your participation in my doctoral dissertation research. The purpose of this research is explained in the enclosed cover letter. I will be asking you to complete the enclosed material as your total involvement in the study.

All the data collected will be kept strictly confidential. "Confidential" in this case means that no data concerning an individual or couple will be reported. All data used will be reported for groups of students or spouses. All forms will be coded and scored anonymously. Upon receipt of completed forms, they will be checked against a master list—there will be no other reference to this list unless you request your scores from me. The procedure for requesting individual scores is explained in the cover letter.

Your participation in this project is important in that the results may aid the University in better meeting the needs of married graduate students and their spouses.

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION

I understand that the information in this research is to be used by Brian Clifford in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education and that it is under faculty supervision. I have read the above description and understand that it is a truthful representation of this project. I consent to participation in this project with the understanding that my consent may be withdrawn at any time.

Date:_____ Signature:_____

Printed name:_____

Address:_____

_____

APPENDIX E

REMINDER

Hi,
About 2 weeks ago you received some research materials for a study about problems faced by graduate students. I would really appreciate it if you and your spouse could spare 1/2 hour from the "end of the year" rush to complete the forms and mail them back. I'm hoping to start my data analysis on June 8.

Thanks for your help,

Brian Clifford

APPENDIX F

Code number:_____

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA FORM

Please answer all the appropriate questions

I. Male_____ Female_____

II. Age_____

III. Married for ____ years

IV. Number of children _____

V. Education
Highest degree _____
Are you now a student? yes_____ no_____
If not attending school now, do you intend to do so in the future? yes_____ no_____

VI. Employment
Are you primarily a homemaker (no paid employment?
Yes_____ no_____
If you are a paid employee, do you
Work full-time_____ part-time_____
Enjoy your job? yes_____ no_____
Feel underpaid for your experience? yes_____ no_____
Dislike your job, but need the money? yes_____ no_____
Have an assistantship or workship job? yes_____ no_____
Comments:_____
_____
_____

VII. Future occupation objective_____

VIII. Expected graduation date (if presently enrolled)_____

IX. My parents live approximately_____ miles away.

APPENDIX G

Code number:_____

MARITAL-ADJUSTMENT TEST

1. Check the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "Happy," represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in marriage.

Very Unhappy			Happy			Perfectly Happy
•	•	•	•	•	•	•

State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items. Please check each item in the appropriate column.

	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
2. Handling family finances						
3. Matters of recreation						
4. Demonstrations of affection						
5. Friends						
6. Sex relations						
7. Conventionality (right, good, or proper conduct)						
8. Philosophy of life						
9. Ways of dealing with in-laws						

10. When disagreements arise, they usually result in: husband giving in _____, wife giving in _____, agreement by mutual give and take _____.

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interest together? All of them _____, some of them _____, very few of them _____, none of them _____.

12. In leisure time do you generally prefer: to be "on the go" _____, to stay at home _____? Does your mate generally prefer: to be "on the go" _____, to stay at home _____?

13. Do you ever wish you had not married? Frequently _____, occasionally _____, rarely _____, never _____.

14. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: marry the same person _____, marry a different person _____, not marry at all _____?

15. Do you confide in your mate: almost never _____, rarely _____, in most things _____, in everything _____?

CODE: C

1950 REVISION

MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST

Ross L. Mooney
Assisted by Leonard V. Gordon
Bureau of Educational Research
Ohio State University

C COLLEGE FORM

Age..... Date of birth..... Sex.....

Class in college..... Marital status.....
(Freshman, Sophomore, etc.) (Single, married, etc.)

Curriculum in which you are enrolled.....
(Electrical Engineering, Teacher Education, Liberal Arts, etc.)

Name of the counselor, course or agency for whom you are marking this check list.....

Your name or other identification, if desired.....

Date.....

DIRECTIONS

This is not a test. It is a list of troublesome problems which often face students in college—problems of health, money, social life, relations with people, religion, studying, selecting courses, and the like. You are to go through the list, pick out the particular problems which are of concern to you, indicate those which are of most concern, and make a summary interpretation in your own words. More specifically, you are to take these three steps.

First Step: Read the list slowly, pause at each item, and if it suggests something which is troubling you, *underline* it, thus "34. Sickness in the family." Go through the whole list, underlining the items which suggest troubles (difficulties, worries) of concern to you.

Second Step: After completing the first step, look back over the items that you have underlined, and rate each as to the degree that that item is troublesome. Use the following rating scale. Write the appropriate number after each underlined item.

Rating Scale:
1-hardly any difficulty
2-little difficulty
3-average amount of difficulty
4-quite a bit of difficulty
5-very much difficulty

Example:
34. Sickness in the family 3
(this suggests that sickness in the family is a problem of average difficulty)

Third Step: After completing the first and second steps, answer the summarizing questions on pages 5 and 6.

71-S3ST
Printed in U.S.A.
The Psychological Corporation, New York

	Cir.	Tot.
HPD		
FLE		
SRA		
SPR		
PPR		
CSM		
HF		
MR		
ACW		
FVE		
CTP		
TOTAL . . .		

1. Feeling tired much of the time
2. Being underweight
3. Being overweight
4. Not getting enough exercise
5. Not getting enough sleep

6. Too little money for clothes
7. Receiving too little help from home
8. Having less money than my friends
9. Managing my finances poorly
10. Needing a part time job now

11. Not enough time for recreation
12. Too little chance to get into sports
13. Too little chance to enjoy art or music
14. Too little chance to enjoy radio or television
15. Too little time to myself

16. Being timid or shy
17. Being too easily embarrassed
18. Being ill at ease with other people
19. Having no close friends at college
20. Missing someone back home

21. Taking things too seriously
22. Worrying about unimportant things
23. Nervousness
24. Getting excited too easily
25. Finding it difficult to relax

26. Too few dates
27. Not meeting anyone I like to date
28. No suitable places to go on dates
29. Deciding whether to go steady
30. Going with someone my family won't accept

31. Being criticized by my parents
32. Mother
33. Father
34. Sickness in the family
35. Parents sacrificing too much for me

36. Not going to church often enough
37. Dissatisfied with church services
38. Having beliefs that differ from my church
39. Losing my earlier religious faith
40. Doubting the value of worship and prayer

41. Not knowing how to study effectively
42. Easily distracted from my work
43. Not planning my work ahead
44. Having a poor background for some subjects
45. Inadequate high school training

46. Restless at delay in starting life work
47. Doubting wisdom of my vocational choice
48. Family opposing my choice of vocation
49. Purpose in going to college not clear
50. Doubting the value of a college degree

51. Hard to study in living quarters
52. No suitable place to study on campus
53. Teachers too hard to understand
54. Textbooks too hard to understand
55. Difficulty in getting required books

56. Not as strong and healthy as I should be
57. Allergies (hay fever, asthma, hives, etc.)
58. Occasional pressure and pain in my head
59. Gradually losing weight
60. Not getting enough outdoor air and sunshine

61. Going in debt for college expenses
62. Going through school on too little money
63. Graduation threatened by lack of funds
64. Needing money for graduate training
65. Too many financial problems

66. Not living a well-rounded life
67. Not using my leisure time well
68. Wanting to improve myself culturally
69. Wanting to improve my mind
70. Wanting more chance for self-expression

71. Wanting a more pleasing personality
72. Losing friends
73. Wanting to be more popular
74. Being left out of things
75. Having feelings of extreme loneliness

76. Moodiness, "having the blues"
77. Failing in so many things I try to do
78. Too easily discouraged
79. Having bad luck
80. Sometimes wishing I'd never been born

81. Afraid of losing the one I love
82. Loving someone who doesn't love me
83. Too inhibited in sex matters
84. Afraid of close contact with the opposite sex
85. Wondering if I'll ever find a suitable mate

86. Parents separated or divorced
87. Parents having a hard time of it
88. Worried about a member of my family
89. Father or mother not living
90. Feeling I don't really have a home

91. Differing from my family in religious beliefs
92. Failing to see the relation of religion to life
93. Don't know what to believe about God
94. Science conflicting with my religion
95. Needing a philosophy of life

96. Forgetting things I've learned in school
97. Getting low grades
98. Weak in writing
99. Weak in spelling or grammar
100. Slow in reading

101. Unable to enter desired vocation
102. Enrolled in the wrong curriculum
103. Wanting to change to another college
104. Wanting part-time experience in my field
105. Doubting college prepares me for working

106. College too indifferent to student needs
107. Dull classes
108. Too many poor teachers
109. Teachers lacking grasp of subject matter
110. Teachers lacking personality

111. Poor posture
112. Poor complexion or skin trouble
113. Too short
114. Too tall
115. Not very attractive physically

116. Needing money for better health care
117. Needing to watch every penny I spend
118. Family worried about finances
119. Having a physical disability or one others
120. Financially unable to get married

121. Awkward in meeting people
122. Awkward in making a date
123. Slow in getting acquainted with people
124. Inactive student activities
125. Boring weekends

126. Easily hurt easily hurt
127. Being disliked by other people
128. Being excluded by other people
129. Worrying how I impress people
130. Feeling inferior

131. Unhappy too much of the time
132. Having memories of an unhappy childhood
133. Daydreaming
134. Forgetting things
135. Having a certain nervous habit

136. Being in love
137. Deciding whether I am in love
138. Deciding whether to become engaged
139. Wondering if I really know my prospective mate
140. Being in love with someone I can't marry

141. Friends not welcomed at home
142. Home life unhappy
143. Family quarrels
144. Not getting along with a member of my family
145. Irritated by habits of a member of my family

146. Parents old-fashioned in their ideas
147. Missing opportunities in college life
148. Tired of being left out by others
149. Affected by racial or religious prejudice
150. In love with someone of a different race or religion

151. Not spending enough time on study
152. Having too many outside interests
153. Trouble organizing term papers
154. Trouble concentrating or note-taking
155. Trouble with oral reports

156. Wondering if I'll be successful in life
157. Needing to plan ahead for the future
158. Not knowing what I really want
159. Trying to combine marriage and a career
160. Concerned about military service

161. Not having a good college adviser
162. Not getting individual help from teachers
163. Not enough chances to talk to teachers
164. Teachers lacking interest in students
165. Teachers not considerate of students' feelings

166. Frequent sore throat
167. Frequent colds
168. Nose or sinus trouble
169. Speech handicap (stuttering, etc.)
170. Weak eyes

171. Working late at night on a job
172. Living in an inconvenient location
173. Transportation or commuting difficulty
174. Lacking privacy in living quarters
175. Having no place to entertain friends

176. Wanting to learn how to dance
177. Wanting to learn how to entertain
178. Wanting to improve my appearance
179. Wanting to improve my manners or etiquette
180. Trouble in keeping a conversation going

181. Being too envious or jealous
182. Being stubborn or obstinate
183. Getting into arguments
184. Speaking or acting without thinking
185. Sometimes acting childish or immature

186. Losing my temper
187. Being careless
188. Being lazy
189. Tending to exaggerate too much
190. Not taking things seriously enough

191. Embarrassed by talk about sex
192. Disturbed by ideas of sexual acts
193. Needing information about sex matters
194. Sexual needs unsatisfied
195. Wondering how far to go with the opposite sex

196. Unable to discuss certain problems at home
197. Clash of opinion between me and parents
198. Talking back to my parents
199. Parents expecting too much of me
200. Carrying heavy home responsibilities

201. Wanting more chances for religious worship
202. Wanting to understand more about the Bible
203. Wanting to feel closer to God
204. Confused in some of my religious beliefs
205. Confused on some moral questions

206. Not getting studies done on time
207. Unable to concentrate well
208. Unable to express myself well in words
209. Vocabulary too limited
210. Afraid to speak up in class discussions

211. Wondering whether further education is worthwhile
212. Not knowing where I belong in the world
213. Needing to decide on an occupation
214. Needing information about occupations
215. Needing to know my vocational abilities

216. Classes too large
217. Not enough class discussion
218. Classes run too much like high school
219. Too much work required in some courses
220. Teachers too theoretical

221. Frequent headaches
222. Menstrual or female disorders
223. Sometimes feeling faint or dizzy
224. Trouble with digestion or elimination
225. Glandular disorders (thyroid, lymph, etc.)

226. Not getting satisfactory diet
227. Tiring of the same meals all the time
228. Too little money for recreation
229. Not enough exercise
230. Unsure of my future financial support

231. Lacking skill in sports and games
232. Too little chance to enjoy nature
233. Too little chance to pursue a hobby
234. Too little chance to read what I like
235. Wishing more worthwhile discussions with people

236. Disliking someone
237. Being disliked by someone
238. Feeling that no one understands me
239. Having no one to tell my troubles to
240. Finding it hard to talk about my troubles

241. Afraid of making mistakes
242. Can't make up my mind about things
243. Lacking self-confidence
244. Can't forget an unpleasant experience
245. Feeling life has given me a "raw deal"

246. Disappointment in a love affair
247. Girl friend
248. Boy friend
249. Breaking up a close affair
250. Wondering if I'll ever get married

251. Not telling parents everything
252. Being treated like a child at home
253. Being an only child
254. Parents making too many decisions for me
255. Wanting more freedom at home

256. Sometimes not being as honest as I should be
257. Pretending to be something I'm not
258. Having a secret or bad habit
259. Unable to break a bad habit
260. Getting into serious trouble

261. Worrying about examinations
262. Shy with the opposite sex
263. Weak in logical reasoning
264. Not smart enough in scholastic ways
265. Fearing failure in college

266. Deciding whether to leave college for a job
267. Doubting I can get a job in my chosen vocation
268. Wanting advice on next steps after college
269. Choosing courses to take next term
270. Choosing best courses to prepare for a job

271. Some courses poorly organized
272. Courses too unrelated to each other
273. Too many rules and regulations
274. Unable to take courses I want
275. Forced to take courses I don't like

276. Having considerable trouble with my teeth
277. Trouble with my hearing
278. Trouble with my feet
279. Bothered by a physical handicap
280. Needing medical advice

281. Needing a job during vacations
282. Working for all my expenses
283. Doing more outside work than is good for me
284. Getting low wages
285. Dissatisfied with my present job

286. Too little chance to do what I want to do
287. Too little social life
288. Too much social life
289. Nothing interesting to do on vacations
290. Wanting very much to travel

291. Too self-centered
292. Hurting other people's feelings
293. Avoiding someone I don't like
294. Too easily led by other people
295. Lacking leadership ability

296. Too many personal problems
297. Too easily moved to tears
298. Bothered by bad dreams
299. Sometimes bothered by thoughts of immodesty
300. Thoughts of suicide

301. Thinking too much about sex matters
302. Too easily stressed mentally
303. Having to wait too long to get married
304. Needing advice about marriage
305. Wondering if my marriage will succeed

306. Wanting love and affection
307. Getting home too seldom
308. Living at home or too close to home
309. Bothered by suffering with family affairs
310. Wishing I had a different family background

311. Sometimes not being as honest as I should be
312. Having a troubled or guilty conscience
313. Can't forget some mistake I've made
314. Giving in to temptations
315. Lacking self-control

316. Not having a well-planned college program
317. Not really interested in books
318. Poor memory
319. Slow in mathematics
320. Needing a vacation from school

321. Afraid of unemployment after graduation
322. Not knowing how to look for a job
323. Lacking necessary experience for a job
324. Not sure what the real I've set for myself
325. Wanting to quit college

326. Grades unfair as measures of ability
327. Unfair tests
328. Campus activities poorly coordinated
329. Campus lacking in school spirit
330. Campus lacking in recreational facilities

Totals

Second Step: Look back over the items you have underlined and circle the numbers in front of the problems which are troubling you most.

Third Step: Pages 5 and 6

Third Step: Answer the following four questions.

QUESTIONS

1. Do you feel that the items you have marked on the list give a well-rounded picture of your problems? ____Yes. ____No. If any additional items or explanations are desired, please indicate them here.

2. How would you summarize your chief problems in your own words? Write a brief summary.

(Questions are continued on next page ->)

3. Whether you have or have not enjoyed filling out the list, do you think it has been worth doing? _____Yes. _____No. Could you explain your reactions?

4. If the opportunity were offered, would you like to talk over any of these problems with someone on the college staff? _____Yes. _____No. If so, do you know the particular person(s) with whom you would like to have these talks? _____Yes. _____No.

VITA

Brian Denis Clifford was born on August 24, 1944, in Brooklyn, New York. He attended elementary school in Denville, New Jersey, and graduated from Morris Hills Regional High School in Rockaway, New Jersey, in 1962. He enrolled at Montclair State College in Upper Montclair, New Jersey, and in June 1966 he graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Studies Education.

For eight years he was employed by the Metuchen Public Schools as a teacher of World Geography, and later a counselor, at the high school. In 1967, he married Debora Solomon, now Dr. Debora Clifford. During this same time period, he completed a Master of Arts degree in Student Personnel Services. Subsequent course work and experiences focused on training in small group work.

In September 1974 he entered a doctoral program at The University of Tennessee, majoring in Counseling in the Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance. He worked for two years as a graduate assistant counselor at the University's Student Counseling Center. He graduated with a Doctor of Education degree in August 1976 and plans to return to school counseling. Future occupational goals include applying for licensure as a psychologist and doing part-time private therapy and consulting.

Dr. Clifford is a member of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the American School Counselor Association, the Association for Specialists in Group Work and is a Student in Psychology in the

American Psychological Association. As an undergraduate he was elected to Pi Gamma Mu, the National Social Science Honor Society.