

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Edgar Charles John Long for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Human Development and
Family Studies presented on June 22, 1987

Title: Perspective-Taking as a Determinant of Marital
Adjustment and Propensity to Divorce

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy

David Andrews

Perspective-taking has been defined as the tendency to take the point of view of another, to put oneself in the psychological shoes of another. This ability has been argued to be an important component of social interaction. This research examined three components of perspective-taking: a general measure of perspective taking (PT), dyadic perspective-taking (DPT) and the perceptions of a partner's dyadic perspective-taking (PDPT). It was hypothesized that these three components of perspective taking would be predictive of marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce among a sample of 159 married couples. Included in this study was the development and initial psychometric assessments of the dyadic perspective-taking and perceptions of dyadic perspective-taking measures.

The results indicated that the Dyadic Perspective-

Taking and Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking measures were both reliable and valid. All three components of perspective-taking were found to be predictive of marital adjustment for both husbands and wives. Similarly perspective-taking was found to be predictive of a propensity to divorce for both husbands and wives. Overall the wives rated themselves and were rated by their husbands as being superior in perspective-taking ability. The perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking were also positively correlated with the pleasantness of interaction with a partner.

The results were discussed within the context of a social exchange framework of marital quality and stability. Finally, implications for interventionists, the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research were discussed.

Perspective-Taking as a Determinant of
Marital Adjustment and Propensity to Divorce

by

Edgar Charles John Long

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Completed June 22, 1987

Commencement June 1988

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Assistant Professor of Human Development and
Family Studies in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Human Development and
Family Studies

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis was presented

June 22, 1987

DEDICATED TO
my wife. Kathryn Lee

my children:
Toby Charles John
Tarami Kathryn

and my parents:
Frank W. Long
the memory of my mother
Mabel Ellen

Acknowledgements

There are so many individuals that have played significant parts in the completion of this study that the acknowledgment page in itself becomes difficult to write. Foremost in my mind is my wife Kathy. For the duration of my graduate education she has shown considerable tenacity, constantly being there to encourage me to "press on" when life seemed to unravel itself in ways that had not been predictable. She has throughout our marriage been an excellent perspective-taker, understanding me, and being for me, what I needed at the time. I also want to thank Toby and Tarami for allowing me those countless hours of isolation in my study. Their patience with my studying aided in the completion of this project. This study reflects the patience and tenacity of Kathy, Toby and Tarami as much as it does mine.

My major professor, Dr. David Andrews has been to me a mentor, colleague, friend, and encourager throughout my educational experience at Oregon State. His many evening and weekend hours spent clarifying ideas, reading drafts and discussing the findings have not been taken for granted. Many of those "informal times" on the telephone have been a consequential part

of my educational experience.

Additionally I want to thank the other members of my committee. Dr. Clara Pratt, Dr. Tom Murphy, and Dr. Anisa Zvonkovic have all invested a great deal of time in this research. Their comments and insight on previous drafts are evidenced throughout the text.

There have been several other professors over my educational career that have contributed in less direct, but important ways to the completion of this study. Dr. Barrie Palfreyman has numerous times over the past 15 years been a source of reassurance to me in my academic pursuits. Similarly, Dr. Rodney Cate a former professor and committee member, was very influential in helping me understand the importance of quality research within family studies.

Lastly but not in any sense the least, my family of origin deserves mention in the completion of this study. It was the interest of Mom, Dad, Wes, Vera and Roger in PEOPLE that caused me to want to pursue graduate education in the area of family studies.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
Summary	10
Definition of Terms	12
II. Review of the Literature	14
Perspective-Taking Among Earlier Social Scientists	15
A Definition of Perspective-Taking	18
Marital Quality	23
Marital Adjustment	25
Propensity to Divorce	26
An Exchange Understanding of Marital Adjustment and Stability	30
Perspective-Taking as a Predictor of Marital Adjustment	33
Dyadic Perspective-Taking	41
Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking	42
Additional Analyses	44
Time Spent With a Partner	44
Pleasantness of Interaction With a Partner	45
Similarity of Perspective-Taking	45

	Summary	47
	Hypotheses	49
III.	Method	51
	Procedures	52
	Sample Selection	52
	Design	53
	Measurement of the Predictor Variables	54
	Instrument Development	55
	Measurement of the Outcome Variables	60
	Demographic Data	63
	Data Analysis	63
	Restatement of Purpose	65
IV.	Results	66
	Sample	66
	Instrument Development	72
	Analyses	76
	Hypothesis #1	77
	Hypothesis #2	83
	Hypothesis #3	84
	Hypothesis #4	85
	Hypothesis #5	91
	Hypothesis #6	92
	Pleasantness of Marital Interaction	93

Time Spent With a Partner	97
Discrepancy Among Husband's and Wive's Perspective-Taking	100
Husband's and Wive's Perspective-Taking High and Low Adjusted Couples	104
	107
IV. Discussion	115
Implications for Interventionists	129
Limitations of the Present Study	131
Implications for Future Research	133
Social Exchange	134
Summary	135
References	138
Appendices	150
Footnotes	176

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Description of the Sample	67
2.	Means and Standard Deviations of Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Adjustment, and Propensity to Divorce Scores	70
3.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Adjustment and Propensity to Divorce Scale Scores	71
4.	Simple Multiple Regression of Wive's Perspective-Taking on the Husband's Dyadic Adjustment	79
5.	Simple Multiple Regression of Husband's Perspective-Taking on the Wive's Dyadic Adjustment	80

6.	Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Wive's Perspective-Taking on Husband's Dyadic Adjustment	81
7.	Hierarchical Regressions Analysis of Husband's Perspective-Taking of Wive's Dyadic Adjustment	82
8.	Simple Multiple Regression of Wive's Perspective-Taking on the Husband's Propensity to Divorce	87
9.	Simple Multiple Regression of the Husband's Perspective-Taking on the Wive's Propensity to Divorce	88
10.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression of the Wive's Perspective-Taking on the Husband's Propensity to Divorce	89
11.	Hierarchical Multiple Regression of the Husband's Perspective-Taking on the Wive's Propensity to Divorce	90

12.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Husband's Perspective- Taking with Wive's Pleasantness of Interaction	95
13.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Wive's Perspective- Taking with Husband's Pleasantness of Interaction	96
14.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Wive's Perspective- Taking with the Husband's Proportion of Leisure Time and All Time Alone With His Wife	98
15.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of Husband's Perspective- Taking with the Wive's Proportion of Leisure Time and All Time Alone With Her Husband	99
16.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Perspective-Taking Discrepancy Scores and Spouses Marital Adjustment	102

17.	Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Perspective-Taking Discrepancy Scores and Spouses Propensity to Divorce	103
18.	A T-Test of Significant Differences Between Husband's and Wife's Scale Scores	106
19.	A T-Test Comparison of the Perspective- Taking Scores of the High and Low Adjustment Husbands	110
20.	A T-Test Comparison of the Perspective- Taking Scores of the High and Low Adjustment Wives	112

Perspective-Taking as a Determinant of
Marital Adjustment and Propensity To Divorce

I. Introduction

"People appear to differ in their ability to correctly interpret the attitudes and intentions of others, in the accuracy in which they can perceive situations from others' standpoint, and thus anticipate and predict their behavior. This type of social sensitivity rests on what we call the empathic responses. Empathic responses are basic to taking the role of the other and hence to social interaction and the communicative processes upon which rest social integration... we must include empathic capacity as one of the essential components of social competence. The sign of its absence is misunderstanding.

(Foote & Cottrell, 1955, pp.54)

The imaginative tendency to put oneself in another person's place, to take the perspective of the other, has been argued to be of the utmost importance to interpersonal dynamics (Cooley, 1930; Dymond, 1949; Foote & Cottrell, 1955; Mead, 1934; Sullivan, 1947). It has been argued that effective social interaction requires individuals to modify their behavior in social interactions as a result of an understanding of the perspective of the other (Feffer & Suchotliff, 1966; Turner, 1978). Individuals who focus solely upon their own perspective could have difficulty in modifying their

behavior in a specific situation, or may unknowingly behave in ways that others perceive as being inappropriate. Several researchers (Cooley, 1930; Dymond, 1949; Feffer, Suchotliff, 1966; Foote, Cottrell, 1955; Mead, 1934; Turner, 1978) contend that improved perspective-taking will enhance social functioning because this ability allows a person to anticipate the behavior of others, and thus modify one's own behavior accordingly. Individuals who take into account the view point of others may be more tactful in their social interaction showing a greater concern for the needs, interests and desires of others.

Numerous terms such as sympathy, empathy, understanding, empathic understanding, role-taking and cognitive empathy have been used to denote perspective-taking. Recently researchers have conceptualized perspective-taking to be one component of the multidimensional concept of empathy (Coke, Batson, & McDavis, 1978; Davis, 1983; Deutsch & Malde, 1975; Hoffman, 1977). Perspective-taking has been defined as the ability to understand what the other individual is thinking, put oneself in another's place, and cognitively understand the condition of another without vicariously experiencing their emotions (Hogan, 1969).

The type of interaction that takes place in marriage relationships may depend heavily upon

individuals understanding the cognitive perceptions of a situation from the standpoint of a partner. The marriage relationship has been described as:

"a genuine encounter between two persons who are committed to being their true selves and to being equal partners, and within that context finding a way to meet each other's needs with understanding and compassion. This is a very complex and demanding task, and the possibilities of failure are frightening. Yet the rewards for those who succeed are tremendous."

(Mace, 1982, pp.22)

Spouses who lack understanding of a partner's point of view may act in ways that demonstrate little regard for the welfare of the other. These persons would then be perceived as uncaring, when in reality they merely lack information which would enable them to act with more sensitivity towards a partner. Awareness of the point of view of a partner may also enable a person to understand and thus fit in with the expectations of a spouse. Individuals who understand the perspective of their partners have information that allows them to change or regulate their behavior in positive ways. The accumulation of positive interactions with a partner who understands my perspective should improve the functioning of the relationship.

Perspective-taking may be related to two specific aspects of marital interaction. The study of the

functioning of marriage relationships has focused primarily upon the quality and stability of the dyad (Spanier, 1979). One component of marital quality that has been frequently studied is marital adjustment (Bernard, 1934; Burgess & Cottrell, 1936; Dean, 1966; Locke, 1951; Spanier, 1972, 1972b, 1973; Spanier & Cole, 1976; Terman, Johnson, 1939). Adjustment has been defined as a changing process varying between well and maladjusted.

"Marital adjustment is a process, the outcome of which is determined by the degree of: troublesome marital differences, interspousal tensions and personal anxiety, marital satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, consensus on matters of importance to marital functioning".

(Spanier, Cole, 1976, pp.127-128)

If perspective-taking is an important component of dyadic interaction, which both facilitates tactful interaction and enables spouses to anticipate the behavior of a partner, then it is likely that perspective-taking will be positively related to marital adjustment.

The other aspect of marital functioning that may be related to perspective-taking is marital stability. Stability has been defined as a propensity to divorce including any thoughts feelings and actions that a partner has about dissolving the relationship (Booth,

Johnson & Edwards, 1983). Persons in stable relationships are less likely to have thoughts about ending their marriage while those in less stable relationships are likely to have had more frequent thoughts about terminating the partnership. If perspective-taking allows a person to understand the needs and desires of the other, enables an individual to more readily fit in with a partner's expectations, and allows partners to regulate their behavior based upon their information about that partner, then it is likely that perspective-taking will be negatively related to a propensity to divorce. Individuals who are better perspective takers will likely have partners who have fewer feelings, thoughts and actions pertaining to the termination of the relationship.

A social exchange framework may be useful in explaining the relationship between perspective-taking and marital functioning. Social exchange theorists argue that even within the context of intimate relationships individuals seek to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1950; 1961; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Thus the perspective-taking of one partner may influence the perceived costs and rewards of the other spouse. The exchange typology of marital quality and stability is one such social exchange framework (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). The

typology combines assessments of the quality and stability of marriage relationships, stating that high quality marriages are generally more stable than low quality marriages (Spanier, 1976; Dean & Lucas, 1974). This social exchange framework of marital functioning posits that individuals consider costs and rewards when evaluating their own perceptions of their relationship.

While theoretical speculation and intuition suggest that perspective-taking is related to marital functioning there is little empirical evidence to support the relationship. Not only is there little empirical support for the relationship between perspective-taking and marital adjustment and stability, but there are few studies examining the construct of perspective-taking among adult populations (Somers, 1984). Limited evidence does exist that suggests that perspective-taking may be related to certain aspects of social interaction within intimate relationships. In one such study of college students (Somers, 1984) role taking, a term used interchangeably with perspective-taking, (Wispe, 1986) was shown to be positively related to higher self disclosures and greater intimacy among same sex friendships. While this study suggests that perspective-taking types of behaviors may facilitate interpersonal interaction among adult

populations, psychometric inadequacies of the measure, such as questionable validity and reliability make the findings equivocal.

Perspective-taking, defined as the ability to adopt the point of view of another, has been shown to be positively related to relationship satisfaction, and positively related to more democratic means of resolving conflict, in a sample of 131 college student couples (Franzoi, Davis, & Young, 1985). A small minority of the couples in this sample were engaged and married. The results included married and nonmarried couples together in the analysis. While there is this evidence that perspective-taking is related to relationship satisfaction in this largely premarital sample, there has been a paucity of research conducted that examined the relationship between perspective-taking and dimensions of marital functioning.

The primary purpose of this study was to empirically explore the relationship between perspective-taking, and two aspects of marital functioning, adjustment and a propensity to divorce. Some researchers in family studies may already assume an existing relationship between perspective-taking and marital functioning. Lewis and Spanier (1979) suggest that perspective-taking and marital quality are positively related. However a review of the literature

revealed that research on these variables has been plagued with methodological and psychometric problems that make the relationship between perspective-taking and marital functioning at best, equivocal (Burgess, & Wallin, 1953; Dymond, 1954; Foote & Cottrell, 1955; Buerkle & Badgley, 1959). For example several authors (Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Foote & Cottrell, 1955) hypothesized about the relationship between perspective-taking and marital interaction but gave no empirical evidence for its existence. Other researchers (Buerkle & Badgley, 1959; Dymond, 1950) operationalized perspective-taking, but made no attempts to assess the validity or reliability of the measurements used. In fact Burr (1973) later mentioned that there was a lack of conclusive evidence verifying the relationship between perspective-taking and marital functioning. The methodological sophistication of this research (Buerkle & Badgley, 1959; Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Dymond, 1950; Foote & Cottrell, 1955) may have been defensible in its time, but in retrospect this research has not empirically verified the relationship between perspective-taking and marital functioning.

A secondary purpose of this study was to look at other aspects of perspective-taking and examine their relationship to marital functioning. Marital research

needs to be undertaken that not only assesses the perspective-taking of the individual, but ascertains whether or not the individual uses perspective-taking skills within the context of a specific relationship. It has been argued (Clements, 1967) that individuals within a marriage may have the ability to be empathic, to take the perspective of the other, but lack the motivation to use those skills. Research that examines the relationship between perspective-taking and marital functioning needs to examine the general ability to take another's perspective, and the use of those skills within a specific dyad. It may be that a person has the ability to take the perspective of a spouse but lacks the motivation to use those abilities within the context of a specific relationship. Whether or not the person used perspective-taking skills within a specific relationship, has been defined as dyadic perspective taking for the purposes of this study.

Finally, the perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking may be of equal importance to marital interaction. Perceptions of the personality of a partner have been argued to be more important to marital satisfaction than the actual personality characteristics of the spouse (Kelly, 1941). With this in mind it was also hypothesized in the present study that perceptions of a spouse's dyadic perspective-taking may play an

important role in predicting relationship adjustment and a propensity to divorce. Perceptions of a partner's dyadic perspective-taking were hypothesized to be positively related to marital adjustment and negatively related to marital stability.

The focus of this research was the examination of the relationship between perspective-taking and two dimensions of marital functioning, marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. Perspective-taking has been defined as the ability to comprehend the point of view of others. Specifically it was thought that an individual who understood the vantage point of a spouse would be more aware of the needs, desires and expectations of that partner. The information gained through perspective-taking would allow for a more tactful style of interaction within the marital relationship. It was expected that perspective-taking would be positively related to marital adjustment while being negatively related to any thoughts about terminating the relationship.

Summary

This study sought to examine the influence of perspective-taking on the marital adjustment and stability of a sample of married couples. Perspective-

taking was perceived as being consequential to marital interaction. Perspective-takers were expected to adopt a more tactful style of interaction, being more sensitive to the needs, interests, and expectations of their partners. Interaction with a partner skilled in the use of perspective-taking would be more rewarding and pleasant and thus perspective-taking was thought to be positively related to marital adjustment. Similarly interaction with a partner skilled in perspective-taking would result in the spouse having few thoughts about leaving a partner. The perspective-taking of the one spouse was to be predictive of the adjustment and stability of the other partner.

Working from an exchange framework, this research investigated the relationship between three dimensions of perspective-taking as they predicted marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. A general measure of perspective-taking assessed the use of such skills in general social interaction with others. Partners who did not adopt the vantage point of another in general interaction with others would not likely have the ability to do the same with a spouse. Dyadic perspective-taking assessed the use of perspective-taking skills in the context of a specific relationship. Lastly partners reported on their spouse's dyadic perspective-taking. The perceptions of a spouse were

also thought to be related to marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. No previous research had examined these three components of perspective-taking as they related to the adjustment or stability of a sample of married couples.

Definition of Terms

1. Perspective taking: The ability to understand what the other individual is thinking, put oneself in another's place, and intellectually understand the condition of another without vicariously experiencing the other's emotions (Hogan, 1969).

2. Marital adjustment: One component of marital quality which is determined by the degree of troublesome differences, interspousal tensions and personal anxiety, marital satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, and consensus on matters of importance to marital functioning (Spanier, 1976).

3. Propensity to divorce: Marital instability, or the propensity to divorce is defined as any feelings, thoughts or actions that individuals may have had or taken to dissolve a relationship (Booth, et al., 1983).

4. Dyadic perspective-taking: The reported use of perspective-taking ability within the context of a specific relationship.

5. Perceptions of dyadic perspective-taking: The perceptions of a partner's use of perspective-taking ability within the context of a relationship.

II. Review of the Literature

The body of literature reviewed for this study incorporated several different areas of empirical research. The review of perspective-taking included only those studies of adult samples. In the perspective-taking literature an attempt was made to include some clinical, developmental, and social psychological research to reveal the wide array of social scientists interested in perspective-taking types of behaviors. The empathy literature was comprised of cognitive empathy studies among samples of adults.

There has been a plethora of empirical studies conducted in the area of marital adjustment and stability. Those examined in this project primarily included classic studies of marital adjustment, drawing heavily upon the work of Graham Spanier. The Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and the conceptual understanding of marital adjustment used in this study were developed by Spanier and his colleagues. Thus there was a good deal of emphasis upon Spanier's work. A specific endeavor was made to review any published studies dealing with perspective-taking or cognitive empathy as they related to marital functioning. The review of these later studies included a critical examination of the

instruments used to measure perspective-taking. Stability was conceptualized in this research as a propensity to divorce. The stability literature reviewed focused primarily upon studies dealing with divorce propensity rather than the large and diverse body of divorce literature.

Apart from the central focus of this research which was the testing of the six hypotheses, additional analyses were undertaken to further ascertain the influence of perspective-taking. These additional analyses involved the examination of variables that were more exploratory in nature. Very little previous work had examined the influence of perspective-taking upon these additional variables and thus the review of this literature was delimited by the number of studies conducted in this area. Literature for these additional variables was reviewed in an effort to build conjectures of the relationships that were thought to exist.

Perspective-Taking Among Earlier Social Scientists

A large number of social scientists in the mid 1900's (Cooley, 1930; Cottrell & Dymond, 1949; Mead, 1934; Piaget, 1959; Rogers, 1946; Sullivan, 1947) elucidated the importance of perspective-taking on interpersonal interaction. Two prominent sociologists,

Herbert Mead (1946) and Charles Cooley (1930), defined sympathy as taking the role of the other individual.

"Sympathy in the adult springs from this same capacity to take the role of the other person with whom one is socially implicated....Sympathy always implies that one stimulates himself to his assistance and consideration of others by taking in some degree the attitude of the person whom one is assisting. The common term for this is putting yourself in his place".

(Mead, 1934, pp.366)

Social psychologists (Cottrell, 1942; Cottrell & Dymond, 1949) also argued that perspective-taking was an important concept in the understanding of interpersonal behavior. Cottrell defined empathy as a cognitive action by which a person took the role of the other. Later on, Cottrell and Dymond (1949) defined an empathic response as the ability to perceive the situation of the other. They argued that "researchers must have taken it (empathy) for granted", since it was so crucial to social and group interaction.

In developmental psychology, Jean Piaget argued that the ability to enter into another's point of view was difficult for a child of less than seven or eight years of age (Piaget, 1959; Piaget & Inhelder, 1971). Piaget perceived perspective-taking to be a cognitive phenomenon that took place only after egocentrism had given way to decentering. Decentering, the ability to

recognize the difference between oneself and others, was restricted to impersonal cognitive functioning. Other researchers (Feffer & Suchotliff, 1966) expanded Piaget's ideas to consider decentering as an important component of social interaction. These researchers argued that effective social interaction required that individuals modify their behavior based upon the reactions of others. Thus individuals who could focus only on their own viewpoint at any one time would have difficulty in modifying their responses in social interaction.

There were clinicians (Rank, 1929; Rogers, 1946, 1951, 1957; Sullivan, 1947; Taft, 1933) that emphasized the role of perspective-taking within the therapeutic relationship. Taft (1933) and Rank (1929) emphasized understanding as an intense activity of attention. Sullivan (1947) argued that psychiatrists needed to perceive not only their own perception of the situation but the client's definition of the situation, placing themselves in the "psychological shoes of the patient". Carl Rogers, (1946) specified that a deep understanding of the client was essential to good therapy. Rogers emphasized that therapists must concentrate upon understanding their clients as the clients saw themselves. He later on referred to this deep understanding of the other as empathic understanding;

"it is the counselors function to assume, in so far as he is able, the internal frame of reference of the client, to perceive the world as the client sees it, to perceive the client himself as he is seen by himself, to lay aside all perceptions from the external frame of reference while doing so, and to communicate something of the empathic understanding to the client."

(Rogers, 1951, pp.29)

Rogers thus defined empathy as seeing the world of the other "as if" one were the person. Rogers however went beyond the typical understanding of empathy and added a communicative dimension to empathy. Empathy was not only seeing the world through the clients eyes, but communicating back to the client what had been seen.

Thus a large number of early social scientists (Cooley, 1930; Cottrell & Dymond, 1949; Mead, 1934; Piaget, 1959; Rogers, 1946, 1951, 1957; Sullivan, 1947) each representing their own disciplines viewed perspective-taking as an important element of social interaction.

A Definition of Perspective-Taking

There was and still is however a lack of clarity over the specific terminology used to represent perspective-taking (Wispe, 1986). Terms such as empathy, sympathy, cognitive perspective-taking, role taking, and social cognitive perspective-taking have all been used

interchangeably to denote the same concept. Evidence for the multidimensional nature of empathy has existed for centuries (Smith, 1759; Spencer, 1870). Smith and Spencer both concluded that empathy consisted of a cognitive intellectual component, the ability to understand the perspective of the other, and an affective emotional reaction to another.

Affective empathy has been defined as the involuntary vicarious experience of another's emotional states (Clark, 1980; Mehrabian, & Epstein, 1972). This emphasis on affective empathy has focused upon the vicarious experience of another's emotions, measuring even physiological responses to the suffering of others. Conversely cognitive empathy, has been defined as putting oneself into the place of another (Dymond, 1949; Hogan, 1969; Kerr & Speroff, 1954; Mead, 1934). These researchers focused upon the understanding of the situation of the other.

Recently a number of researchers have argued that empathy could only fully be understood when both the affective and cognitive components were studied (Coke, Batson & McDavis, 1978; Davis, 1983; Deutsch & Malde, 1975; Hoffman, 1977). They argued that perspective-taking, the tendency to adopt the point of view of others, was only one aspect of the

multidimensional concept of empathy.

Others examining the social cognitive development of children (Shantz, 1975; Underwood & Moore, 1982) have construed perspective-taking to be multidimensional. Taking the other persons perspective has been organized into three separate components. Perceiving what the other person sees, feels, or thinks, has been defined as the visual-spatial, affective, and cognitive dimensions of perspective-taking (Shantz, 1975). Underwood and Moore (1982) used differing terminology but defined three very similar categories; perceptual perspective-taking, affective perspective-taking and social cognitive perspective-taking respectively.

The present study focused upon what has been called cognitive perspective-taking (Shantz, 1975) or social cognitive perspective-taking (Underwood, et al., 1982). Perspective-taking within the context of this study was defined as: the ability to put oneself in another persons place, the intellectual or imaginative apprehension of another's condition or state of mind without actually experiencing the persons feelings (Hogan, 1969). Thus a good perspective-taker would seek to understand the other, to perceive the situation "as if" one were the other, without losing the "as if" quality (Rogers, 1951).

Perspective-taking was thought to be an individual

variable that would be influential to social interaction within the marital dyad. An individual who was fully cognizant of a partner's perspective would be more apt to respond in ways that were pleasing to that partner. This cognizance would improve the functioning of the relationship. Perspective-taking is an individual factor that has been almost ignored by family researchers. Positive personality factors were not even included in recent reviews of the marital quality literature (Lewis & Spanier, 1979; Spanier & Lewis, 1980). "Neurotic tendencies" was the only individual factor that was hypothesized to be negatively related to marital quality (Lewis et al., 1979). Most family researchers have focused their research upon relationship properties, such as nonverbal communication (Gottman & Poterfield, 1981; Kahn, 1970), listening skills (Garland, 1981), and communication problems (Kitson & Sussman, 1982; Patterson, Hops & Weiss, 1975) rather than individual factors. One of the reasons for this focus upon dyadic characteristics has been the emphasis of family researchers on the couple as the unit of analysis. Researchers seem to have minimized the importance that individual factors have on the quality of marriage relationships (Filsinger & Wilson, 1983). It may be that positive personality variables such as

perspective-taking may account for significant amounts of variance in marital adjustment scores. Filsinger & Wilson, (1983) argued that personality characteristics must not be overlooked as predictors of marital quality.

"While the current interest in skills in specific relationships has been fruitful in aiding our understanding of marital adjustment, it may be that some important aspects of interpersonal life may be overlooked if the pendulum swings too far toward the particular relationship and entirely away from the characteristics of the individuals involved".

(Filsinger & Wilson, 1983, pp.514)

Research has shown (de Turk & Miller, 1986; Filsinger et al., 1983; Pickford, Signori & Rempel, 1966) that individual variables such as social cognition, social anxiety, general activity level, serious-mindedness, and persistency of effort are significantly related to marital adjustment. A longitudinal study (Bentler & Newcomb, 1978) of 162 married couples, largely college educated caucasians, has shown that personality factors explained 29% of the variance in marital adjustment scores while demographic variables accounted for only 18%.

Perspective-taking in this study was construed to be an individual variable of social interaction that would be influential within marital interaction. Perspective-taking was viewed as being a cognitive

component of empathy. the understanding of the point of view of another. Clinical psychologists, developmental psychologists, and social psychologists each from their respective disciplines have perceived it to be an important component of social interaction.

Marital Quality

The earliest objective studies addressing marital quality were conducted in the mid 1900's (Burgess, Cottrell, 1939; Davis, 1929; Hamilton, 1929; Terman, 1938). This early research focused primarily on discovering correlates of marital happiness. Terman (1938) for example found that 140 of a total of 233 personality factors correlated with the happiness of the marital relationship. Other early researchers (Kirkpatrick, 1937a; 1937b) found evidence to substantiate personality factors as significant contributors to marital quality. Many of these early studies focused on negative personality traits: being critical of others, dominating, isolation, lack of emotional stability and poor self confidence, were all negatively related to the quality of the marriage (Hoffeditz, 1934; Kelly, 1940; Schooley, 1936). Much of this early work has been criticized for being atheoretical (Hicks & Platt, 1970) and conceptually ambiguous (Lively, 1969). These criticisms seem

somewhat justified as a review of this literature on marital adjustment reveals that many authors (Bowerman, 1964; Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Burgess, Locke & Thomas 1971; Burr, 1970; Lively, 1969; Locke & Wallace 1959; Locke & Williamson, 1958; Order & Bradburn, 1968) defined adjustment differently, while others failed to even define the concept (Hamilton, 1929; Bernard, 1933a; 1933b; 1934). Even as late as 1971 researchers (Hicks & Platt, 1970) argued that there were no foundational theories that could unite the variety of findings in the marital quality literature.

To remedy the conceptual ambiguity Spanier and colleagues asserted that previous dependent variables such as marital happiness, satisfaction, adjustment, and success be abandoned in favor of the term marital quality (Lewis & Spanier, 1979; Spanier, 1976). These authors argued that this would allow researchers to focus on the "functioning of the dyad" without becoming confused about previous terminology. The term marital quality is thus seen as encompassing the entire range of variables previously studied in the literature. Marital quality is positively related to variables such as happiness and satisfaction, and negatively related to factors like role strain and conflict. The quality of a marriage relationship is thus the result of a composite of many criteria which cumulatively represent the

construct.

Marital Adjustment

Although marital quality has become the most common term used to encompass other aspects of marital functioning, researchers continue to measure more specific components of the quality of the relationship (Spanier & Cole, 1976). Marital adjustment is one of those specific components of marital quality. The most general and global measurement of marital quality is the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976; 1979).

Marital adjustment (Spanier, 1976), has been portrayed as a process that is constantly changing from well to maladjusted, yet a process that can be evaluated at specific points in time. The adjustment of the relationship is determined by several criteria.

"Marital adjustment is a process, the outcome of which is determined by the degree of:

1. Troublesome marital differences
2. Interspousal tensions and personal anxiety
3. Marital satisfaction
4. Dyadic cohesion
5. Consensus on matters of importance to marital functioning".

(Spanier, 1976, p. 128)

These criteria are neither exhaustive, nor mutually exclusive, but are seen as being key criteria that move the relationship to new points along the continuum of adjustment (Spanier & Cole, 1976). While some

differences may enhance marital adjustment, it is argued that differences the individuals perceive as being troublesome reduce the adjustment of the relationship.

"Marital adjustment, then, is viewed not as a process of two individuals simply getting used to each other or learning to live with each other, but is defined such that increasing adjustment is associated with dyadic improvement in the five areas listed. No causal relationship is implied here. Most probably, there is a two-way interaction. When adjustment is taking place, troublesome marital differences are being reduced, interspousal tensions and personal anxiety are being reduced, satisfaction or happiness is being increased, and dyadic cohesion and consensus on matters of importance to marital functioning are being enhanced. Conversely when these characteristics are present, marital adjustment is taking place".

(Spanier, 1976, p.129)

Propensity to Divorce

Lewis and Spanier (1979) defined stability in terms of whether or not the marriage was intact. An unstable marriage was thus one that had been terminated by one or both partners. Low marital quality has not always signified a permanent separation (Landis, 1963; Udry, 1973). Low quality marriages often stay together while higher quality marriages may end in divorce. Thus the study of the stability of the relationship may be facilitated if researchers focus on the propensity of a

couple to dissolve an existing relationship. An intact definition of stability neglects to take into account any individuals who may think about divorce yet fail for some reason to take any action. Divorce may also be considered to be a process. Research (Goode, 1956) has shown that before divorce most couples separate for a period of time. Weiss (1975) found that one half of married individuals separated at some time with most of these separations being short term. Other researchers (Kitson, Holmes & Sussman, 1977) found that 16% of the individuals had filed for divorce without ever obtaining a final decree.

Marital stability/instability has been defined (Booth, Johnson & Edwards, 1983) as the thoughts, feelings and actions that a partner has about dissolving the relationship.

"Marital instability, conceived in this manner, suggests: (a) an affective state (how I feel about my marriage), (b) cognitions concerning the relationship (what I have thought about doing as a result of how I feel), and (c) certain actions (what I have actually done about how I feel and what I have thought)".

(Booth, et al., 1983, pp.388)

It may be that an individual has had feelings and thoughts about ending a relationship without taking any specific actions to end the relationship. As Levinger (1965) has argued there may be considerable barriers

that would keep a relationship intact even when marital quality would be low. Several researchers (Campbell et al.; 1976; Huber & Spitze, 1980; Booth & White, 1980) have thus used a cognitive measure of the stability/instability of the relationship rather than measuring whether or not the relationship was intact. These researchers asked a single question such as: "Has the thought of getting a divorce ever crossed your mind?". The results of these investigations revealed that from one quarter to one third of all individuals had given some thought to terminating their relationship.

Thinking about divorce has also been argued to be one stage in the complex process of dissolution (Booth & White, 1980). In telephone interviews with 1,364 randomly sampled married individuals in Nebraska, researchers asked respondents if they had ever thought about divorce within the last two years. Twelve percent of the females and 8% of the males reported that they had thought of terminating the relationship. A small percent (4%) of those with very happy marriages had also considered divorce. Those with happy marriages were less likely to have considered terminating the relationship than unhappy individuals. Those considering divorce had less financial security, less religious commitment, had been married at an earlier

age, and had preschoolers in the home. Unemployed individuals were unlikely to have thought about divorce no matter what their marital happiness, whereas abused partners were likely to have thought of terminating the relationship regardless of their marital happiness. Age at marriage, marital duration, religiosity and income were significantly related to thinking about divorce even when marital happiness was controlled for. These variables were related to thoughts about dissolving the relationship irrespective of marital happiness.

These findings (Booth et al., 1980) emphasize the fact that divorce is a process and that thinking about terminating the relationship is one aspect of this process. It seemed most helpful in this present study of intact couples to assess the thoughts, feelings and actions that may lead to a separation or divorce.

In this study it was argued that there would be an inverse relationship between perspective-taking and a propensity to divorce. Perspective-taking had been conceptualized as an individual variable that would facilitate interaction among married partners. It seemed reasonable to contend that this skill that would facilitate dyadic interaction would be negatively related to any feelings, thoughts or actions that may

lead to a divorce.

An Exchange Understanding of Marital Adjustment and Stability

Social exchange theories have been used extensively in the study of marital quality (Blood & Wolf, 1960; Foa & Foa, 1973; 1974; 1980; Lewis & Spanier, 1979; Rettig & Bubolz, 1983). Social exchange theorists posit that partners give and receive resources and rewards even within intimate social relationships. Resources are defined as anything spouses makes available to their partners, that enable the latter to meet their needs (Blood, 1960). Exchanges of resources such as love, information, money, and services are what influence the perceived rewards and costs of a particular relationship. Rewards are satisfactions and pleasures while costs are any actions or feelings that are unpleasant. The exchanges that take place among partners influence the perceived value of the relationship and thus impact the quality and stability of relationships.

The conceptual framework that has been outlined by Lewis and Spanier (1979) is based on a social exchange view of human interactions. The Exchange Typology of Marital Quality and Marital Stability (Lewis & Spanier, 1979) seeks to integrate findings pertaining to marital

quality and marital stability. They defined marital quality as a dynamic process, the result of interaction, and not some "static end result" (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). The quality of the relationship was the subjective evaluation of the relationship reflecting characteristics of marital interaction such as adequate communication, high levels of happiness, adjustment, satisfaction, and low levels of conflict. These theorists (Lewis & Spanier, 1979) argued that there were a large number of factors that could be perceived as being either rewarding or costly that would move the dyad along the continuum from high to low marital quality. An individual's perceptions of the rewardingness of the relationship would thus potentially increase the perceptions of quality. Costs (e.g., conflict, lack of satisfying communication) would decrease the perceptions of the quality of the relationship. The quality of the relationship was represented on a continuum ranging from high to low quality. It was argued in this present study that perspective-taking would be one of those individual factors influencing the perceptions of costs and rewards in the relationship thus impacting perceived relationship adjustment.

Lewis and Spanier (1979) defined stability only in

terms of the marriage being intact. In a cross-sectional study of intact marriage relationships a propensity to divorce is a more useful definition of stability. Relationship stability within intact married relationships has been defined as any thoughts or feelings that a person may have about terminating a relationship (Booth et al., 1983). Stable relationships are those where partners have few thoughts or feelings about terminating the partnership. Unstable marriages are those where feelings and thoughts about termination are more common. In this present study it was thought that the three dimensions of perspective-taking would be negatively related to a spouse's thoughts about terminating a relationship.

Lewis and Spanier (1979) sought to integrate findings on both marital quality and stability into their model. The central proposition of their theory was that marital quality was positively related to marital stability (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). The present study included an examination of perspective-taking as it was related to both marital adjustment and stability. It was posited that perspective-taking would be positively related to marital adjustment while being negatively related to a propensity to divorce. It was also thought that marital adjustment would be negatively related to thoughts and feelings about leaving the

relationship. Figure 1 depicts graphically the relationship between perspective-taking and marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce.

Perspective Taking as a Predictor of Marital Adjustment

There are reportedly (Somers, 1984) very few studies of perspective-taking with adult samples. The large majority of perspective-taking studies have been conducted with samples of children. Several studies have sought to assess the perspective-taking ability of college students (Franzoi, Davis, Young, 1985; Somers, 1984).

Role taking has been defined (Somers, 1984) as the ability to take into account the viewpoint of self as well as others. Somers used the Role Taking Task (Feffer, 1959) as an assessment of this property. This is a projective type assessment where subjects are asked to tell stories about an ambiguous picture from the viewpoint of five different characters. Several evaluations of the RTT have questioned its high positive correlation with IQ (Turnure, 1975) and its poor internal consistency ($r = .40$) (Kurdek, 1978). The measurement weaknesses made somewhat equivocal the finding that higher perspective-takers had significantly higher self disclosures, and reported greater intimacy to their same sex peers than did lower perspective-

takers (Somers, 1984).

Other research (Franzoi, et al., 1985) sought to assess the impact of perspective-taking on relationship satisfaction in a sample of 131 college student heterosexual couples. The seven item scale used to assess perspective-taking had adequate internal reliability (.76). The criterion validity of the measure was assessed in several studies showing positive correlations with measures theoretically related to perspective-taking (Bernstein & Davis, 1982; Davis, 1983). Perspective-taking was defined as the tendency of the person to put aside one's own perspective and adopt the perspective of the other. Satisfaction in the relationship was measured with the Marital Adjustment Test (Locke, 1951). This measure of relationship satisfaction has been assessed as valid and reliable for married partners but there is no assessment of its psychometric properties with non married couples. Other measures of relationship quality such as the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) would have been more appropriate to use with a sample of nonmarried couples.

The results of this research (Franzoi et al., 1985) revealed that perspective-taking was related to satisfaction. Males perspective-taking scores were not significantly related to females satisfaction ($r = .13$,

$p = NS$) while females perspective-taking was significantly related to male satisfaction ($r = .24, p < .05$). This research indicated that the perspective-taking of the females was significantly predictive of the males relationship satisfaction, whereas the males satisfaction was not related to the females perspective-taking. The low correlations between perspective-taking and satisfaction in this study (Franzoi, et al., 1985) may have been partially due to the fact that a person may report a general perspective-taking ability, but may not be motivated to use those skills with a partner. No measure of whether or not the individual used perspective-taking skills with a partner (dyadic perspective-taking) was assessed. This research also did not assess whether or not partner A perceived B to be using perspective-taking skills within their relationship (perceptions of dyadic perspective-taking). This study (Franzoi et al., 1985) used only a self-report measure of perspective-taking.

Researchers of the family may have presupposed a positive relationship between perspective-taking and marital quality. Lewis and Spanier (1979) argued that several studies (Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Dymond, 1954; Foote & Cottrell, 1955; Buerkle & Badgley, 1959) revealed a positive relationship between the intellectual understanding of the other, the ability to

take the perspective of the other, and the quality of the relationship. Others (Burr, 1973) later argued that there was no conclusive evidence for the hypothesized relationship. An evaluation of those studies was necessary to justify the present research.

Burgess and Wallin (1953) defined empathy as taking the role of the other, and stated that increased empathy would facilitate marital adjustment. These authors however failed to offer any empirical evidence for this relationship. In a similar fashion other authors (Foote & Cottrel, 1955) hypothesized a relationship between the two variables but offered no empirical support. The later group of researchers presented hypotheses that needed to be tested by empirical research.

An empirical evaluation of perspective-taking was attempted with two groups of married couples (Buerkle & Badgley, 1959). The first group was composed of 36 troubled couples in counseling all reporting serious marital problems. Group two consisted of 186 religiously affiliated couples who were described as nontroubled. Forty vignettes of husbands and wives in conflict type situations were presented to the subjects. They were asked to respond with one of four alternatives that would most closely represent their behavior in

these hypothetical conflicts. The forced choice alternatives gave the respondents the opportunity of taking the perspective of the other or not. The first choice always represented the most egocentric response, while the last choice always portrayed the individual as a good perspective-taker, acting in an altruistic manner. A chi square analysis revealed that there were significant differences with the well adjusted group being the better perspective-takers.

These results (Buerkle & Badgley, 1959) lend credence to the notion that perspective-taking is positively related to marital adjustment. The findings however are somewhat tentative as the validity and reliability of the measure of perspective-taking was not evaluated. The authors operationalized a measure of perspective-taking but made no attempts to assess its validity or reliability. Response sets may also have been likely in this research (Buerkle & Badgley, 1959). Response alternatives should have been randomized so that individuals would not have developed a response set, always selecting the last, altruistic alternative. It may have been that the sample of well adjusted couples would have been more likely to repeatedly choose the last alternative. Always choosing the fourth option may have been the most socially desirable response for a religious group of couples, as this would have given

evidence of "living by the golden rule".

Another attempt to study perspective-taking (Dymond, 1950) was conducted on a homogeneous sample of 80 students, (41 males 39 females) in a social psychology class. The mean age of the students was 22.7 years. Perspective-taking was operationalized by asking individuals to rate themselves on a bipolar differential semantic scale representing six personality traits: superior - inferior, friendly - unfriendly, leader - follower, shy - self assured, sympathetic - unsympathetic, secure - insecure. These same individuals were then asked to predict how other group members would rate themselves on the same six traits. It was argued that in order to predict accurately the person would have to adopt the perspective of the other individual. Later research (Taylor, 1967) also used similar prediction methods to measure perspective-taking with married couples. Perspective-taking was defined as the correct prediction of a partner's score on an interpersonal checklist and was found to be marginally related to marital adjustment.

Although the original authors of this prediction method of measuring perspective-taking (Cottrell & Dymond, 1949) stated that the measure was rather crude, others have more seriously questioned its validity

(Hastorf & Bender, 1952; Deutsch & Malde, 1975). It was argued that individuals may project their own responses on to another's situation rather than take the perspective of the other. If a person was very similar to a partner, and they projected their own response they would be perceived as being a good perspective taker. If the individual was very different to the partner, and they projected their own response then they would be perceived as being a poor perspective-taker. This may have been a confounding factor in these early studies of perspective taking. To control for this problem of projection, other researchers credited subjects with a perspective-taking response only when the response predicted for the partner was different than their own (Hobart & Klausner, 1959). In this later study of married full time students there was no significant relationship between adjustment and perspective-taking for males, and a negative relationship for females.

A more recent study of perspective-taking and marital satisfaction (Boettcher, 1977) was conducted with a sample of 25 couples who had been in marital counseling. The couples had been married an average of 6 years. The average age of the participants was 27. Researchers had subjects complete the Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) at the beginning of therapy and again 7 months later. The Relationship

Inventory was purported to be a measure of empathy assessing the degree to which partners understood the thinking, feeling and actions of their spouse. Partners rated their spouses on each of the 14 items in the Inventory. In the results of the study the authors argued that improved empathy scores were significantly related to marital satisfaction. The validity of this scale as a measure of perspective-taking has been questioned. Recent factor analyses of the scale (Schumm, Jurich & Bolland, 1980; Schumm, Bolland & Jurich, 1981) revealed that the entire scale score included factors of empathy, positive regard, and congruence. Thus a summed scale score as was used in the study (Boettcher, 1977) would not have been conceptually meaningful as a measure of perspective-taking. A total scale score included factors of empathy, positive regard, and perspective-taking. Although the results showed a positive relationship between perspective-taking and marital satisfaction the results were conceptually ambiguous.

The results of these studies of perspective-taking ability and marital quality are not conclusive (Burr, 1973) primarily because of a lack of valid and reliable measures. A recent review of measures of empathy (Chlopan, McCain, Carbonell & Hagen, 1985) defined as

putting yourself in the place of another, contended that the measure developed by Dymond (1949) had questionable validity and was difficult to administer. Other earlier measures of perspective-taking (Kerr & Speroff, 1954) also were assessed as having inconclusive evidence of validity and reliability. The two measures that were reviewed (Chlopan et al., 1985) as having empirically assessed reliability and validity were Hogans Empathy Scale (Hogan, 1962) and the perspective-taking subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980).

Dyadic Perspective Taking

Research that examines the impact of perspective-taking on the marital adjustment of a relationship should examine the general ability to take the perspective of the other, and the use of those skills within a specific dyad. It may be that individuals in relationships that are highly conflicted may not be motivated to understand the perceptions of their partner. The use of perspective-taking skills within the context of a specific relationship was defined in this study as dyadic perspective-taking. It seemed logical to assert that dyadic perspective-taking would also be positively related to marital adjustment and negatively related to a propensity to divorce.

Perceptions Of Dyadic Perspective-Taking

Additionally the perceptions of the perspective taking of a partner would also be related to marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. Incongruent or distorted perceptions have been argued to differentiate between well and maladjusted relationships (Sillars, 1985). Individuals have been shown to be less likely to perceive their partner as well thought of, respected by others, friendly, affectionate, considerate, or helpful, the longer they were married (Luckey, 1960). Thus the longer a couple is married, the more negative their perceptions of a partner may become (Newman, 1981).

A lack of congruence about perceptions of the marital relationship has been commonly reported in the marriage literature. Individuals have been shown to lack agreement over who won marital disagreements, and who made decisions in the family (Turk & Bell, 1972). Research with marital couples has shown repeatedly that husbands and wives perceive the adjustment of their relationship differently. These studies reveal much less than a perfect positive correlation (Burgess & Cottrell, 1936; Dean, 1966; Locke, 1951; Spanier, 1972, 1972b, 1973; Spanier & Cole, 1973; Terman & Orden, 1947). Correlation coefficients between husband and wife scores of marital adjustment in the above studies ranged

from .39 to .88. One understanding of this lack of congruence has been differing perceptions of the relationship (Spanier et al., 1976).

The nature of interpersonal relationships in and of itself may account for some of the lack of agreement in perceptions (Sillars, 1985). Individuals have been shown to overestimate their knowledge about their partners (Shapiro & Swensen, 1969). Assuming that they have accurate perceptions of their partner they seek less information from a spouse (Pavitt & Capella, 1979). Familiarity thus may be one aspect of intimate relationships that impacts the perceptions of a partners perspective-taking.

Since couples may perceive their relationship differently, it was thought that the relationship between perspective-taking and marital adjustment would be mediated by the perceptions of the perspective-taking ability of a partner. One early researcher (Kelly, 1941) argued that perceptions of the personality of a spouse was more important to marital compatibility than the actual personality characteristics of an individual. Kelly administered a personality rating scale to 76 couples. Each individual rated self and the spouse on 36 separate items. He found that compatibility was positively related to favorable self ratings, yet ratings by a spouse were even more favorably related to

compatibility. Others (Preston, Peltz, Mudd & Froscher, 1952) with a sample of happy and unhappily married couples (n=171) found that less happily married men judged their wives more severely than the happily married men. Thus the perceptions of a partner's dyadic perspective taking were expected to be an important influence on the perceptions of marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce.

Additional Analyses

Time Spent With a Partner

It has been shown that satisfied and dissatisfied couples spend proportionately differing amounts of time together. Birchler and Webb (1977) found that happily married couples spent a larger proportion of their free time with each other and less time alone than unhappy couples. It seemed reasonable that individuals perceived as being good perspective-takers would also be perceived as being able to provide more positive interactions with a spouse. Thus the total proportion of time spent interacting with a partner would be positively related to the general measure of perspective-taking, dyadic perspective-taking, and the perceptions of a partner's dyadic perspective-taking.

Pleasantness of Interaction With a Partner

No previous research had sought to ascertain the influence of dimensions of perspective-taking on the perceived pleasantness of interaction with a married partner. It was expected that the three dimensions of perspective-taking would be positively related to the perceived satisfaction and pleasantness of interaction with a spouse. Individuals who are perceived as understanding the point of view of their spouses would be more sensitive to the needs and desires of their partners. Research indicated (Davis, 1983) in a sample of college students that perspective-taking was positively related to a measure of sensitivity to the feelings of others ($r = .35$). Time spent with these perspective-takers may be perceived as being more rewarding than time spent with poorer perspective-takers. Thus it was argued that the three dimensions of perspective-taking would be positively associated with the satisfaction and pleasantness of interaction with a spouse.

Similarity of Perspective-Taking

It was expected that individual members of a couple who had similar scores on measures of perspective taking would have improved scores on marital adjustment. In a

sample of 8 happy and 7 unhappy couples (Dymond, 1954) partners were asked to fill out 115 items of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. They were asked to answer the items for themselves and then predict how their spouses would respond on the items. The happy group of couples were significantly more alike in their self-descriptions than were the unhappy group (happy group mean, 32.37, unhappy group mean, 25.14, $p < .01$). This same study revealed that unhappy couples underestimated the actual differences that existed between the individuals, making more errors in predicting similarity between themselves and their spouses.

Other researchers, showed that wives and husbands who described themselves as being similar on an adjective checklist had higher adjustment scores (Murstein & Beck, 1972). Sixty middle class married couples completed a bipolar checklist describing themselves their ideal self, spouse, and ideal spouse (Murstein & Beck, 1972). The results of this research revealed that spouses with similar scores had higher marital adjustment scores on the Lock Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale. Similar responses on a personality inventory, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, with 35 well and 35 maladjusted couples (Newmark, et al., 1977) also gave evidence to confirm

the idea that more satisfied couples were more similar to each other in their responses than were unsatisfied couples. The well adjusted group stated that 233 of the items were true self descriptions, while the unsatisfied group endorsed only 194 items. There was significantly more similarity of self description among the satisfied group ($t(68) = 5.59, P < .001$). Thus it was expected for both husbands and wives that there would be a negative relationship between the discrepancy of perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking scores and marital adjustment.

Summary

Perspective-taking has been construed as a variable salient to marital interaction, yet widely ignored by marriage and family researchers. Perspective-taking was defined as the ability to understand the point of view of another, to see things from the vantage point of others. This ability was seen as being important to a wide array of social interaction including marital functioning. Awareness of the point of view of a spouse would enable a partner to fit in with the spouse's expectations, enable husbands and wives to regulate their behavior in ways pleasing to spouses, and give partners information about a spouse's desires, wishes,

and interests. It was thought that the information gained through perspective-taking would facilitate a more tactful style of marital interaction.

In this study husbands and wives reported on their own and their partner's perspective-taking skills. The perspective-taking of one partner was seen as being consequential to the marital adjustment and divorce propensity of the other spouse. Three dimensions of perspective-taking were examined. A general measure assessed the use of perspective-taking skills in general social interaction. A dyadic measure examined perspective-taking in the context of a specific marital relationship. A third instrument explored the perceptions of the perspective-taking skills of a spouse. It was expected that each of these dimensions of perspective taking would be predictive of the marital adjustment of both husbands and wives. Similarly it was expected that husbands and wives skilled in perspective-taking would be married to spouses less likely to be thinking about ending their marriages.

Additional analyses were undertaken to further explore the relationship between perspective-taking and pleasantness of interaction with the spouse, proportion of time spent with a partner and the discrepancy between husbands and wives perspective-taking ability. Expectations were that perspective-taking would be a

variable predictive of marital adjustment and stability.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1 An individual's reported perspective-taking, will be a significant positive predictor of a partner's marital adjustment.

Hypothesis #2 An individual's reported use of perspective-taking within the context of the marital relationship will be a significant positive predictor of the partner's marital adjustment.

Hypothesis #3 An individual's perceptions of a partner's use of perspective-taking within the marital dyad will be a significant positive predictor of one's own marital adjustment.

Hypothesis #4 An individual's reported perspective-taking will be a significant negative predictor of a partner's propensity to divorce.

Hypothesis #5 An individual's use of reported perspective-taking within the context of a specific relationship will be a significant negative predictor of a partner's propensity to divorce.

Hypothesis #6 Individuals perceptions of their partner's use of perspective taking within their own

relationship will be a significant negative predictor of one's own propensity to divorce.

III. Method

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 159 intact married couples, each of whom had a child attending Oregon State University. Only parents who were married at the time of the study were contacted. While there were a small percentage of the individuals in the sample who had been previously married, the majority of both the males and the females (72% males, 79% females) were in their first marriages. A complete description of the sample is presented in chapter four.

Procedures

Sample Selection

A group of students in several human development and family studies classes at Oregon State University were asked to give the names of their parents for possible participation in a study of marital adjustment and stability. The students provided names, addresses, and relationship status (Appendix A). The married couples were contacted by mail with a brief description of the study and instructions to have each spouse complete the questionnaires separately. In an effort to maximize the response rate, an adapted form of the protocol for mailing questionnaires outlined by Dillman, (1978) was followed.

The first mailing included two questionnaires, two return envelopes, and a cover letter explaining the importance of the research (Appendix B). One week after the original mailing, a postcard was sent as a courteous thank you and reminder for those who had not yet responded (Appendix C). At the third week interval the final letter and questionnaires informed the respondents that at least one spouse had not yet responded (Appendix D). All of the questionnaires were stamped with an identification number on the front of the first page so that follow up mailings were sent only to those individuals who had not responded.

Design

The predictor variables examined in this study were the following:

1. a self-report of perspective-taking
2. a self-report of dyadic perspective-taking
3. perception's of the dyadic perspective-taking ability of the spouse
4. the discrepancy of the partner's perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking scores.

The outcome variables analyzed in this research were:

1. marital adjustment
2. a self report of behavioral interaction with a partner
 - a. pleasantness of interaction
 - b. proportion of total time spent with a spouse
3. the propensity to divorce

The impact and magnitude of the predictor variables on the outcome variables was assessed by multiple regression analysis.

Measurement of the Predictor Variables

The perspective taking (PT) subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980; Appendix J) was used to assess the tendency of the individual to adopt the point of view of others. The PT is a seven item Likert-type scale used to assess the ability to step outside one's own perspective in dealing with other people.

This scale has been shown to be internally consistent and stable over time on a sample of 570 male and 582 female introductory psychology students (Davis, 1980). The alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) for males and females respectively were .71 and .75 (Davis, 1980). The test re-test reliability over a two month period was for males .61 and for females .62 (Davis, 1980).

The construct validity of the test was assessed by factor analysis with oblique rotation. Each of the seven items loaded clearly on the perspective taking scale with factor scores ranging from .47 to .74. None of these items loaded significantly on any other subscale factor of the IRI (Davis, 1980).

Additional research (Davis, 1983) on a sample of 225 male and 235 female introductory psychology students sought to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of the PT scale. The PT scale was

significantly related to an "other-oriented sensitivity" measure (e.g., The F Scale, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) ($r = .35$), positively related to self esteem (e.g., The Texas Social Behavior Inventory, Helmreich, Stapp, & Ervin, 1974) ($r = .23$), and negatively related to a measure of social dysfunction (e.g., The Femininity Verbal Passive Aggressive Scale, of the Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire, Spence, Helmreich, & Holohan, 1979) ($r = -.22$).

Instrument Development

The dyadic perspective-taking scale (DPT) and the perceptions of dyadic perspective-taking scale (PDPT) were developed by the present researcher. The DPT is a self-report measure of perspective-taking skills used in the context of a specific relationship. The PDPT, also a self-report measure, assessed the perceptions of a partner's use of perspective-taking skills within the context of the relationship. A review of the literature revealed that no previous scales had been developed to measure either of these concepts.

An original pool of 46 items, 23 for the DPT (Appendix E) and 23 for the PDPT (Appendix F) was pretested at two times on two different samples of young adults who were either married or seriously dating one individual. The items of the DPT and PDPT were adapted

from previous cognitive empathy or perspective taking measures (eg. The Interpersonal Reactivity Index, Davis, 1980; The Relationship Inventory, Barrett-Lennard, 1962; The Hogan Empathy Scale, Hogan, 1969; and The Peer Role-Taking Questionnaire, Moser, 1984).

An original psychometric assessment of these measures was undertaken on two samples of college students. The first assessment of the reliability and validity of the Dyadic Perspective-Taking, and the Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scales was undertaken on 88 college students (78 females, 10 males) who were either married or seriously dating one individual. The mean age of these respondents was 19.35 years.

Construct validity determines specifically what factors or properties explain the variance of the test (Kerlinger, 1973). The most powerful method of assessing construct validity is factor analysis (Kerlinger, 1973). An orthogonal factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to assess the construct validity of the scales. Items were only included in the final scale if they met the criteria outlined as being important in interpreting factor scores (Tabachnick, Fidell, 1983): (1) only factors with eigenvalues ≥ 1 . were used and (2) factor loadings $\geq .40$ were used to

define and name the factor. Those items with the highest loadings were given greater attention in naming the factors. Six items (items 12, 17, 18, 19, 25, 28) were dropped from the original DPT scale since they did not have factor loadings on either of the two factors at values greater than .40.

Item analysis is an additional method of ascertaining the construct validity of each of the items in a scale (Kerlinger, 1973). Items that had item-total correlations less than .30 were also dropped from the scale. One item (item 11) from the DPT scale was deleted since it had an item total correlation less than .30. The Alpha coefficient for the final 16 items of the DPT was (.89) with item-total correlations ranging from .34 to .66.

In the DPT scale, two interpretable factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 emerged from the factor analysis. Factor 1, the strategies factor (Eigenvalue 5.73) accounted for 76% of the total scale variance. Factor 2, the cognizance factor (eigenvalue 1.81) accounted for 24% of the variance of the scale. A complete reporting of the item-total correlations, factor scores, and Alpha Coefficient for this first sample of 88 students can be found in Appendix G.

The perceptions of the partner's use of perspective-taking within the relationship (PDPT) was

also included in this first assessment. Once again two interpretable factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 emerged from the analysis. Factor 1, the strategies factor (eigenvalue 9.38) accounted for 86% of the scale variance. Factor 2, the cognizance factor (eigenvalue 1.54) accounted for 14% of the scale variance. Only three items (items 35, 36, 42) were deleted from the scale because of factor loadings less than .40, while no additional items were deleted as a result of the item analysis. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the 20 items of the PDPT was (.95) with item total correlations ranging from .54 to .76. See Appendix G for a complete reporting of the factor scores, item-total correlations and Alpha coefficients.

Approximately 12 weeks later an additional assessment of the measures was conducted with a sample of 189 college students (167 females, 22 males) who were also married or seriously dating one individual. The mean age of the respondents was 20.72 years.

Similar factors and alpha coefficients emerged from these analyses. Factor 1 of the DPT scale, the strategies factor accounted for 82% of the scale variance (eigenvalue 5.58) while factor 2, the cognizance factor accounted for 18% of the scale variance (eigenvalue 1.20). The Alpha coefficient for

the 16 items of the DPT was .89 with item-total correlations ranging from .30 to .75.

In the PDPT scale factor 1, the strategies factor accounted for 88% of the scale variance (eigenvalue 8.45) while factor 2, the cognizance factor accounted for 12% of the scale variance (eigenvalue 1.16). The Alpha coefficient for the final 20 items of the PDPT was .93 with item-total correlations ranging from .51 to .75. A complete reporting of the factor scores, item-total correlations and Alpha coefficients for the DPT and PDPT, on this second sample of 118 college students can be found in Appendix H and I.

The initial analysis with the 88 college students was used to delete items that were not reliable or valid measures of perspective-taking. All further deletion of items was undertaken only on the sample of 159 married couples. The additional analyses of the reliability and validity of these measures on the sample of couples in this study are presented in chapter four.

Discrepancy perspective-taking scores were calculated by subtracting the husband score from the wife score and squaring the result to remove any negative values

$$(\text{husband perspective-taking score} - \text{wife perspective-taking score})^2 \quad (\text{HPT-WPT})^2 .$$

A similar procedure was followed to calculate the

discrepancy between the husband and wife dyadic perspective-taking scores

$$\frac{(\text{husband dyadic perspective-taking score} - \text{wife dyadic perspective-taking})^2}{2} - \frac{(\text{HDPT} - \text{WDPT})^2}{2}$$

Measurement of the Outcome Variables

Marital adjustment was measured by the 32 item Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) (Appendix K). The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) is a self report measure that can be easily completed in several minutes. The reliability and validity of the measure has been assessed on samples of divorced, separated, intact married and cohabitating couples (Spanier, 1976; Spanier & Thompson, 1982). Non probability samples of 50 separated, 245 divorced, and 218 white married persons were included in the psychometric assessment. A measure of the internal consistency of the scale, Cronbach's alpha, is .96 (Spanier, 1976).

The content validity of the scale was assessed by three judges (Spanier, 1976). Each item was assessed according to whether it was a relevant measure of adjustment for contemporary intimate relationships, and consistent with the definitional criteria of adjustment (Spanier, 1976).

Criterion related validity was assessed by

correlating the DAS with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959) ($r = .87, p < .001$) (Spanier, 1976). Each item in the scale was shown to discriminate at the .001 level, between groups of divorced and married couples (Spanier, 1976). Construct validity was assessed through factor analysis. Factor analysis with oblique rotation revealed four interrelated components of adjustment; dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, and affectional expression. Later attempts to replicate the factor structure (Spanier & Thompson, 1982; Sharpley & Cross, 1982) on a sample of 205 divorced and separated persons confirmed the use of the DAS as a global measure of adjustment.

The stability/instability of the marriage relationship was measured by an abbreviated form of the Marital Instability Index (MII) (Booth, Johnson, & Edwards, 1983). Five self-report items assessed the stability of the intact relationships (Appendix L). The measure was assessed on a national probability sample of 2,034 married men and women under 55 years of age. The sample was found to be representative of U.S. Census estimates of young and middle aged married persons within the continental U.S. with respect to age, race, household size, presence of children, region, and female labor-force participation (Booth & Johnson, 1983).

The coefficient alpha of the abbreviated scale is .75. These five items account for 89% of the variance of the total scale score (Booth et al., 1983) and thus are a very adequate representation of the 30 item scale.

Criterion related validity was assessed by having 36 judges rate the reported behaviors on the Marital Instability Index with the possibility that they would lead to divorce. A Spearman correlation coefficient (.80) revealed that MII scores were highly correlated with behaviors judged as being serious with respect to possible divorce.

The MII was also significantly related to other variables previously seen in the research as predicting divorce or separation. Race, religion, place of residence, female employment, and parental marital dissolution were all significantly related to the Marital Instability Scores in the direction predicted. This gave further evidence of the criterion related validity of the scale (Booth et al., 1983).

The proportion of time spent with a partner and the pleasantness of that time was assessed by three questions adapted from the Activities Checklist (AC) (Surra, 1980) (Appendix M). One global question assessed the pleasantness of interaction with a partner on a five point Likert scale ranging from, "activity

with partner is very unpleasant and unsatisfying", to "activity with partner is very pleasant and satisfying". Two other questions assessed the amount of time spent with a partner in leisure activities, and all available time during the past seven days. The validity and reliability of these three global questions was not assessed as they did not constitute specific measures of a property. The examination of perspective-taking as it related to partners' behavioral interactions with each other was exploratory in nature, endeavoring to provide direction for future research using fully developed scales of the properties.

Demographic Data

Demographic information was compiled in an effort to accurately describe the sample (Appendix N). Information including age, sex, relationship status, education, income, number of children, years of marriage, and months dated before getting married was collected.

Data Analysis

The predictor variables for the analysis were perspective-taking, dyadic perspective-taking, perceptions of dyadic perspective-taking, and discrepancy scores. The outcome variables were marital

adjustment, a propensity to divorce, pleasantness of behavioral interaction and proportion of total time spent with a spouse.

Standard and hierarchical multiple regression analysis were used to assess the impact of the predictor variables on each outcome variable. Multiple regression is a method of studying the impact and magnitude of several predictor variables on one outcome variable (Kerlinger, 1973). In a standard regression all of the independent variables are entered into the equation at once. (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). In a hierarchical regression the user can specify the order that the predictor variables are entered into the model. The use of this method allows the researcher to ascertain the unique variance of each predictor variable, by forcing it into the equation after all of the other variables have been entered. Thus using both standard and hierarchical regression analyses allows the researcher to determine the contribution of a group of independent variables on the dependent variable as well as the assessment of a particular independent variable, with all of the other independent variables controlled for.

Restatement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the impact of several aspects of perspective-taking on the marital functioning of a sample of intact couples. A general self-report measure of perspective-taking, a self-report of dyadic perspective-taking and the perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking were all examined. Each of these dimensions of perspective-taking were hypothesized to be positively related to marital adjustment and negatively related to a propensity to divorce.

IV. Results

Sample

The subjects for this study were 159 intact married couples. Spouses ranged in age from 29 to 73. The mean age of the wives was 47, the husband's mean age was 50. Two hundred and thirty nine couples were contacted by mail and 67% (159) of the dyads responded by returning completed questionnaires. At least one member from 77% of the couples responded by completing a survey. For 92% of the wives and 80% of the husbands this was their first marriage. The couples had been married an average of 23 years. A detailed description of the demographic data for the sample including income, number of children, and years of education can be found in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Description of the Sample

	n	% of Total Sample
Couples Contacted	239	100%
Couples Responded	159	67%
One member responded	23	10%
Wives responded	178	74%
Husbands responded	164	67%
Wives first marriage	169	92%
Wives second marriage	7	4%
Wives third marriage	1	.6%
Wives fourth marriage	1	.6%
Husbands first marriage	132	80%
Husbands second marriage	29	16%
Husbands third marriage	3	2%
		Mean
Age Husband		49.87
Age Wife		47.38
Mean number of months dated		20.24
Mean number of children for Wives		3.152
Mean number of children for husbands		3.183
Mean number of children living at home		.92
Mean number of years married to spouse		23.8

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Description of the Sample

		Mean

Mean years of education for husbands		15.29
Mean years of education for Wives		14.31

	Mode	% of n

Income for husbands	>\$40,000.	32.2%
Income for wives	<\$5,000.	27.9%

A report of the means and standard deviations of all of the scale scores is found in Table 2. Similarly the Pearson product moment correlations of the three perspective-taking scales, the dyadic adjustment scale and the marital instability scale can be found in Table 3. These zero-order correlational analyses revealed that the general measure of perspective-taking was significantly positively related to marital adjustment but was not significantly negatively related to a propensity to divorce. Dyadic perspective-taking and perceptions of a partner's dyadic perspective-taking were both positively related to marital adjustment and negatively related to a propensity to divorce as had been hypothesized.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Perspective-Taking,
Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Perceptions of Dyadic
Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Adjustment, and Marital
Instability Scale Scores

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Perspective-Taking	17.979	3.963
Dyadic Perspective-Taking	35.497	7.461
Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking	47.970	15.485
Dyadic Adjustment	115.252	16.239
Propensity to Divorce	1.510	2.121

TABLE 3

Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking, Dyadic Adjustment, and Propensity to Divorce Scale Scores

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. PT	1.00	.49**	.07*	.08**	.04
2. DPT		1.00	.52**	.56**	-.33**
3. PDPT			1.00	.67**	-.50**
4. DAS				1.00	-.65**
5. MII					1.00

Note. PT = Perspective-Taking Scale, DPT, = Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale, PDPT = Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale, DAS = Dyadic Adjustment Scale, MII = Marital Instability Scale.

* $p \leq .10$. ** $p \leq .001$.

Instrument Development

Further assessments of the reliability and validity of the Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale (DPT) and the Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale (PDPT) were conducted on the sample of the 159 married couples. In the first assessment of the 16 items of the Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale husbands' and wives' scores were analyzed together ($n = 366$). Once again a two factor solution emerged. Factor 1, the cognizance factor, (eigenvalue 5.62) accounted for 82% of the scale variance while factor 2, the strategies factor, (eigenvalue 1.23) accounted for 18% of the scale variance. Fifteen of the sixteen items loaded on only one of the factors at $\geq .40$. Item-total correlations for each of the 16 items ranged from .42 to .70. The Alpha Coefficient for the 16 items on this sample of 366 married individuals was .89. A complete listing of factor scores, and item-total correlations can be found in Appendix H.

Similarly, analyses were made on the Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale (PDPT). Factor 1, the strategies factor, (eigenvalue 9.27) accounted for 84% of the scale variance while factor 2, the cognizance factor, (eigenvalue 1.78) accounted for 16% of the scale variance. Item-total correlations ranged from .54 to

.75. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the 20 items of the PDPT was .94. A complete reporting of the factor loadings and item-total correlations on the sample of 366 married individuals can be found in Appendix I. No further items were dropped from the scales when husbands and wives were both included in the assessment.

A final series of analyses were conducted on all of the items in both the DPT and PDPT scales to ascertain whether each of the items was a reliable and valid item for males and females separately. Three final items were deleted from the Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale because they loaded on one factor for the males and on the other factor for the females, or because factor loadings on both factors were less than .40. The factor structure for this analysis was very similar to that when males and females were both included in the analysis. A complete listing of the factor scores and item-total correlations can be found for the 16 item scale in Appendix O.

Only 13 items were included in the final version of the DPT. One hundred and fifty nine husbands and 172 wives were included in this assessment. A two factor solution was derived from this analysis with factor 1 being the cognizance factor and factor 2 being the strategies factor. Cronbach's Alpha for the males was .86 and for the females was .88. A complete reporting

of this final assessment of the DPT when males and females were analyzed separately can be found in Appendix Q. This final analysis of the 13 item DPT confirmed previous assessments that the scale was a reliable and valid measure of perspective-taking within the context of a specific dyad.

The 20 items of the Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale were also included in this final assessment where the male and female factor structures were observed separately. Examination of the factor loadings and item-total correlations resulted in no further items being deleted from the PDPT scale. For both males and females each of the items loaded on only one factor at the .40 level. A two factor structure also emerged with factor 1 being the strategies factor and factor 2 being the cognizance factor. The Coefficient Alpha with the final 20 items for males was .93 and for females was .95. A complete reporting of the factor loadings, item-total correlations and Alpha Coefficients when males and females were analyzed separately can be found in Appendix P. This final analysis gave further corroboration that the PDPT was a valid and reliable measure of the perceptions of the perspective-taking of one's partner.

Items that load on one factor may be used as

subscales of the entire scale (Kerlinger, 1973). To assess the reliability and validity of the subscales, Alpha Coefficients and item-total correlations were assessed on each of the four subscales. Once again both males and females were included together in the analysis. Analyses were also performed where male and female scores were assessed separately.

The two subscales of the DPT scale were the strategies and the cognizance scales. When males and females were combined in the analysis the 8 items (items 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33) of the cognizance subscale had an Alpha coefficient of .85. Item-total correlations ranged from .44 to .70. The 5 items of the strategies subscale (items 24, 26, 27, 29, 30) of the DPT had an Alpha coefficient of .82 with item-total correlations ranging from .56 to .69. A complete listing of the item-total correlations for each of the subscales of the DPT can be found in Appendix R. Very similar results were found when analyses were done separately on the husbands and the wives. A complete listing of the item-total correlations when husbands and wives results were analyzed separately can be found in Appendix R. These results confirm the use of the subscales of the DPT as separate measures of two dimensions of dyadic perspective-taking.

Confirmatory analyses were also conducted on the

two subscales of the PDPT. The results of the item-total correlations when husbands and wives scores were combined revealed that these two subscales could also be used as separate scales. The 8 items (items, 37, 39, 43, 44, 46, 48, 51, 54) of the cognizance subscale of the PDPT had an Alpha coefficient of .89 with item-total correlations ranging from .59 to .75. The 12 items of the strategies subscale (items 34, 38, 40, 41, 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56) had an Alpha Coefficient of .94 with item-total correlations ranging from .64 to .81. A complete listing of item-total correlations and Alpha coefficients when males and females were analyzed together and separately can be found in Appendix S.

Analyses

Multiple regression analyses were used to answer the six hypotheses. Multiple regression analysis ascertains the impact of a group of independent variables on a dependent variable. It assesses how the dependent variable (marital adjustment, or a propensity to divorce) is dependent upon the independent variables (the three dimensions of perspective-taking). Simple regression enters all of the independent variables into the equation at once and evaluates whether or not each independent variable significantly accounts for variance

in the dependent variable. Simple regression also assesses the cumulative variance accounted for by all of the independent variables in the equation. In the regression analyses perspective-taking, dyadic perspective-taking and perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking were the three independent variables. Marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce were the dependent variables.

A hierarchical regression allows the researcher to enter the variables into the equation in a specified order. Entering an independent variable into the equation last enables the researcher to ascertain the unique variance, the amount of variance accounted for above and beyond those already in the equation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). This analysis allows the researcher to ascertain the impact of one aspect of perspective-taking above and beyond the other two dimensions of perspective-taking.

Hypothesis #1

Perspective-taking as measured on the PT scale (Davis, 1980) was to be a significant positive predictor of the marital adjustment of the partner. This hypothesis was evaluated by using a simple multiple regression analysis. In the simple multiple regression analysis, perspective-taking made a significant

contribution to marital adjustment for both husbands and wives. Table 4 and Table 5 give the summary table for the simple regression analysis of the husbands and wives separately.

Hierarchical regression analyses were also performed and perspective-taking was entered into the regression equation last to calculate the unique variance of that variable upon marital adjustment (see Table 6 and Table 7). The perspective-taking of the wives was a significant predictor of the husband's marital adjustment accounting for a unique 8% of the variance in dyadic adjustment scores. Husband's perspective-taking accounted for 4% of the unique variance in the wife's dyadic adjustment scores. Hypothesis #1 was supported. For both males and females perspective-taking significantly entered into the regression equation and accounted for unique amounts of variance in a partner's marital adjustment.

TABLE 4

Simple Multiple Regression of Wife's Perspective-Taking
on the Husband's Dyadic Adjustment

Variable	B	F	P-Value
Wife's Perspective- taking	-9.159	20.57	.0001
Wife's dyadic perspective- taking	8.58	20.02	.0001
Husband's perception of wife	11.51	54.88	.0001

Note. Residual degrees of freedom = 119

RSQ with all variables in the model = .52

TABLE 5

Simple Multiple Regression of Husband's Perspective
Taking on the Wive's Dyadic Adjustment

Variable	B	F	P-Value
Husband's perspective- taking	-6.18	10.57	.0001
Husband's dyadic perspective- taking	5.60	6.95	.009
Wife's perceptions of husband	14.75	144.62	.00001

Note. Residual degrees of freedom = 119

RSQ with all variables in the model = .58

TABLE 6

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Wive's Perspective
Taking on the Husband's Dyadic Adjustment

Variable	Unique Variance	F	P-Value
Wive's			
Perspective-Taking	.08345	20.57	.0001
Dyadic	.08122	21.02	.0001
Perspective-Taking			
Cognizance Subscale	.01773	3.74	.056
Strategies Subscale	.03300	6.95	.010
Husbands Perceptions	.22266	54.88	.0001
of Wife			
Cognizance Subscale	.03380	8.267	.005
Strategies Subscale	.07358	17.995	.0001

TABLE 7

Hierarchical Regression Of Husband's Perspective-Taking
on the Wive's Dyadic Adjustment

Variable	Unique Variance	F	P-Value
Husband's			
Perspective-Taking	.03678	10.57	.001
Dyadic			
Perspective-Taking	.02418	6.95	.009
Cognizance			
	.01398	3.69	.057
Strategies			
	.00014	.023	.880
Wife's Perceptions			
of Husband	.50300	144.62	.00001
Cognizance			
	.07484	21.465	.0001
Strategies			
	.05653	16.215	.0001

Hypothesis #2

The degree to which the individual sought to understand the perspective of the marital partner (dyadic perspective-taking) was also to be predictive of relationship adjustment. Once again a simple multiple regression analysis evaluated the impact of dyadic perspective-taking on the partner's marital adjustment (see Table 4 and Table 5). For both wives and husbands, a partner's use of dyadic perspective-taking was predictive of marital adjustment. The wife's dyadic perspective-taking was a significant predictor of the husband's marital adjustment accounting for 8% of the unique variance in marital adjustment. Similarly the husband's dyadic perspective-taking was a predictor of the wife's marital adjustment accounting for 2% of the unique variance in the wife's adjustment scores (see Table 6 and Table 7). The second hypothesis was also supported. Whether or not a spouse used perspective-taking skills within the context of the marital relationship was predictive of the partner's marital adjustment.

The cognizance and strategies subscales of the DPT were also analyzed and the wife's cognizance and strategies were both significant predictors of the husband's dyadic adjustment. The wife's cognizance accounted for 2% of the unique variance while her

strategies accounted for 3% of the unique variance in the husband's marital adjustment. The husband's cognizance accounted for 1% ($p = .056$) while the specific strategies he reported accounted for less than 1% of the unique variance in the wives dyadic adjustment. Spouses who report perspective-taking within their marriage have partners who are better adjusted than spouses who fail to report the use of perspective-taking.

Hypothesis #3

Perceptions of a partner's dyadic perspective taking was also to be predictive of marital adjustment. The simple regression analysis revealed that perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking was a significant predictor of both husband's and wife's marital adjustment (Table 4 and Table 5). The husband's perceptions of his wife's perspective-taking accounted for 22% of the variance in his marital adjustment. Similarly the wife's perceptions of her husband's dyadic perspective taking accounted for 50% of the variance in her dyadic adjustment. Whether or not a partner was perceived as being sensitive to "my point of view" was predictive of my own marital adjustment. The third hypothesis was strongly supported.

The cognizance and strategies subscales of the PDPT were also analyzed to ascertain whether or not they were predictive of marital adjustment. The husband's perceptions of his wife's cognizance was predictive of a 3% of the variance in his marital adjustment while his perceptions of her strategies was predictive of 7% of his adjustment. The wife's perceptions of the husband's cognizance was predictive of 7% of her adjustment while her perceptions of his strategies was predictive of 6% of the variance in her adjustment. The perceived perspective-taking ability of a partner is positively related to one's own marital adjustment. Husbands and wives are better adjusted if they have a partner that can see things from the point of view of their spouse.

Hypothesis #4

Perspective-taking of both husbands and wives was also to be negatively related to a propensity to divorce. For both husbands and wives, perspective-taking significantly entered into the regression equation accounting for variance in the propensity to divorce scores (see Table 8 and Table 9). The husband's perspective-taking was predictive of the wife's propensity to divorce accounting for 5% of the variance in the marital instability index. The wife's perspective-taking was predictive of 7% of the variance

in the husband's propensity to divorce scores (see Table 10 and Table 11). Having a partner who can take the point of view of others is negatively related to thoughts about ending the marriage.

TABLE 8

Simple Multiple Regression of Wive's Perspective Taking
on the Husband's Propensity to Divorce

Variable	B	F	P-Value
Wife's Perspective- Taking	.2147	11.23	.001
Wife's Dyadic Perspective- Taking	-.2085	11.74	.001
Husband's Perceptions of Wife's Perspective- Taking	-.1706	11.98	.001

Note. Residual Degrees of Freedom = 119

RSQ with all variables in the model = .26

TABLE 9

Simple Multiple Regression of the Husband's Perspective-
Taking on the Wife's Propensity to Divorce

Variable	B	F	P-Value
Husband's Perspective- Taking	.2168	9.57	.002
Husband's Dyadic Perspective- Taking	-.1360	3.46	.065
Wife's Perceptions of Husbands Perspective- Taking	-.3095	53.71	.0001

Note. Residual Degrees of Freedom = 119

RSQ with all variables in the model = .36

TABLE 10

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of the Wive's
Perspective-Taking on the Husband's Propensity to
Divorce

Variable	Unique Variance	F	P-Value
Wive's			
Perspective-Taking	.06967	11.23	.001
Dyadic Perspective-	.07282	11.74	.001
Taking			
Cognizance	.06083	8.75	.004
Strategies	.00102	.147	.702
Husband's	.07432	11.98	.001
Perceptions of Wife			
Cognizance	.02961	4.76	.031
Strategies	.00909	1.45	.229

TABLE 11

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of the Husband's
Perspective-Taking on the Wive's Propensity to Divorce

Variable	Unique Variance	F	P-Value
Husband's			
Perspective-Taking	.05185	9.57	.002
Dyadic Perspective-	.01874	3.46	.065
Taking			
Cognizance	.00445	.739	.392
Strategies	.00014	.023	.880
Wife's Perceptions	.29098	53.71	.0001
of Husband			
Cognizance	.02200	4.03	.047
Strategies	.05693	10.43	.002

Hypothesis #5

It was hypothesized that the use of perspective taking skills within the context of the marital relationship (dyadic perspective-taking) would be a predictor of a propensity to divorce. The wife's dyadic perspective-taking was a significant predictor of the husband's propensity to divorce while the husband's dyadic perspective-taking did not significantly enter into the regression equation (see Table 8 and Table 9). The wife's dyadic perspective-taking accounted for 7% of the variance in the husband's propensity to divorce. The husbands dyadic perspective taking accounted for a non-significant 2% ($p=.065$) of the variance in the wife's instability scores (see Table 10 and Table 11). Hypothesis #5 was supported for the husbands but was not supported for the wives. Thus while the dyadic perspective-taking of wives was predictive of the husband's propensity to divorce, the same relationship did not exist for the wives.

Once again the subscales of the DPT were analyzed to assess their ability to predict a propensity to divorce. The wife's cognizance accounted for 6% while her strategies accounted for none of the unique variance in his propensity to divorce. Neither the husband's cognizance nor strategies accounted for any of the variance in the wife's propensity to divorce. Husbands

are less likely to think about terminating the marriage if they are married to wives who report perspective-taking.

Hypothesis #6

It was argued that perceptions of spouses would be negatively related to thoughts about terminating the relationship. This hypothesis was supported for both males and females (see Table 8 and Table 9). The husband's perceptions of his wife's dyadic perspective-taking accounted for a unique 7% of the variance in his propensity to divorce. The wife's perceptions of her husband's dyadic perspective-taking accounted for a unique 29% of the wife's propensity to divorce (see Table 10 and Table 11). The perceptions of a spouse's dyadic perspective-taking skills was for both husbands and wives predictive of thoughts about terminating the marital relationship. Perceptions of dyadic perspective taking was negatively related to a propensity to divorce.

The subscales of the PDPT were also analyzed to see if they were predictive of a propensity to divorce. The perceived cognizance of the husband was predictive of 3% of the unique variance whereas the perceptions of strategies was predictive of none of the variance in the

husband's propensity to divorce. The perceived cognizance accounted for a unique 2%, while the perceived strategies accounted for a unique 6% of the variance in the wife's propensity to divorce. Perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking are negatively predictive of a propensity to divorce for both husbands and wives.

Pleasantness of Marital Interaction

Additional analyses were undertaken to examine the relationship between perspective-taking and other aspects of marital functioning. Specifically, it was thought that individuals who were married to better perspective-takers may find their marital interactions more pleasant than those interacting with poorer perspective-takers. Spouses who understand the perspective of a partner are more sensitive and may be perceived as providing more pleasant interactions with their spouses. Individuals were asked to rate how pleasant and satisfying their interaction with their partner was on a 5 point scale (see Appendix M). It was expected that the three dimensions of perspective-taking, the general measure of perspective-taking, dyadic perspective-taking, and perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking would all be positively correlated with the pleasantness of interaction with a

partner. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of the relationship between two variables (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975). Table 12 and Table 13 list the Pearson product moment correlations between perspective-taking and pleasantness of interaction with a partner, for both husbands and wives. The perspective-taking of husband's and wife's was not significantly related to the pleasantness of the interaction with their partner. The wife's dyadic perspective-taking was significantly though weakly related to the pleasantness of interaction for the husbands ($r = .11$) while the husband's dyadic perspective taking was not significantly related to the wife's pleasantness of interaction. For both husbands and their wives, the perceptions of their partners perspective-taking was significantly related to the pleasantness of their interaction with that partner (for wives $r = .45$, for husbands $r = .35$).

TABLE 12

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of
Husband's Perspective-Taking with Wife's Pleasantness of
Interaction

	Wife's Pleasantness of Interaction
	r
Husband's Perspective- Taking	-.0433
Husband's Dyadic Perspective-Taking	.1088
Perceptions of Husband's Perspective- Taking	.4508***

*** $P < .001$ All other correlations are not significant
at the .05 level.

TABLE 13

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of
Wive's Perspective-Taking with Husband's Pleasantness of
Interaction

	Husband's Pleasantness of Interaction
	r
Wive's Perspective- Taking	-.0222
Wive's Dyadic Perspective-Taking	.1882**
Perceptions of Wive's Dyadic Perspective-Taking	.3454***

** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

Time Spent With a Partner

Since perspective-taking was hypothesized to be positively related to pleasantness of interaction with a partner it was also contended that perspective-taking would be positively related to the amount of time spent with a partner. The pleasantness of the interaction would be positively associated with the actual amount of time spent alone with the spouse. Two separate questions assessed the percentage of all the time available in the last seven days, and the leisure time that was spent with the partner only (see Appendix M). Table 14 and Table 15 list the correlations for both husbands and wives perspective-taking and time spent alone with a spouse. For both husbands and wives, none of the three aspects of perspective-taking were significantly related to the amount of time spent with a partner.

TABLE 14

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of
Wive's Perspective-Taking with the Husband's Proportion
of Leisure Time and All Time Alone with His Wife

	Proportion of Leisure Time Alone With Wife	Proportion of All Time Alone With Wife
	r	r
Wife's		
Perspective-	-.043	-.0983
Taking		
Dyadic	.082	.1028
Perspective-		
Taking		
Perceptions of	.025	.0192
Dyadic		
Perspective-Taking		

Note. None of the above correlations are significant at
the .05 level.

TABLE 15

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of
Husband's Perspective-Taking with the Wife's Proportion
of Leisure Time and All Time Alone with Her Husband

	Proportion of Leisure Time Alone With Husband r	Proportion of All Time Alone With Husband r
Husband's Perspective- Taking	-.043	.0218
Dyadic Perspective- Taking	.086	.0789
Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking	.0765	.0181

Note. None of the above correlations are significant at
the .05 level.

Discrepancy Among Husband's and Wife's Perspective Taking

Several studies (Dymond, 1954; Murstein & Beck, 1972; Newmark et al., 1977) have shown that high adjusted couples are more alike than low adjusted couples. It was expected that well adjusted couples may be more alike in their ability to see things from the point of view of their partner than poorer perspective takers. A negative relationship between the perspective taking, dyadic perspective-taking discrepancy scores and marital adjustment was expected. Discrepancy scores were used to calculate the differences between perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking ability for each couple. Discrepancy perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking scores were calculated.

(husband perspective-taking - wife perspective-taking)².

The same procedure was used to calculate discrepancy dyadic perspective-taking scores.

Table 16 and Table 17 list the Pearson product moment correlations for both husband's and wife's marital adjustment. Discrepancy of perspective-taking ability was negatively related to the wife's dyadic adjustment ($r = -.14$). Similarly, discrepancy of dyadic perspective-taking was negatively related to the wife's

marital adjustment ($r = -.16$). Discrepancies in perspective-taking were not significantly related to the husband's dyadic adjustment.

Wives were more likely to be well adjusted in their marriages if they reported perspective-taking ability that was similar to their husbands. Husband's marital adjustment was not significantly related to the similarity of perspective-taking ability of their wives.

TABLE 16

Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Perspective-
Taking Discrepancy Scores and Spouses Marital Adjustment

	Wive's Adjustment	Husband's Adjustment
	r	r
Discrepancy Scores		
Perspective-Taking	- .1414*	- .0492
Dyadic Perspective-	- .1598*	- .0228
Taking		

Note. *P < .05

TABLE 17

Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Perspective-
Taking Discrepancy Scores and Spouses Propensity to
Divorce

	Wive's Propensity to Divorce r	Husband's Propensity to Divorce r
Discrepancy Scores		
Perspective-Taking	.0764	- .0515
Dyadic Perspective- Taking	.1141*	- .0123

Note. *P < .10

Husband's and Wive's Perspective-Taking

Analyses were also undertaken to test for significant mean differences between the perspective-taking ability of husbands and wives. Females had significantly higher perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking scores and wives were perceived as being better dyadic perspective-takers by their husbands. A T-test assesses whether or not two sample means are significantly different (Nie et al., 1975). Table 18 lists T-tests of significant differences between husbands and wives scale scores. On all three measures of perspective-taking the wives had significantly higher scores than the husbands. Previous research had shown that women scored significantly higher on the perspective-taking scale than did the men (Davis, 1980). Similarly a review of self-report empathy measures favored the empathic ability of females over males (Eisenberg & Lennon, 1983). This research confirmed the empathic ability of women. Wives also had significantly higher instability scores while there were no significant differences between the husbands and wives scores on the dyadic adjustment scale, or the pleasantness of interaction with a spouse.

In this study both the husband and the wife reported on their own and their partner's dyadic

perspective-taking. In reality both the husbands and the wives gave themselves higher marks on perspective-taking than they received from their partners. A paired T-test indicated that the husband's judgment of his own perspective-taking was significantly higher than the wife's perception of him ($T=4.43$, $p = .0001$). Similarly wife's assessment of their own perspective-taking was higher than that made by their husbands ($T=5.03$, $p = .0001$). Thus husbands and wives perceive their own perspective-taking to be better than their partners perception of their perspective-taking. Wife's self-report of dyadic perspective-taking correlated with their husband's perceptions of them ($r = .46$), whereas husband's self-report correlated to a lesser extent with their wife's perceptions of them ($r = .26$). Thus the wives may be better at rating their own perspective-taking than the husbands.

TABLE 18

A T-Test of Significant Differences Between Husbands and Wives Scale Scores

Scale	Gender	Mean	T-Value	D.F.	Prob.
Perspective-Taking	Females	18.89	4.59	338	.0001
	Males	16.98			
Dyadic Perspective-Taking	Females	36.46	2.48	338	.014
	Males	34.45			
Perceptions of Partners	Females	45.74	-2.76	321	.006
	Males	50.37			
Perspective-Taking Propensity To Divorce	Females	1.72	1.981	331	.048
	Males	1.28			
Dyadic Adjustment	Females	115.02	-.26	300	.798
	Males	115.50			
Pleasantness of Interaction With Partner	Females	5.51	-1.53	335	.127
	Males	4.63			

High and Low Adjusted Couples

Analyses were also conducted with two separate groups of couples. Individuals with scores less than 95 represented the low adjustment group (mean 80.83). Individuals with scores greater than 125 represented the high adjustment group (mean 133.33). It was expected that spouses who were well adjusted would have partners with significantly higher DPT and PDPT scores than the low adjustment group. Both husbands and wives were divided into high adjusted and low adjusted groups based upon the mean scores of previous research samples (Spanier, 1976).

There were 10 males in the low adjustment group and 37 males in the high adjustment group. The wives of these husbands did not differ in their perspective-taking scores, but the two groups of wives had significantly different scores on the dyadic perspective-taking scale. There were also significant differences in how the husbands in the two groups perceived their wives. Husbands in the high adjustment group perceived their wives to be significantly better at dyadic perspective-taking than the husbands in the low adjustment group. The wives of the husbands in the low adjustment group reported that they made fewer attempts at dyadic perspective-taking and these wives

reported less cognizance of their husbands than the wives of well adjusted husbands.

Similarly the husbands in the low adjustment group perceived their wives to be making fewer perspective-taking attempts and saw their wives as less cognizant than the wives in the high adjustment group. Thus husbands in both the high and low adjustment group had wives who were equal in their general ability to take the perspective of another. The low adjustment husbands however had wives who failed to use their abilities in the context of the marital relationship. Table 19 lists a T-test comparison of wives perspective-taking scores among the sample of high and low adjusted males.

There were 14 wives in the low adjustment group with 45 wives in the high adjustment group. The husbands of these two groups of wives did not differ on their perspective-taking or dyadic perspective-taking scale scores. The husbands of the well adjusted wives reported that they had a better global understanding of their wives, but the husbands did not report more perspective-taking strategies than the males in the low adjustment group. Similarly the wives married to the better adjusted husbands reported that their husbands were better perspective-takers. The husbands married to well adjusted wives were perceived as being more

cognizant husbands and males who used more perspective-taking strategies than the husbands of the low adjustment wives. Table 20 lists a T-test comparison of husband's perspective-taking scores among the sample of high and low adjusted females.

TABLE 19

A T-Test Comparison of the Perspective-Taking Scores of the High and Low Adjustment Husbands

Scale	Mean	T-Value	D.F.	Prob.
a				
Wive's Perspective-Taking Scale				
Low Adjustment Males	2.66	-.38	45	.70
High Adjustment Males	2.73			
a				
Wive's Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale				
Low Adjustment Males	1.93	-6.04	45	.0001
High Adjustment Males	3.02			
Cognizance Subscale				
Low Adjustment Males	15.2	-6.36	45	.0001
High Adjustment Males	24.5			
Strategies Subscale				
Low Adjustment Males	9.9	-4.02	45	.0001
High Adjustment Males	14.86			
a				
Perceptions of Wive's Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale				
Low Adjustment Males	1.56	-7.76	48	.0001
High Adjustment Males	2.91			

TABLE 19 (cont.)

A T-Test Comparison of the Perspective-Taking Scores of the High and Low Adjustment Husbands

Scale	Mean	T-Value	D.F.	Prob.
Perceptions of Wive's Dyadic Perspective-Taking				
Strategies Subscale				
Low Adjustment Males	16.0	-5.77	45	.0001
High Adjustment Males	33.4			
Cognizance Subscale				
Low Adjustment Males	8.1	-4.43	45	.0001
High Adjustment Males	19.97			

Note. Low adjustment males have DAS scores ≤ 95

High adjustment males have DAS scores ≥ 125

Low adjustment group n=10 high adjustment group n=37

^a

The total mean scale score can be calculated by multiplying the number listed in the "mean" column by the number of items in the scale.

TABLE 20

A T-Test Comparison of the Perspective-Taking Scores of the High and Low Adjustment Wives

Scale	Mean	T-Value	D.F.	Prob.
a				
Husband's Perspective-Taking Scale				
Low Adjustment Females	2.49	.26	57	.794
High Adjustment Females	2.45			
a				
Husband's Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale				
Low Adjustment Females	2.51	-1.85	57	.069
High Adjustment Females	2.82			
Cognizance Subscale				
Low Adjustment Females	18.07	-2.67	57	.010
High Adjustment Females	22.56			
Strategies Subscale				
Low Adjustment Females	14.50	.51	57	.610
High Adjustment Females	14.04			

TABLE 20 (cont.)

A T-Test Comparison of the Perspective-Taking Scores of the High and Low Adjustment Wives

Scale	Mean	T-Value	D.F.	Prob.
<u>Perceptions of Husband's Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale^a</u>				
Low Adjustment Females	.98	-12.10	61	.0001
High Adjustment Females	3.0			
<u>Strategies Subscale</u>				
Low Adjustment Females	25.5	-4.42	57	.0001
High Adjustment Females	34.62			
<u>Cognizance Subscale</u>				
Low Adjustment Females	12.64	-5.43	57	.0001
High Adjustment Females	22.29			

Note. Low adjustment wives have DAS scores \leq 95 High adjustment wives have scores \geq 125

Low adjustment group n = 14 high adjustment group n = 45
^a

The total mean scale score can be calculated by multiplying the number listed in the "mean" column by the number of items in the scale.

Perspective-taking is a variable that is predictive of marital adjustment and propensity to divorce for both husbands and wives. The self-report of individual characteristics of one partner have in this study been shown to be predictive of the other partner's adjustment and propensity to divorce. Similarly the perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking are also predictive of marital adjustment and propensity to divorce. Wives perspective-taking scores were significantly higher than the husbands scores. Wive's marital adjustment was shown to be negatively related to the discrepancy of perspective-taking among the husbands and wives. The well adjusted wives were those who had partners of equal ability. Well adjusted husbands and wives perceived their partners to be significantly better at dyadic perspective-taking than low adjusted husbands and wives.

V. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine three aspects of perspective-taking: (1) a general measure of the tendency to adopt the point of view of others (2) a measure of dyadic perspective-taking, whether or not a married individual took the perspective of a spouse and (3) whether or not a married spouse was perceived to be taking the perspective of the married partner. It was hypothesized that these three components of perspective taking would significantly predict marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce in a sample of 159 married couples.

The results of the present study indicated that for both husbands and wives the perspective-taking of a partner was significantly predictive of one's own marital adjustment and propensity to divorce. The wife's self-report of perspective-taking accounted for 8% of the unique variance in the husband's dyadic adjustment while the husband's perspective-taking accounted for 4% of the wife's dyadic adjustment. Similarly wife's self-report of perspective-taking accounted for 7% of the unique variance in the husband's propensity to divorce while husband's perspective-taking accounted for 5% of the unique variance in the wife's propensity to divorce.

The social interaction style of perspective-takers is predictive of two important dimensions of marital functioning. Having a partner who can understand the perspective of others is related to one's own marital adjustment. Individuals who can adopt the point of view of others are more likely to have partners who are well adjusted in their own marital relationships. Similarly individuals who can see things from another's vantage point are less likely to have spouses thinking about terminating their marriages. It may be that individuals who fail to be able to see things from the point of view of others generally are more likely to fail to perceive the point of view of their spouses. A level of general perspective-taking ability seems to be necessary for competent social interaction within the marital relationship. Some individuals may lack perspective-taking ability in the context of all social interaction. These results lend support to the notion that the perspective-taking ability of the one spouse can predict the perceived adjustment and stability of the other partner. In a more general sense one could argue that being married to a partner who is socially competent (in terms of one's ability to see things from the perspective of another) may greatly influence the stability and adjustment of the relationship.

Furthermore, it was posited that dyadic perspective-taking, the ability to adopt the point of view of one's own spouse, would be of consequence in predicting marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. An individual who can take into account the point of view of others in general, may not be motivated to be a perspective-taker within a specific marriage relationship.

Statistical analyses of the data indicated that above and beyond the general measure of perspective taking, dyadic perspective-taking significantly predicted marital adjustment for both husbands and wives. The wife's dyadic perspective-taking was a predictor of the husband's dyadic adjustment accounting for 8% of the unique variance in the husband's adjustment. The husband's dyadic perspective-taking accounted for a unique 2% of the variance in the wife's adjustment. Over and above the importance of general perspective-taking, it was of consequence that a spouse be considerate of the point of view of one's partner. It was important to the adjustment of both husbands and wives that they had a partner who tried to understand things from their perspective. Spouses who understand the point of view of their partners can regulate their behavior in ways that are perceived to be pleasing to those partners. This type of interaction with a spouse

would give evidence of the partner's sensitivity and understanding, improving marital functioning.

The dyadic perspective-taking measure (DPT) revealed two components of perspective-taking, cognizance and strategies. Cognizance represented a general and somewhat global understanding and awareness of a partner (e.g., "I very often seem to know how my partner feels", "I not only listen to my partner, but I seem to know what he/she is saying, and seem to know where he/she is coming from"). Strategies represented the attempts and endeavors that a person made to try and put themselves in the shoes of their spouse (e.g., "I sometimes try to understand my partner better by imagining how things look from his/her perspective", "When I'm upset with my partner, I usually try to put myself in his/her shoes for awhile").

The strategies and cognizance subscales of the DPT were also analyzed to see if they were predictive of marital adjustment. The wife's strategies subscale was predictive of the husband's adjustment, accounting for 3% of the unique variance in the his dyadic adjustment. The wife's cognizance accounted for 2% of the unique variance ($p=.056$) in the husbands dyadic adjustment. Neither the husband's cognizance nor strategies were significantly predictive of the wife's dyadic

adjustment. The most predictive aspect of the husband's marital adjustment was the wife's strategies to see things from his perspective. It was the wives willingness to "try", that was the greatest predictor of the husbands adjustment.

The dyadic perspective-taking of the wife was also a significant predictor of the husband's propensity to divorce accounting for a unique 7% of the variance in his instability scores. Husbands married to wives who failed to see things from their perspective, were more likely to have thought about divorcing their wives. The husband's dyadic perspective-taking was a predictor of 2% of the unique variance in the wife's propensity to divorce. Not only is perspective-taking related to marital adjustment, but it is predictive of a persons thoughts about leaving a marriage.

In analyzing the subscales of the DPT only the wife's cognizance was a significant predictor, accounting for a unique 6% of the husband's propensity to divorce. If the wife understood her husband, had a general sense of how he felt, and seemed to understand him even if he had difficulty communicating, then the husband was less likely to think of terminating the marriage relationship. The wife's ability to understand her husband predicted the husband's thoughts about leaving the relationship.

Thirdly it was hypothesized that perceptions of one's spouse would be a significant predictor of marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. If I perceived my partner to put him/herself in my shoes, I would be more likely to perceive my marriage to be better adjusted and would be less likely to think about ending the relationship. This hypothesis assessed whether or not I perceived my partner's dyadic perspective-taking to be important to my own marital functioning. To some extent it represented the perspective-taking expectations spouses had of their partners.

For both husbands and wives the perceptions of a spouse were significant predictors of marital adjustment and a propensity to divorce. The husband's perceptions of the wife's dyadic perspective-taking accounted for 22% of the unique variance in his dyadic adjustment. The wife's perceptions of her husband accounted for 50% of the variance in her adjustment. One half of the variance in the wife's marital adjustment was accounted for by the wife's perceptions of her husband's ability to put himself in her shoes. It was very important to the wife that her husband be sensitive and understanding of her perceptions of a situation. Similarly the same ability was important to the husbands, and predictive of the husband's marital adjustment. If the husband and

the wife were perceived by their partners to be perspective takers, then this was predictive of marital adjustment.

The husband's perceptions of the wife accounted for 7% of the unique variance in his propensity to divorce, whereas the wife's perceptions of the husband accounted for a unique 29% of the variance in her marital instability. For both husbands and wives, the perceptions of whether or not a partner could understand and take their perspective greatly influenced their thoughts about leaving the relationship. The perceptions one has of a married partner greatly influence the perceived adjustment and stability of the relationship.

The strategies and cognizance subscales of the PDPT were also analyzed to ascertain whether or not they were predictive of adjustment and marital instability. The husband's perceptions of both the wife's cognizance (3%) and specific strategies (7%) accounted for unique amounts of variances in his dyadic adjustment. The strongest predictor of the husband's marital adjustment was his perceptions that his wife was making some attempts to see things from his perspective. Similarly wife's perceptions of a husband's cognizance (7%) and strategies (6%) accounted for unique amounts of variance in her dyadic adjustment. The perceptions of a partner's understanding of self, and perspective-taking endeavors

greatly influences one's dyadic adjustment.

The husband's perceptions of the wife's cognizance were predictive of the husband's propensity to divorce. Husbands seem to have expectations that their wives have a clear understanding of them. The wife's perceptions of her husband's cognizance and strategies were predictive of the wife's propensity to divorce. Wives have expectations of their husbands that they understand them and make attempts at taking their perspective.

A superficial look at the findings of this research seem to emphasize the importance of the wife's dyadic perspective-taking over that of the husband. The wives perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking was a better predictor of adjustment than the perspective-taking of the husband. These findings are similar to those found in an earlier study (Franzoi et al., 1985). Female perspective-taking was found to predict male satisfaction yet male perspective-taking was not a significant predictor of female satisfaction. These authors explained the finding by arguing that perspective-taking was relevant to the woman's expressive role while being somewhat irrelevant to the male instrumental role. They (Franzoi et al., 1985) stated that this interpretation was plausible yet

speculative until it could be replicated in further studies.

The findings of this present study lend credence to the notion that wife's perspective-taking is more important to the husband's marital adjustment than vice versa. This may only be the case however when men and women report their own perspective-taking. The strongest predictor of the wife's adjustment was her perceptions of her husband's perspective-taking ability. Closer scrutiny of the data indicates that when the wives rate their husband's perspective-taking, that ability is extremely important to the wife's marital adjustment. The wife's perception of her husband's dyadic perspective-taking accounted for 50% of the variance in her marital adjustment, whereas his perceptions of his wife accounted for only 22% of the variance in his adjustment. Both husbands and wives have perspective-taking expectations of their partners that greatly influence their marital adjustment.

Thus comments about perspective-taking being only relevant to male satisfaction or the expressive role (Franzoi et al., 1985) are somewhat misleading. Both husbands and wives have perspective-taking expectations of their partners. When spouses are perceived to be understanding, taking their partner's perspective into account, then marital adjustment is increased while

marital instability is decreased.

The data clearly indicated that wives were better perspective-takers than husbands. Not only did the wives have significantly higher scores on the perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking scales, but the husbands rated their wives as better at perspective-taking. This finding may be related to the expressive role that women are said to play in family interaction (Parsons & Bales, 1955). The female sex role stereotype seems to portray females as more nurturant and emotionally sensitive than males, and more adept in the maintenance of harmonious social interaction. Research has shown (Eisenberg & Lennon, 1983) that women are more likely than men to be affectively responsive to others. Thus it seemed quite understandable in this present study that women were better at perspective-taking than were men.

Not only was perspective-taking predictive of marital adjustment and stability, it was positively correlated with the pleasantness and satisfaction of the interaction with that partner. For both husbands and wives, if a partner was perceived to be a good perspective-taker, then activities with that partner were perceived to be more pleasant and satisfying. Perceptions of the wife's dyadic perspective-taking were

positively correlated ($r = .35$) with the husband's pleasantness and satisfaction with marital interaction. Perceptions of the husband's dyadic perspective-taking were positively correlated ($r = .45$) with the wife's pleasant and satisfying interaction. It is more pleasant and satisfying to interact with a partner who is perceived to take my perspective into account than it is to interact with a spouse who has little understanding of my point of view.

The wife's self-rated dyadic perspective-taking was also related to the husband's satisfaction with the interaction with his wife ($r = .19$). The husband's self ratings of dyadic perspective-taking were positively correlated with the wife's perceived pleasantness of interaction ($r = .11$, $p = .09$). The interaction style of a married partner is related to the perceived pleasantness and satisfaction of the activity with that partner.

While perspective-takers were more pleasant to interact with, perspective-taking ability was not related to the amount of time that one spent with a partner. The lack of any relationship between perspective-taking and proportion of time spent with a partner may have been the result of measurement problems. Partners may have had difficulty recalling the proportion of actual time spent with a partner

(Huston & Robins, 1982). Other variables may also influence how married partners spend their time. Work schedules, number of children in the home, similarity of leisure interests, shared friendships, and number of careers in the family, may be more likely to influence the amount of time spent with a spouse than the individual characteristics of a partner.

Several studies have shown (Dymond, 1954; Murstein & Beck, 1972; Newmark et al., 1977) that individuals in well adjusted relationships are more alike in terms of personality characteristics than maladjusted couples. To assess the similarity among partner's perspective-taking, discrepancy scores were computed indicating the discrepancy between the perspective-taking of the husband and the wife. It was thought that couples who were the most similar in terms of perspective-taking abilities would be better adjusted than couples who were dissimilar. For wives, discrepancy scores were negatively correlated with marital adjustment. Discrepancies in perspective-taking ($r = -.14$) and dyadic perspective-taking ($r = -.16$) were negatively related to the wives marital adjustment. There were no significant correlations between discrepancy scores and the husbands marital adjustment. Wives are the most adjusted in their marital relationship when they have

husbands whose perspective taking ability is similar to their own. While these correlational relationships are significant they account for very small amounts of actual variance in the wives dyadic adjustment.

This study also contributed to the body of knowledge that differentiates between high and low adjustment couples. For the final analysis a portion of the couples were divided into high and low marital adjustment groups. The low adjustment group had a mean on the dyadic adjustment scale of 81, comparable to a divorced sample who had a mean of 71 (Spanier, 1976). The high adjustment group had an average score on the dyadic adjustment scale of 133 sufficiently higher than a sample of married couples with a mean of 115 (Spanier, 1976). It was argued that the high and low adjustment husbands and wives may have spouses that differ in their ability to take the perspective of their partner.

The results of these analyses revealed that the partners of the two adjustment groups did not differ in their general ability to take the perspective of another. In their general social interaction with others, the partners of both the high and the low adjustment group were equally as able to adopt the vantage point of others. The low adjustment husbands however did have wives who rated themselves poorer than

the high adjustment husbands. The low adjustment group of husbands were married to wives who had significantly lower dyadic perspective-taking scores. This finding supports the notion that some couples may lack the motivation to be sensitive towards a partner (Clements, 1967). These results parallel other research (Gottman, 1982) that revealed that distressed couples interacted negatively with a spouse while being able to communicate as well as nondistressed couples with a stranger. Gottman reasoned that the distressed couples did not have deficits in their abilities. The abilities were evidenced in their interaction with strangers, yet those same skills were not used in their interaction with a spouse. The low adjustment wives however did not have husbands with significantly different dyadic perspective-taking scores than the high adjustment wives.

Husbands and wives within the low adjustment group were more likely to have partners that reported that they were less understanding of their partners, than the high adjustment husbands and wives. Low adjusted husbands also had wives that reported making fewer perspective-taking attempts than the high adjusted husbands. Alternatively, the higher adjusted husbands and wives perceived their partners to be better

perspective-takers than the low adjustment group. The high adjustment spouses perceived their spouses to be more understanding, and the well adjusted husbands perceived their wives to be making attempts at seeing things from the point of view of their partners. For the most part individuals who were well adjusted in their marriages were more likely to be married to partners who were motivated in their use of perspective-taking abilities with their partner.

Implications for Interventionists

The results of this study have important implications for interventionists whose frequent concern is an attempt to increase relationship stability and adjustment. Clinicians often focus their clinical energies and skills on increasing the fulfillment and satisfaction of both partners in a relationship (Hof & Miller, 1981).

It may be that interventionists could develop preventative programs to increase specific perspective-taking behaviors. A remarkable amount of the variance in marital adjustment and propensity to divorce for both husbands and wives was predicted by the perceptions of a partner's perspective-taking. Partners seem to have perspective-taking expectations of their spouses.

Having spouses discuss their own needs for perspective-taking may help individuals understand the unique perspective-taking expectations of a partner. A necessary prerequisite of this preventative approach would be a more behavioral understanding of perspective-taking. Interventionists could have spouses list the specific behaviors that indicate a partner's perspective-taking and those behaviors most desired from a partner. This would enable individuals to reward those precise perspective-taking behaviors that were desired from a spouse.

Therapists must not assume that teaching perspective-taking skills will naturally increase relationship adjustment and stability. Behavioral skill training will do little to increase the adjustment and stability of marriages when partners lack the motivation to use those skills. This research indicated that maladjusted couples had perspective-taking skills that they were not using with their partners. Thus behavioral training alone may not be beneficial to the couples most in need of help. A behavioral orientation combined with motivation to use those skills may be the most advantageous approach of facilitating marital adjustment and stability with maladjusted couples. Individuals need to understand the situations actions

and attitudes that both facilitate and impede the use of perspective-taking. Couples specifically need to discuss with each other the attitudes, actions and situations that motivate them to want to see things from the vantage point of the spouse.

Marriage and family therapists may also find the DPT and PDPT to be useful diagnostic tools. Couples may be maladjusted in a relationship and yet lack understanding of the specific problem. Clinicians may use these instruments to ascertain whether or not increased perspective-taking may in fact improve marital functioning. Similarly couples could discuss with a therapist the results of their assessments of perspective-taking in deciding upon a specific treatment for a marital problem. Spouses may perceive themselves as adequate perspective-takers yet be perceived by a partner as less than adequate. Reviewing the items in the scales may accomodate dialogue between couples regarding the perspective-taking that takes place in a relationship.

Limitations of the Present Study

Although the results of this present study gave empirical support to the importance of perspective-taking within marital interaction, certain limitations were inherent. The measurements of perspective-taking

assessed perceptions of perspective-taking rather than observations of specific perspective taking behaviors. The assessments thus gave no indication of the specific behavioral skills that would improve a partner's perspective-taking. In an effort to create changes in marital interaction therapists and family life educators need an understanding of the specific behaviors that are consequential to marital adjustment and stability.

The sample for this study was a nonprobability sample and thus represented a fairly well educated, white, middle class group of intact couples who had been married a considerable period of time. Further studies are necessary to ascertain whether or not perspective taking is equally as important a variable in other stages of relationship development among a more diverse sample.

Assessments that are made using self-report instruments may be biased by social desirability or response sets (Cozby, 1985; Huston & Robins, 1982). Even though the respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their responses, there was no way to ascertain whether or not respondents answered in ways that were socially desirable. Similarly there were several lengthy scales and respondents could have had a tendency to answer all of the questions from a

particular perspective rather than carefully reading each of the items.

Implications For Future Research

The results of this study provide empirical evidence for the importance of individual variables of social competence that may be related to marital interaction. Future family researchers need to pay more attention to these individual variables that influence marital and family functioning (Filsinger & Wilson, 1983). While this study has provided support for the importance of perspective-taking, future study needs to be conducted to ascertain the behavioral aspects of this dimension of social interaction. Specific perspective-taking behaviors need to be identified so that intervention strategies can be developed to improve dyadic interaction. The development of behavioral self-report instruments as well as observational measures of perspective-taking would offer a more complete understanding of this phenomena.

Additional attention needs to be given to perspective-taking among distressed and well adjusted couples. This study presented some tentative evidence to show that distressed couples lacked motivation rather than ability in taking the point of view of their

partners. Although this finding seems plausible it should be replicated in future studies comparing groups of distressed and well adjusted couples.

It has also been argued (Wispe, 1986) that the information gained through perspective-taking may be employed punitively against a partner. Information acquired about a partner may be used to express hostility towards a spouse. No research presently exists to verify this notion of the punitive use of perspective-taking in severely dysfunctional relationships.

Longitudinal studies would also enable researchers to ascertain any specific points in a relationship where a lack of motivation may interfere with perspective-taking. It is likely that very early stages of premarital relationship development would see increased perspective-taking, whereas conflict or a lack of rewarding interactions with a spouse would lead to a decreased use of perspective-taking. Assessment of perspective-taking over time would enable researchers to address these questions.

Social Exchange

The exchange typology of marital quality and stability (Lewis & Spanier, 1976) has been beneficial in integrating empirical findings into a theoretical

framework. These researchers argue that perceptions of how rewarding interaction with a partner is increases the quality and stability of the relationship. The results of this present research indicated that the perspective-taking characteristics of the one partner played an important part in the other partner's perceptions of the relationship. Perspective-taking has been shown to be positively related to marital adjustment while being negatively related to a propensity to divorce. Future study may do well to ascertain the relationship between perspective-taking and relationship rewards or the perceived equity of the relationship.

Summary

This study examined three dimensions of perspective taking as they were related to the marital adjustment and marital instability of a sample of 159 married couples. A general measure of perspective-taking assessed the individual's ability to adopt the point of view of others in general social interaction. A dyadic perspective-taking measure evaluated whether or not the individual understood the point of view of a spouse. Thirdly, partners evaluated the perceived dyadic perspective-taking of their spouses. The findings

revealed that marital adjustment of both husbands and wives was significantly predicted by each of these three components of perspective-taking. It is important to the marital adjustment of both husbands and wives that they have partners who have the skill and cognizance to see things from another's perspective.

These three dimensions of perspective-taking were also predictive of a propensity to divorce. Husbands were more likely to have thoughts about terminating the marriage if the wife rated herself and was rated by her husband as an inadequate perspective-taker. Wives were likely to have thought about terminating the marriage if they perceived their husbands to be poor perspective-takers. This study confirmed the importance of individual variables of perspective-taking as predictors of marital functioning for both husbands and wives.

Beyond the testing of the six hypotheses additional analyses were undertaken to assess gender differences and perspective-taking differences between a subset of well and maladjusted couples. The results indicated that wives were better perspective-takers than were husbands. This finding was perceived as evidence of the females greater skill and sensitivity within interpersonal interaction. Partners who were perceived as being sensitive to the point of view of a spouse were also more pleasant and satisfying to interact with.

Wives were also found to be more sensitive to the perspective-taking discrepancies that existed within the dyad. Discrepancies that existed between husband and wives perspective-taking and dyadic perspective-taking were negatively related to the wives marital adjustment. Wives were the most adjusted when they had partners whose perspective-taking was similar to their own. Lastly, the analyses revealed that low adjustment couples did not lack the capability to take the perspective of others in general but apparently the motivation to use the abilities they possessed with a partner.

These findings were viewed from a social exchange perspective. Perspective-taking was contended to be an individual variable that influenced the perceived rewardingness of interaction with a spouse. Perspective-taking was positively related to marital adjustment while being negatively related to marital instability. These findings supported the basic tenet of the exchange typology (Lewis & Spanier, 1979) that high quality marriages are more stable than low quality marriages. The results of the study were discussed in terms of their implications for interventionists, the limitations of the research, and suggestions for future marriage and family scholars.

References

- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1962). Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 43, 76 (Whole No. 562).
- Bentler, P. M., & Newcomb, M. D. (1978). Longitudinal study of marital success and failure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1053-1070.
- Bernard, J. (1933a). An instrument for measurement of success in marriage. American Sociological Society, 27, 94-106.
- Bernard, J. (1933b). Distribution of success in marriage. American Journal of Sociology, 39, 194-203.
- Bernstein, W. H., & Davis, M. H. (1982). PERSpective-taking, self-consciousness, and accuracy in person perception. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 3, 1-19.
- Birchler, G. R., & Webb, L. J. (1977). Discriminating interaction behaviors in happy and unhappy marriages. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 494-495.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. Free Press: Illinois.
- Boettcher, R. E. (1977). Interspousal empathy, marital satisfaction, and marriage counseling. Journal of Social Science Research, 1 105-113.
- Booth, A., & White, L. (1980). Thinking about divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 605-616.
- Booth, A., Johnson, D., & Edwards, J. N. (1983). Measuring marital instability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 387-394.
- Bowerman, C. (1964). Prediction studies. In H. Christensen (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNalley.

- Buerkle, J., & Badgley, R. F. (1959). Couple role-taking. Yale marital interaction battery. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 53-58.
- Burgess, E. W., & Cottrel, L. (1936). The prediction of adjustment in marriage. American Sociological Review, 1, 739.
- Burgess, E. W., & Cottrel, L. S. (1939). Predicting success or failure in marriage. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Burgess, E. W., & Wallin, P. (1953). Engagement and marriage. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Burr, W. R. (1970). Satisfaction with various aspects of marriage over the life cycle: A random middle class sample. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 29-37.
- Burr, R. (1973). Theory construction and the sociology of the family. New York: Wiley.
- Burr, W. R., Leigh, G. K., Day, R. D., & Constantine, J. (1979). Symbolic interaction and the family. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, and I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Pp.42- 111. Contemporary theories about the family (Vol.2). New York: The Free Press.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P., & Rogers, W. (1976). The quality of American life, New York: Russell Sage.
- Chlopan, B. E., McCain, M. L., Carbonell, J. L., & Hagen, R. L. (1985). Empathy: Review of available measures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 635-653.
- Clark, K. B. (1980). Empathy: A neglected topic in psychological research. American Psychologist, 35, 187-190.
- Clements, W. H. (1967). Marital interaction and marital stability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 697-702.
- Coke, J., Batson, C., & McDavis, K. (1978). Empathic mediation of helping: A two-stage model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 752-766.

- Cooley, C. H. (1930). Social theory and social research. Henry Holt: New York.
- Cottrel, L. S., & Dymond, R. A. (1949). The empathic responses: A neglected field for research. Psychiatry, 12, 355-359.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.
- Cozby, P. C. (1985). Methods in behavioral research. Mayfield: London.
- Davis, K. (1929). Factors in the sex lives of 220 women. New York: Harper.
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10, 85.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 113-126.
- Dean, D. G. (1966). Emotional maturity and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 454-457.
- Dean, D. G., & Lucas, W. L. (1974). Improving marital prediction: A model and a pilot study. Revised version of paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, St. Louis, Missouri (October).
- deTurk, M., & Miller, G. R. (1986). The effects of husbands' and wives' social cognition on their marital adjustment, conjugal power, and self-esteem. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 715-724.
- Deutsch, F., & Malde, R. (1975). Empathy: Historic and current conceptualizations, measurement, and a cognitive theoretical perspective. Human Development, 18, 267-287.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Dymond, R. F. (1949). A scale for the measurement of empathic ability. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 13, 127-133.
- Dymond, R. G. (1950). Personality and empathy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 343-350.
- Dymond, R. G. (1954). Interpersonal perception and marital happiness. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 8, 164-171.
- Feffer M. (1959). The cognitive implications of role taking. Journal of Personality, 27, 152-158.
- Feffer, M., Suchotliff, M. (1966). Decentering implications of social interactions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 415-423.
- Filsinger, E. E. & Wilson, M. R. (1983). Social anxiety and marital adjustment. Family Relations, 32, 513-519.
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1973). Measuring quality of life: Can it help solve the ecological crisis? International Journal of Environmental Studies, 5, 21-26.
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). Societal structures of the mind. Charles Thomas: Illinois.
- Foa, U.G., & Foa, E. B. (1980). Resource theory: interpersonal behavior as exchange. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg & R. H. Wills (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research. New York: Plenum Press.
- Foote, N. N., & Cottrel, L. S. (1955). Identity and interpersonal competence: A new direction in family research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frank, C., Anderson, O. N., & Rubenstein, D. (1980). Marital role ideas and perceptions of marital role behavior in distressed and nondistressed couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6, 55-64.
- Franzoi, S. L., Davis, M.H., & Young, R. D. (1985). The effects of private self-consciousness and perspective taking on satisfaction in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1584-1594

- Garland, D. R. (1981). Training married couples in listening skills: Effects on behavior, perceptual accuracy, and marital adjustment. Family Relations, 30, 297-306.
- Goode, W. (1956). After divorce. New York: Free Press.
- Gottman, J. M. (1982). Emotional responsiveness in marital conversations. Journal of Communication, 32, 108-120.
- Gottman, J. M., & Potterfield, A. L. (1981). Communicative competence in the nonverbal behavior of married couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 817-824.
- Hamilton, G. V. (1929). A Research in marriage. New York: Boni.
- Hastorf, A. H., & Bender, I. E. (1952). A caution respecting the measurement of empathic ability. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, 574-576.
- Hawkins, J. (1967). Association between companionship, hostility, and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, 647-650.
- Hicks, M., & Platt, M. (1970). Marital happiness and stability: A review of the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 553-574.
- Hobart, C. W., & Klausner, W. J. (1959). Some social interactional correlates of marital role disagreement, and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and Family Living, 21, 256-263.
- Hof, L., & Miller, W. R. (1981). Marriage enrichment: Philosophy, process, & program. Brady: Maryland.
- Hoffedit, L. E. (1934). Family resemblances in personality traits. Journal of Social Psychology, 5, 214-227.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 54, 712-722.
- Hogan, R. (1969) Development of an empathy scale. The Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 307-316.

- Homans, G. C. (1950). The Human group. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior: It's elementary forms. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Huber, J., & Spitze, G. (1980). Considering divorce: An expansion of Becker's theory of marital instability. American Journal of Sociology, 86, 75-89.
- Huston, T. L. & Robins, E. (1982). Conceptual and methodological issues in studying close relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 901-925.
- Jacobson, N. S., Waldron, H., Moore, D. (1980). Toward a behavioral profile of marital distress. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48, 696-703.
- Kahn, M. (1970). Nonverbal communication and marital satisfaction. Family Process, 9, 449-456.
- Kelly, E. L. (1940). Psychological factors in assortative mating. Psychological Bulletin, 37, 473.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt Rinehart.
- Kirkpatrick, C. (1937a). Community of interest and the measurement of marriage adjustment. The Family, 18, 133-137.
- Kirkpatrick, C. (1937b). Factors in marital adjustment. American Journal of Sociology, 43, 270-283.
- Kitson, G. C., & Sussman, M. B. (1982). Marital complaints, demographic characteristics and symptoms of mental distress in divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 87-115.
- Kitson, G. C., Holmes, W. M., & Sussman, M. B. (1977). Predicting reconciliation: A test of the exchange model of divorce. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago.

- Kelly, E. L. (1941). Marital compatibility as related to personality traits of husbands and wives as rated by self and spouse. Journal of Social Psychology, 13, 193-198.
- Kerr, W. A., & Speroff, B. G. (1954). Validation and evaluation of the empathy test. Journal of General Psychology, 50, 369-376.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1978). Relationship between cognitive, perspective-taking, and teacher's ratings of children's classroom behavior in grades one through four. Journal Of Genetic Psychology, 132, 21-27.
- Landis, J. T. (1963). Some correlates of divorce and nondivorce among the unhappily married. Marriage and Family Living, 25, 178-180.
- Levinger, G. (1965). Marital cohesiveness and dissolution: An integrative review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, 19-28.
- Lewis, R., & Spanier, G. (1979). Theorizing about the quality and stability of marriage. In Wesley E. Burr, Reuben Hill, F. Ivan Nye, and Ira L. Reiss (eds.), Contemporary theories about the family, Vol.1 New York: Free Press.
- Lively, E. (1969). Toward conceptual clarification: Case of marital interaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31, 108-114.
- Locke, H. J. (1951). Predicting adjustment in marriage. New York: Holt and Company
- Locke, H., & Wallace, K. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 251-255.
- Locke, H., & Williamson, R. C. (1958). Marital adjustment: A factor analytic study. American Sociological Review, 23, 562-569.
- Luckey, E. B. (1960). Marital satisfaction and its association with congruence of perception. Marriage and Family Living, 22. 49-54.
- Mace, D. R. (1982). Close companions: The marriage enrichment handbook. Continuum: New York.

- McKenry, P. C., White, P. N., Price-Bonham, S. (1978). The fractured conjugal family: A comparison of married and divorced dyads. Journal of Divorce, 1, 329-339.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, self and society, (1934). Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. Journal of Personality, 40, 525-533.
- Miller, G. R., & Steinberg, M. (1975). Between people: A new analysis of interpersonal communication. Palo Alto, CA: Science Research Associates.
- Moser, R. C. (1984). The measurement of role taking in young adults. Journal of Personality Assessment, 48, 380-387.
- Murstein, B. I., & Beck, G. D. (1972). Person perception, marriage adjustment, and social desirability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 396-403.
- Newman, H. (1981). Communication within ongoing intimate relationships: An attributional perspective. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7, 59-70.
- Newmark, C. S., Woody, G., & Ziff, D. (1977). Understanding and similarity in relation to marital satisfaction. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 83-86.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D. H. (Eds.). (1975). Statistical package for the social sciences. McGraw Hill: New York.
- Nye, F. I., & Bayer, A. E. (1963). Some recent trends in family research. Social Forces, 41, 290-301.
- Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. A. (1968). Dimensions of marriage happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 73, 545-550.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (Eds.). (1955). Family, socialization, and interaction processes. New York: Free Press.

- Patterson, G. R., Hops, H., & Weiss, R. L. (1975). Interpersonal skills training for couples in early stages of conflict. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 295-303.
- Pavitt, C., & Capella, J. N. (1979). Coorientational accuracy in interpersonal and small group discussions: A literature review, model and simulation. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook (Vol.3). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Piaget, J. (1959). Judgment and reasoning in the child. Patterson NJ: Littlefield, Adams.
- Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1971). The psychology of the child. New York: Basic Books.
- Pickford, J. H., Signori, E. I., & Rempel, H. (1966). Similar or related personality traits as a factor in marital happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 190-192.
- Preston, M. G., Peltz, W. L., Mudd, E. T., & Frosher, H. B. (1952). Impressions of personality as a function of marital conflict. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, 326-336.
- Rank, O. (1929). Will therapy and truth and reality. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Rettig, K. G., & Bubolz, M. M. (1983). Interpersonal resource exchanges as indicators of quality of marriage. Journal of marriage and the Family, 45, 497-509.
- Rogers, C. R. (1946). Significant aspects of client-centered therapy. American Psychologist, 1, 416.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). Client-Centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 95-103.
- Schooley, M. (1936). Personality resemblances among married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 31, 340-347.

- Schumm, W. R., Bollman, S. R., & Jurich, A. P. (1980). Marital communication or marital conventionality? A brief report on the relationship inventory. Psychological Report, 46, 1171-1174.
- Schumm, W. R., Bollman, S. R., & Jurich, A. P. (1981). Dimensionality of an abbreviated version of the relationship inventory: An urban replication with married couples. Psychological Reports, 48, 51-56.
- Shantz, C. (1975). The development of social cognition. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Review of child development research (Vol.5). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shapiro, A., & Swensen, C. (1969). Patterns of self-disclosure among married couples. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 179-180.
- Sharpley, C. G., & Cross, D. G. (1982). A psychometric evaluation of the Spanier dyadic adjustment scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 739-741.
- Shostrom, E. L. (1975). The caring relationship inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Sillars, A. L. (1985). Interpersonal perception in relationships. In William Ickes (Ed.), Pp. 277- 305. Compatible and incompatible relationships. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Smith, A. (1759). Theory of moral -sentiments. London: A. Miller.
- Spanier, G. B. (1972a). Romanticism and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 481-487.
- Spanier, G. B. (1972b). Further evidence on methodological weaknesses in the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale and other measures of adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 403-404.
- Spanier, G. B. (1973). Whose marital adjustment? A research note. Sociological Inquiry, 43, 95-96.
- Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: new scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-27.

- Spanier, G. B. (1979). The measurement of marital quality. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 5, 288-300.
- Spanier, G. B., & Cole, C. L. (1976). Toward clarification and investigation of marital adjustment. International Journal of the Sociology of the Family, 6, 121-146.
- Spanier, G. B., & Lewis, R. A. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 825-839.
- Spanier, G. B., & Thompson, L. (1982). A confirmatory analysis of the dyadic adjustment scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 731-738.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holohan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1673-1682.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4, 43.
- Spencer, H. (1870). The principles of psychology. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1947). Conceptions of modern psychiatry. White Foundation: Washington D. C..
- Surra, C. A. (1980). Premarital origins of marital interaction: Toward a typology of premarital relationships. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 4183A. (University Microfilms No. 8105811).
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. Harper & Row: New York.
- Taft, J. (1933). The Dynamics of therapy in a controlled relationship. New York: Mcmillan.
- Terman, L. M. (1938). Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Terman, L., & Johnson, W. (1939). Methodology and results of recent studies in marital adjustment. American Sociological Review, 4.
- Terman, L. M., & Oden, M. H. (1947). The gifted child grows up. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelly, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.
- Turk, J. L., & Bell, N. W. (1972). Measuring power in families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 215-222.
- Turner, R. H. (1978b). The role and the person. American Journal of Sociology, 84, 1-23.
- Turnure, C. (1975). Cognitive development and role-taking ability in boys and girls from 7 to 12. Developmental Psychology, 11, 202-209.
- Udry, J. R. (1973). The social context of marriage. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Underwood, B., & Moore, B. (1982). Perspective-taking and altruism. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 143-173.
- Weiss, R. (1975). Marital separation. New York: Basic Books.
- Weiss, R. L., & Margolin, G. (1977). Assessment of marital conflict and accord. In A. R. Ciminero, K. S. Calhoun, & H. E. Adams (Eds.), Handbook for behavioral assessment. New York: Wiley.
- Wills, T. A., Weiss, R. L., & Patterson, G. R. (1974). A behavioral analysis of the determinants of marital satisfaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 802-811.
- Wispe, L. (1986). The distinction between sympathy and empathy: To call forth a concept, a word is needed. Journal Of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 314-321.

Appendices

If you do not know the address of one or both of your parents, please call the HDFS office (754-4765) within the next two days and leave this information with the secretary.

5. What is your name?

6. At what local phone number can you be contacted? _____

APPENDIX B

January, 1987

Dear Parents:

Your child is presently enrolled in a class in the Human Development and Family Studies Department at Oregon State University. One of the purposes of "family classes" is to give students scientific information that will aid them in making decisions in areas of their lives such as love, dating, marriage and family. A question frequently asked by these students is, "What makes marriage relationships work?" Knowing what makes marriages successful or not is important to all of us, especially the many students who are presently single. We don't know many of the reasons why some relationships are rewarding and long lasting, while other marriages are short lived.

You and your spouse are one of a small number of couples that are being asked to share their experience on these matters. It is important that your responses be completed and returned so that the results truly represent a cross section of marriages. We would like the questionnaires to be completed by both of you in order to have information of both men and women. Please complete the questionnaires separately without discussing them with your partner.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The surveys have an identification number on them for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaires are returned. Your name will never be placed on a questionnaire.

The results of this research will be made available to professionals in the field of marriage and family, and will benefit future students like your child. If you have any questions please call Ed Long at the above phone number (extension 4765).

Thank you very much for your help. When you have returned the questionnaires to us your names will be automatically entered in a random \$100. drawing.

Sincerely,

Ed Long, M.A.
Principal Investigator

David Andrews, Ph.D.
Department Head

APPENDIX C

January 17, 1987

Last week two questionnaires seeking your responses to some questions about your experience of marriage, were sent to you and your spouse. The two of you as a couple, are a part of a small sample that are being asked to respond. It is important that your responses are included in the results.

If the TWO OF YOU have already completed the surveys and returned them to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, we would very much appreciate it, if you could do so as soon as possible.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaires, they got misplaced, or you have questions, please call Ed Long at 1-800 462-3287 (extension 4765). Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ed Long, M.A.
Principal Investigator

David Andrews, Ph.D.
Department Head

P.S. Remember that your name will be entered in the \$100. drawing as soon as the questionnaires are returned to us.

APPENDIX D

January 31, 1987

Dear Parents:

About three weeks ago we wrote to you seeking your responses to a survey about marriage. As of today we have not yet received completed questionnaires from you and your spouse. If our letters have crossed in the mail we want to THANK YOU so much for your cooperation.

As marriage and family researchers we undertake this type of study because we believe that university students need to understand what facilitates satisfying and lasting marriages.

We are writing to you again because of the significance that each questionnaire has to the usefulness of the study. It is essential that each couple in the sample return completed questionnaires in order for the results of this study to truly represent a wide spectrum of marriages. As mentioned in the last letter it is important that the questionnaire be completed by both the husband and the wife separately.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. If neither of you have returned the surveys, you will find two questionnaires and envelopes enclosed in this mailing. If one of you has completed and returned the survey, you will find one questionnaire, to be completed by the partner that has not yet filled one out.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ed Long, M.A.
Principal Investigator

David Andrews, Ph.D.
Department Head

P.S. Returned questionnaires will assure you that your name will be entered in the \$100. drawing.

21. When I'm involved in an argument with my partner I am able to consider and take into account my partners point of view, and compare it with my own.

*22. I always know exactly what my partner means.

*23. I am able to sense or realize what my partner is feeling.

*24. Before criticizing my partner I try to imagine how I would feel in his/her place.

25. If I feel like I am right about something, I don't waste much time listening to my partners arguments.(R)

*26. I sometimes try to understand my partner better by imagining how things look from his/her perspective.

*27. In my relationship with my partner I believe that there are two sides to every question, and I try to look and think about both sides.

28. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from my partners point of view.(R)

*29. I try to look at my partners side of a disagreement before I make a decision.

*30. When I'm upset with my partner, I usually try to put myself in his/her shoes for a while.

*31. Even if my partner has difficulty in saying something, I usually understand what he/she means.

*32. I usually do not understand the full meaning of what my partner is saying to me.(R)

*33. I am able to appreciate exactly how the things my partner experiences, feel to him/her?

* Items included in the final scale
(R) Items must be reversed for scoring

Cognizance Subscale is items 13,14,15,22,23,31,32,33

Strategies Subscale is items 24,26,27,29,30

- *43. My partner easily becomes impatient with me.(R)
- *44. My partner is not able to put him/herself into my shoes.(R)
- *45. My partner nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
- *46. My partner does not sense or realize what I am feeling.(R)
- *47. My partner realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty saying it.
- *48. My partner does not usually understand the whole meaning of what I say to him/her.(R)
- *49. My partner appreciates how the things I experience, feel to me.
- *50. Before criticizing me, my partner tries to imagine how I feel.
- *51. If my partner thinks he/she is right about something he/she doesn't waste much time in listening to my arguments.(R)
- *52. My partner tries to understand me better by imagining how things look from my perspective.(R)
- *53. My partner believes that there are two sides to every argument and tries to look at both sides.
- *54. My partner sometimes finds it difficult to see things from my perspective.(R)
- *55. My partner tries to look at my perspective before making a decision.
- *56. When my partner is upset with me he/she tries to put him/herself in my shoes for a while.

* Items included in the final scale
(R) Items reversed for scoring

Cognizance Subscale is items 37,39,43,44,46,48,51,54

Strategies Subscale is items
34,38,40,41,45,47,49,50,52,53,55,56

APPENDIX G

Two Factor Solution for the Item Pool
N=88 COLLEGE STUDENTSDyadic Perspective-Taking
ScalePerceptions of Dyadic
Perspective-Taking Scale

<u>ITEM#</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM- TOTAL</u>	<u>ITEM#</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM-TOTAL</u>
D11	-.28	.49	.27	34	.67	.43	.72
D12	.04	.33	.34	D35	.28	.16	.36
13	.41	.49	.55	D36	.15	.22	.40
14	.34	.47	.66	37	.25	.68	.68
15	.20	.54	.65	38	.40	.47	.66
16	.37	.43	.49	39	.26	.77	.76
D17	.35	.07	.16	40	.66	.36	.74
D18	-.12	.03	.04	41	.68	.22	.63
D19	.12	.30	.42	D42	.21	.00	.19
20	.62	.37	.62	43	.42	.41	.61
21	.69	.20	.48	44	.16	.70	.62
22	.05	.57	.47	45	.49	.62	.75
23	.08	.68	.64	46	.15	.88	.69
24	.73	.26	.64	47	.34	.46	.54
D25	.31	.12	.35	48	.17	.76	.60
26	.69	.09	.54	49	.58	.41	.69
27	.66	.18	.55	50	.71	.16	.61
D28	.25	.18	.36	51	.50	.19	.54
29	.46	.08	.46	52	.62	.51	.75
30	.68	.12	.53	53	.71	.23	.67
31	.14	.75	.62	54	.54	.31	.63
32	.37	.51	.35	55	.78	.28	.64
33	.16	.42	.51	56	.65	.46	.72

D Item is deleted from the scale

F1=factor 1, eigenvalue=9.38 F1=76% scale variance F1 Strategies	eigenvalue=5.74	F1= factor 1, eigenvalue=5.74 F1=86% scale variance F1 Strategies
F2=factor 2, eigenvalue=1.81 F2=24% scale variance F2 Partner Cognizance		F2=factor2, eigenvalue=1.54 F2=14% scale variance F2 Cognizance
Item-Total= Item Total Correlation		Item-total =Item Total Correlation
Cronbach's Alpha with 23 items=.87		Cronbach's Alpha with 23 items =.94

APPENDIX H

Two Factor Solution for the
16 Item Dyadic Perspective-Taking ScaleN=88 COLLEGE
STUDENTSN=118 COLLEGE
STUDENTSN=366 MARRIED
INDIVIDUALS

<u>ITEM#</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM-</u> <u>TOTAL</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM-</u> <u>TOTAL</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM-TOTAL</u>
13	.45	.43	.64	.14	.70	.38	.57	.39	.64
14	.44	.52	.64	.21	.69	.45	.65	.41	.70
15	.41	.59	.64	.03	.67	.30	.70	.29	.66
16	.30	.38	.46	.55	.15	.53	.24	.36	.42
20	.62	.30	.61	.63	.11	.57	.40	.37	.55
21	.60	.20	.54	.64	.25	.64	.31	.41	.48
22	.06	.65	.44	.25	.34	.37	.62	.14	.51
23	.28	.66	.61	.44	.31	.53	.69	.20	.58
24	.70	.29	.66	.80	.16	.70	.26	.67	.59
26	.73	.13	.59	.77	.30	.75	.16	.72	.55
27	.55	.28	.57	.70	.24	.68	.25	.58	.54
29	.57	.17	.49	.79	.20	.73	.24	.56	.51
30	.64	.22	.60	.67	.07	.57	.06	.78	.50
31	.16	.82	.59	.36	.03	.33	.68	.15	.56
32	.23	.29	.34	.46	.18	.48	.52	.10	.44
33	.24	.50	.49	.43	.28	.52	.49	.27	.50

88 College students
 F1, eigenvalue=5.79, 84% scale variance
 F1 Strategies
 F2, eigenvalue=1.81 16% scale variance
 F2 Cognizance
 Cronbach's Alpha =.89

118 College students
 F1, eigenvalue=5.59, 82% scale variance
 F1 Strategies
 F2, eigenvalue 1.20, 18% scale variance
 F2 Cognizance
 Cronbach's alpha .89

366 Married individuals
 F1, eigenvalue=5.62, 82% scale variance
 F1 Cognizance
 F2, eigenvalue 1.23, 18% scale variance
 F2 Strategies
 Cronbach's Alpha=.89

APPENDIX I

Two Factor Solution for the 20 Item
Perceptions of Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale

88 COLLEGE STUDENTS			118 COLLEGE STUDENTS			366 MARRIED INDIVIDUALS			
ITEM#	F1	F2	ITEM TOTAL	F1	F2	ITEM TOTAL	F1	F2	ITEM TOTAL
34	.71	.38	.73	.67	.43	.75	.74	.28	.75
37	.27	.68	.69	.30	.66	.64	.21	.67	.58
38	.41	.46	.64	.37	.67	.70	.70	.38	.75
39	.29	.78	.77	.22	.72	.63	.22	.73	.62
40	.67	.31	.73	.52	.34	.59	.66	.29	.67
41	.67	.20	.62	.64	.26	.62	.65	.16	.57
43	.45	.40	.63	.42	.32	.52	.25	.63	.58
44	.20	.67	.61	.63	.41	.71	.23	.76	.65
45	.52	.60	.75	.18	.73	.59	.62	.25	.61
46	.20	.86	.69	.31	.63	.63	.31	.76	.71
47	.37	.43	.53	.36	.55	.62	.59	.35	.65
48	.20	.75	.61	.22	.66	.58	.26	.70	.63
49	.60	.38	.68	.45	.49	.64	.62	.34	.67
50	.70	.14	.61	.72	.17	.61	.74	.25	.69
51	.52	.16	.56	.49	.37	.61	.27	.54	.54
52	.65	.48	.76	.73	.36	.75	.80	.28	.74
53	.72	.18	.68	.67	.11	.53	.75	.24	.70
54	.57	.28	.65	.39	.35	.51	.24	.58	.55
55	.79	.24	.64	.58	.24	.55	.75	.25	.70
56	.68	.43	.73	.60	.32	.63	.76	.22	.69

N= 88 COLLEGE STUDENTS

F1 eigenvalue=9.20 86% scale variance

F1 Strategies

F2 eigenvalue=1.51 14% scale variance

F2 Cognizance

Cronbach's Alpha=.95

N=118 COLLEGE STUDENTS

F1 eigenvalue=8.45 88% scale variance

F1 Strategies

F2 eigenvalue 1.16 12% scale variance

F2 Cognizance

Cronbach's Alpha .93

N=366 MARRIED INDIVIDUALS

F1 eigenvalue=9.27 84% scale variance

F1 Strategies

F2 eigenvalue 1.78 16% scale variance

F2 Cognizance

Cronbach's Alpha .94

APPENDIX K

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

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

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Handling family finances | |
| 2. Matters of recreation | |
| 3. Religious matters | |
| 4. Demonstrations of affection | |
| 5. Friends | |
| 6. Sex relations | 5=ALWAYS AGREE |
| 7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior) | 4=ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE |
| 8. Philosophy of life | 3=OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE |
| 9. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws | 2=ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE |
| 10. Aims, goals or things believed important. | 1= ALWAYS DISAGREE |
| 11. Amount of time spent together. | |
| 12. Making major decisions | |
| 13. Household tasks | |
| 14. Leisure time interests and activities. | |
| 15. Career decisions | |
| 16. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship? | 0=ALL OF THE TIME |
| | 1=MOST OF THE TIME |
| | 2=MORE OFTEN THAN NOT |
| 17. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight? | 3=OCCASIONALLY |
| 18. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well? | 4=RARELY |
| | 5=NEVER |
| 19. Do you confide in your mate? | |
| 20. Do you ever regret that you got married? (or lived together) | |
| 21. How often do you and your partner quarrel? | |
| 22. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves?" | |

23. Do you kiss often?

4= EVERYDAY 3=ALMOST EVERYDAY 2=OCCASIONALLY
1=RARELY 0=NEVER

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

4=ALL OF THEM 3=MOST OF THEM 2=SOME OF THEM
1=VERY FEW OF THEM 0=NONE OF THEM

HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU SAY THE FOLLOWING EVENTS OCCUR BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR WIFE?

25. Having a stimulating exchange of ideas.

0=NEVER

26. Laugh together

1=LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH

27. Calmly discuss something

2=ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH

28. Work together on a project

3=ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK

4=ONCE A DAY

5=MORE OFTEN

These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Circle your answer)

29. Being too tired for sex YES =0

30. Not showing love. NO =1

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

0.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6

0= EXTREMELY UNHAPPY 1=FAIRLY UNHAPPY

2= A LITTLE UNHAPPY 3=HAPPY

4=VERY HAPPY 5=EXTREMELY HAPPY

6=PERFECT

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship? (Circle the appropriate number).

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX L

Marital Instability Index (MII)

Sometimes married people think they would enjoy living apart from their spouse. How often do you feel this way in your current marriage? (Circle the appropriate response).

1. Considering your current marriage have you or your spouse seriously suggested the idea of divorce at any time within the last three years?

(0) NEVER (1) OCCASIONALLY (2) OFTEN (3) VERY OFTEN

2. Have you discussed the possibility of your own divorce, or separation with a close friend?

(0) NEVER (1) OCCASIONALLY (2) OFTEN (3) VERY OFTEN

3. Even people who get along quite well with their spouse sometimes wonder whether their marriage is working out. Have you ever thought that your marriage may be in trouble?

(0) NEVER (1) OCCASIONALLY (2) OFTEN (3) VERY OFTEN

4. Have you talk about consulting an attorney in regards to a divorce?

(0) NEVER (1) OCCASIONALLY (2) OFTEN (3) VERY OFTEN

5. Has the thought of getting a divorce or separation crossed your mind in the past three years?

(0) NEVER (1) OCCASIONALLY (2) OFTEN (3) VERY OFTEN

APPENDIX M

1. Considering all of the activities that you do with your partner. How pleasant and satisfying on a scale from 1 to 5 would you say that your activity with your partner is?

(Circle your response)

1 ACTIVITY WITH PARTNER IS VERY UNPLEASANT AND UNSATISFYING

2 ACTIVITY WITH PARTNER IS SOMEWHAT UNPLEASANT AND UNSATISFYING

3 ACTIVITY WITH PARTNER IS NEUTRAL/ NEITHER PLEASANT NOR UNPLEASANT

4 ACTIVITY WITH PARTNER IS IS SOMEWHAT PLEASANT AND SATISFYING

5 ACTIVITY IS VERY PLEASANT AND SATISFYING

2. Considering all the time you had available in the last seven days, excluding sleep, but including the time you spent on the job, estimate the percentage of time you spent with each person listed below. (Fill in the blank)

TIME SPENT WITH YOUR PARTNER ONLY	_____	%
TIME WITH YOUR PARTNER AND OTHERS	_____	%
TIME SPENT WITH OTHERS ONLY	_____	%
TIME SPENT ALONE	_____	%

TOTAL TIME 100%

3. Considering all of the time you spent in leisure activities during the last seven days, estimate the percentage of leisure time spent with each person listed below. (Fill in the blank)

TIME SPENT WITH YOUR PARTNER ONLY	_____	%
TIME WITH YOU PARTNER AND OTHERS	_____	%
TIME WITH OTHERS ONLY	_____	%
TIME SPENT ALONE	_____	%

TOTAL TIME 100%

APPENDIX N

Demographics

1. What is your age? _____ AGE
2. What is your sex? (Circle one)
(1) FEMALE (2) MALE
3. What is your present relationship status (circle one)
(1) MARRIED
(2) SEPARATED
(3) DIVORCED
(4) WIDOWED
(5) OTHER _____ (please specify)
4. How many years have you been married to your current spouse? _____ YEARS MARRIED
5. How many months did you date your present spouse before getting married? _____ MONTHS DATED BEFORE MARRIAGE
6. If you have been married previously, how many times?
TIMES PREVIOUSLY MARRIED _____
7. How many children do you have? (include adoptions) _____ CHILDREN
8. How many children are presently living at home?
_____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME
9. What are the total years of education that you have completed (include, elementary, junior high, high school college, etc.)? _____ YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED
10. What was your own personal income for last year before taxes (this does not include the income of the entire household, just your own personal income)? (circle one)
(1) Less than \$5,000.
(2) \$5,001 to \$10,000
(3) \$10,001 to \$15,000
(4) \$15,001 to \$20,000
(5) \$20,001 to \$25,000
(6) \$25,001 to \$30,000
(7) \$30,001 to \$35,000
(8) \$35,001 to \$40,000
(9) more than \$40,000

11. What is your present employment status? (circle one)

- (1) EMPLOYED FULL TIME
- (2) EMPLOYED PART TIME
- (3) UNEMPLOYED
- (4) RETIRED
- (5) FULL TIME HOMEMAKER
- (6) OTHER (please specify) _____

12. Which if any of the following activities have you been involved in any of the following activities with your present spouse? (circle all that apply)

- (1) SOME TYPE OF MARRIAGE ENRICHMENT EXPERIENCE
- (2) MARRIAGE COUNSELING
- (3) PREMARITAL COUNSELING

13. How often do you attend church?

- (1) NEVER
- (2) ONCE A YEAR
- (3) TWO OR THREE TIMES A YEAR
- (4) ONCE A MONTH
- (5) ONCE A WEEK

14. If you have spiritual or religious beliefs, how important are these beliefs to you? (circle one)

- (1) EXTREMELY UNIMPORTANT
- (2) SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
- (3) NEITHER IMPORTANT NOR UNIMPORTANT
- (4) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
- (5) EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
- (6) UNCERTAIN

APPENDIX O

Two Factor Solution for the 16 Item Dyadic Perspective
Taking Scale

Husbands and Wives Scores Separately

ITEM#	HUSBANDS			WIVES		ITEM-TOTAL
	F1	F2	ITEM TOTAL	F1	F2	
13	.55	.43	.64	.55	.37	.62
14	.63	.41	.69	.66	.40	.70
15	.67	.27	.64	.74	.29	.68
D16	.30	.30	.38	.17	.45	.44
D20	.50	.33	.59	.28	.42	.51
D21	.45	.34	.52	.22	.48	.46
22	.60	.07	.46	.67	.16	.54
23	.65	.18	.57	.76	.16	.59
24	.20	.69	.54	.33	.64	.63
26	.06	.72	.45	.25	.70	.62
27	.23	.57	.51	.27	.59	.56
29	.25	.47	.46	.23	.62	.55
30	.10	.75	.49	.07	.77	.51
31	.65	.08	.51	.69	.20	.59
32	.63	.06	.49	.37	.17	.38
33	.47	.25	.49	.54	.25	.51

D Items deleted from the scale

Husbands

F1 eigenvalue=5.32 80% scale variance

F1 Cognizance

F2 eigenvalue=1.33 20% scale variance

F2 Strategies

Cronbach's Alpha=.88

Wives

F1 eigenvalue=5.84 83% scale variance

F1 Cognizance

F2 eigenvalue=1.24 17% scale variance

F2 Strategies

Cronbach's Alpha .89

APPENDIX P

Two Factor Solution for the Final 20 Item
Perceptions of Partner's Dyadic Perspective-Taking
Husbands and Wives Scores Separately

ITEM#	Husbands			Wives		
	F1	F2	ITEM-TOTAL	F1	F2	ITEM-TOTAL
34	.74	.25	.69	.76	.30	.75
37	.13	.66	.51	.26	.68	.62
38	.68	.39	.74	.71	.37	.76
39	.25	.73	.64	.20	.73	.61
40	.63	.34	.68	.68	.25	.66
41	.66	.29	.66	.68	.10	.55
43	.27	.51	.52	.22	.71	.61
44	.19	.76	.61	.25	.76	.66
45	.62	.28	.62	.62	.24	.60
46	.30	.73	.68	.30	.79	.72
47	.47	.35	.56	.66	.34	.70
48	.20	.66	.56	.30	.73	.68
49	.56	.30	.59	.66	.36	.71
50	.76	.15	.64	.73	.30	.72
51	.21	.52	.49	.29	.56	.57
52	.79	.28	.74	.80	.28	.75
53	.74	.28	.71	.76	.21	.68
54	.23	.53	.51	.24	.63	.58
55	.74	.13	.61	.75	.34	.76
56	.75	.15	.63	.75	.27	.72

Husbands

F1 Eigenvalue=8.53 83% scale variance

F1 Strategies

F2 eigenvalue=1.77 17% scale variance

F2 Cognizance

Cronbach's Alpha .93

Wives

F1 eigenvalue=9.73 84% scale variance

F1 Strategies

F2 eigenvalue 1.89 16% scale variance

F2 Cognizance

Cronbach's Alpha .95

APPENDIX Q

Two Factor Solution for the Final 13 Item
Dyadic Perspective-Taking Scale

HUSBANDS n=159

WIVES n=172

<u>ITEM#</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM</u> <u>TOTAL</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>ITEM</u> <u>TOTAL</u>
13	.55	.44	.64	.57	.31	.61
14	.60	.41	.67	.68	.38	.72
15	.69	.28	.65	.74	.29	.71
16	Item deleted from scale					
20	Item deleted from scale					
21	Item deleted from scale					
22	.60	.09	.47	.66	.18	.59
23	.67	.18	.58	.74	.19	.63
24	.19	.68	.52	.34	.61	.60
26	.06	.73	.46	.26	.72	.60
27	.23	.56	.50	.28	.59	.56
29	.25	.47	.46	.24	.64	.55
30	.09	.76	.48	.06	.83	.49
31	.68	.09	.54	.69	.18	.62
32	.60	.06	.45	.40	.07	.32
33	.49	.27	.51	.54	.28	.54

Husbands

F1 eigenvalue=4.52 77% scale variance

F1 Cognizance

F2 eigenvalue=1.33 23% scale variance

F2 Strategies

Cronbach's Alpha .86

Wives

F1 eigenvalue=5.22 81% scale variance

F1 Cognizance

F2 eigenvalue=1.19 19% scale variance

F2 Strategies

Cronbach's Alpha .88

APPENDIX R

Assessment of the Cognizance Subscale of the DPT

Husbands and Wives		Husbands	Wives
ITEM #	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL
8	.61	.60	.61
9	.69	.65	.71
10	.70	.66	.72
14	.59	.55	.63
15	.65	.62	.67
21	.64	.61	.66
22	.44	.52	.36
23	.52	.51	.54
Alpha =.85		Alpha =.85	Alpha=.85

Assessment of the Strategies Subscale of the DPT

Husbands and Wives		Husbands	Wives
ITEM#	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL
16	.61	.60	.61
17	.69	.66	.71
18	.57	.55	.58
19	.56	.47	.63
20	.67	.64	.69
Alpha =.82		Alpha =.80	Alpha =.84

APPENDIX S

Assessment of the Cognizance Subscale of the PDPT

Husbands and Wives		Husbands		Wives	
ITEM#	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL
25	.65	.61	.61	.68	.68
27	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71
30	.65	.54	.54	.72	.72
31	.75	.73	.73	.76	.76
33	.75	.70	.70	.78	.78
35	.70	.64	.64	.74	.74
38	.59	.55	.55	.61	.61
41	.59	.53	.53	.64	.64
Alpha =.89		Alpha =.87		Alpha =.91	

Assessment of the Strategies Subscale of the PDPT

Husbands and Wives		Husbands		Wives	
ITEM#	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL	ITEM-TOTAL
24	.77	.73	.73	.79	.79
26	.77	.75	.75	.78	.78
28	.70	.70	.70	.71	.71
29	.64	.69	.69	.65	.65
32	.67	.68	.68	.65	.65
34	.67	.56	.56	.73	.73
36	.69	.61	.61	.73	.73
37	.75	.73	.73	.76	.76
39	.81	.79	.79	.82	.82
40	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
42	.76	.71	.71	.79	.79
43	.75	.72	.72	.77	.77
Alpha =.94		Alpha =.93		Alpha =.94	

Footnotes

¹
The terms prediction and predictor were used throughout this study to denote the statistical procedure of multiple regression where the unknown scores on a dependent variable are predicted from the known scores on a group of independent variables. The term prediction is not used to imply changes in the dependent variables over time as longitudinal research would indicate.