7-2019

16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment Among Spouses of Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment

Harley Cassandra Dungee

16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment Among Spouses of Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment

by

Harley Cassandra Dungee

Bachelor of Arts
Psychology
Florida Institute of Technology
2016

Master of Science
Psychology
Florida Institute of Technology
2018

A Doctoral Research Project submitted to the
School of Psychology at
Florida Institute of Technology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Psychology
in
Clinical Psychology

Melbourne, Florida
July, 2019

We the undersigned committee
hereby approve the attached doctoral research project.

16PF Couples Counseling Report:
Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment Among Spouses of Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment

by

Harley Cassandra Dungee

_____
Richard T. Elmore, Jr., Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Psychology
Committee Chair

_____
Barbara Paulillo, Psy.D.
Associate Professor
School of Psychology

_____
John Frongillo, Ph.D
Assistant Professor
School of Arts and Communication

_____
Lisa Steelman, Ph.D.
Professor and Dean
College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

Abstract

TITLE: 16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment Among Spouses of Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment

AUTHOR: Harley Cassandra Dungee, M.S.

MAJOR ADVISOR: Richard T. Elmore, Jr., Ph.D.

A majority of research regarding military populations focuses on service members solely and often ignores spousal difficulties. The current study utilizes the 16 Personality Factor Couple's Counseling Report (16PF CCR) variables to assist in clarifying factors that impact relationship functioning among female spouses of male combat veterans post-deployment. Results of the present study demonstrated a positive significant relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and one of the nine Individual Satisfaction areas. A significant and negative relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and one of the sixteen Primary Personality factors. Personality Similarity had a significant negative and a significant positive relationship with two Primary Personality factors, whereas Relationship Adjustment demonstrated significant positive relationships with four Primary Personality factors. A significant positive relationship was found between Personality Similarity and Relationship Adjustment. A significant relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores, length of relationship, and age. Limitations, implications, and future research directions based on the current study are discussed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgments

Each day I am reminded of the truth that lies behind the phrase "it takes a village." I have been fortunate enough to have been shaped by two villages and to say that I would not be where I am today without the love, support, and guidance of each person that makes up these villages is a massive understatement. To my educational village, thank you for your guidance, tough-love, and constant encouragement to better myself every day. To my most patient and kind advisor, Dr. Richard T. Elmore, Jr., thank you for always knowing what to say to guide me towards the direction I so desperately need to go. Since interview day, you have remained one of my greatest supporters and I can never thank you enough for that. Thank you to Dr. Barbara Paulillo and Dr. John Frongillo, as this project would not have been possible without your guidance, support, and thoughtful insights. To the cohort that turned into friends that turned into family, you will forever hold a place in my heart as I would not have made it through this journey without each of you. It's practically impossible to choose the words that would encompass how eternally grateful I am to this next group of people, to my original village, to my family. To my parents, Lisa and Dane, there is an endless list of all that I could thank you for. Your unconditional love and support throughout the years has given me the priceless opportunity to explore the world without fear, as I have always known you would be with me every step of the way. As this chapter closes and a new one begins, always know that no matter how far away the military takes me or how long I am gone, I will always find my way home to you. Finally, to my sister, best

friend, and greatest motivator, Jacquelyn. Words will never express what our relationship means to me, as being your older sister has been and always will be the greatest honor of my life. As a family, your strength and guidance has been invaluable and I can never thank you enough. I love you 3000.

Introduction

While combat-deployed service members are placed in foreign lands and quite often come into contact with hostile individuals while in life-threatening situations, they are also likely battling a typically unseen domestic conflict that lies on the homefront, and even more specifically, home's doorstep. Since tragedy struck our nation on September 11, 2001, it is believed that over two million soldiers have served in Afghanistan and Iraq in service of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), and Operation New Dawn (OND) (Bergmann, Renshaw, Allen, Markman, & Stanley, 2014). Of those who have served in the aforementioned conflicts, it is estimated that approximately 56% of those deployed during these operations were married throughout the duration of their deployments (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015). As a result of unique contributing factors, such as lengthy deployments and communication reduction, marital distress and conflict has been seen to be significantly higher amongst military couples when compared to their civilian counterparts.

While a substantial amount of research has been conducted exploring the impacts service has on soldiers, there appears to be a lack of studies conducted concerning the spouses of said service members and the effects service has on them. Notably, even less research has been conducted exploring the interactions between spousal personality factors, personality similarity to their veteran partner, relationship adjustment ability, demographic variables, and overall marital satisfaction.

The present study will utilize the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR) completed by couples comprised of male combat-deployed military veterans and their female spouses post-deployment. The assessment will be used as a means to identify personality factors, individual areas of current relationship satisfaction, and demographic variables that are impacting overall marital satisfaction. In opposition to a majority of studies conducted with military service members, this study will focus on exploring the aforementioned factors regarding female spouses. The following literature review includes information regarding both the clinical and general non-clinical populations as to provide a comprehensive overview of the research conducted over the last few decades. Notably, the clinical population discussed includes information on both military members and their spouses, as the research available on the latter is minimal at this time.

Literature Review

Population Demographics

nonclinical population. Marriage is one of the most common traditions performed throughout the world. While the specifics of ceremonies differ across cultures, finding a partner to spend one's life with remains a goal of many while entering adulthood. The American Psychological Association (APA) (2019) reports that approximately 90% of individuals in Western cultures will marry by age 50, however, approximately 40-50% of these couples will divorce. Notably, divorce

rates are higher for individuals who remarry, such that 60% of second marriages and 73% of third marriages will dissolve (Popenoe & Whitehead, 2010).

clinical population. According to the Department of Defense (DoD) (2019), there are 1,359,685 individuals currently serving in the United States Armed Forces as Active Duty personnel. As of 2017, the DoD reported almost 800,000 individuals classified as Active Duty personnel in the United States military were married, either to a civilian or another military service member. Notably, mental health difficulties in both military cohorts and the general U.S. population have been known to adversely impact one's daily functioning, particularly martial satisfaction (Bergmann et al., 2014; Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). While service members represent less than 1% of the United States' population (DoD, 2019), soldiers and their spouses appear to be experiencing significant psychological distress and relationship difficulties to the same degree, if not greater, than the general public (Campbell & Renshaw, 2012). Several proposed factors that are believed to contribute to these difficulties include length of mandated separations, reductions in intimacy, communication obstacles, and non-standard work schedules that often contribute to work-family conflict, amongst others (Andres, 2014).

Of those deployed during OEF, OIF, and OND, 46.5% of soldiers reported multiple deployments with significant subsets reporting deployment lengths of six months or longer (Bergmann et al., 2014). Many of those deployed experience repeated and extensive combat exposure. Stress as a result of military-mandated

separations has been shown to lead to adverse outcomes, particularly marital dissatisfaction, which is further linked to poor daily functioning, increased difficulty recovering from stress, typically poorer physical health, and a greater likelihood of divorce (Bergmann et al., 2014; Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015).

Deployment Difficulties

Prior research has identified the impact of all the stages of deployment on both service members and their families. As a result of media exposure, many are aware of the difficulties military service members themselves face, such as potential physical dangers, mental health difficulties, and disruptions in social support communication. However, what seems to be left out of most media coverage are the difficulties and sacrifices the spouses of service members encounter. According to Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, and Cosden (2015), family members of deployed personnel, particularly spouses, experience a unique set of challenges, and often conflicting emotions, throughout each deployment stage. For instance, spouses will likely feel a form of loss anticipation during the pre-deployment phase, a greater sense of independence throughout the actual deployment, and then role transitioning pressures upon reaching post-deployment as their spouse begins to reintegrate into the family system. Additionally, spouses of military service members who have deployed demonstrate higher rates of depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, adjustment difficulties, sleep disorders, and acute stress reactions (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015).

According to Larsen et al. (2015), resilience appears to be an important protective factor for military spouses during the deployment cycle. Resilience in often defined as a dynamic process that includes cognitive, behavioral, and emotional aspects that allows an individual to adapt, effectively cope, and recover from stressful circumstances. Resilience is bolstered by the utilization of positive coping skills. A multitude of factors were further identified by Larsen and colleagues (2015) as contributors to effective coping, which include utilizing social support, reestablishing roles, placing one's focus on other things, establishing stability, and utilizing technology to communicate during and post-deployment. They further identified a unique challenge military spouses and their deployed partners go through that civilian couples will never face: the post-deployment reintegration period. During this time, both partners are attempting to once again redefine their role and associated responsibilities once the service member returns home. This is often a confusing and difficult time for both partners as they attempt to not only express their emotions and thoughts surrounding their deployment experiences, but also are attempting to actively empathize and understand what their partner has experienced as well.

While it may seem counterintuitive, unfiltered communication regarding deployment struggles may not always be the best option for spouses attempting to bond with each other post-deployment (Campbell and Renshaw, 2012; Balderrama-Durbin et al., 2013). Campbell and Renshaw (2012) conducted a study utilizing 465 couples comprised of combat-deployed Vietnam Era service members and their

spouses in which significant relationships between PTSD symptom severity, deployment-centered partner communication, non-deployed spousal psychological distress, and overall relationship satisfaction were found. Most notably, the researchers found a specific link between Vietnam deployment-focused communication and partner psychological distress contingent upon the service member's degree of experienced PTSD symptom severity. Furthermore, it was found that when the contingency of PTSD symptom severity meeting clinical criteria was met, partner psychological distress exhibited an increasingly strong and positive link to communication surrounding Vietnam deployment experiences. The aforementioned findings are particularly important to the current research, because while it may seem obvious that more open and honest communication would result in higher levels of relationship satisfaction, this appears to not always be the case for this specified clinical population: soldiers and their spouses.

Marital Satisfaction

nonclinical population. Regardless of one's culture, religion, geographic location, or practically any other differentiating demographic variable, we all continuously find ways to cope with both personal and relationship-based stress. Several external factors that often impact stress levels, and even overall levels of marital satisfaction amongst couples, include the introduction of children early on in a marriage, decreases in external social support, and the presence of mental health symptoms in one's partner (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). However, it is important to note that the coping strategies we choose may not always be adaptive

in nature. Bouchard, Sabourin, Lussier, Wright, and Richer (1998) found a direct link between marital satisfaction of both partners and the use of coping strategies when confronted with marital difficulties. More specifically, they found that men and women tend to rely on different types of coping strategies that have varying effects on marital satisfaction. For example, men reported using denial as a coping strategy more often than women did and the use of this particular strategy was negatively associated with marital satisfaction. However, this may be more complex than meets the eye as women's use of denial, even though it was used less frequently than men, resulted in more complicated outcomes regarding marital satisfaction levels, as it was found to be beneficial in the short-run but showed no significant association regarding long-term satisfaction levels. Regardless of the differences found between genders, the frequency of coping strategy usage by each individual within the relationship significantly impacted the other partner and their respective marital satisfaction ratings. Higher frequency usage of some coping strategies, particularly problem-focused ones, were shown to have beneficial effects, whereas low usage or use of different strategies do not result in same outcome.

Connor-Smith and Flachsbart (2007) indicated the utilization of particular coping strategies may be less related to choice and more so a function of one's personality structure as depicted by the Big Five Factor Model. Within psychological research, personality is often broken down utilizing the Big Five Factor Model, specifying five domains including Extraversion, Neuroticism,

Openness to Change, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness. Through conducting a meta-analysis including 165 studies examining the relationship between one's personality and utilization of coping mechanisms, it was determined that while a weak relationship between general coping and the Big Five personality traits was found, each of the five factors predicted the use of specific traits. Extraversion and Conscientiousness predicted higher usage rates of positive coping skills, such as cognitive restructuring and problem-solving strategies, whereas Neuroticism was linked with less use of these skills. Moreover, Neuroticism was linked with maladaptive coping strategies, such as social withdrawal and wishful thinking. Notably, Neuroticism, along with Extraversion, was associated with the use of support-seeking coping strategies.

Moreover, a substantial number of studies have also examined the relationship between personality structure and marital satisfaction. Amongst general population cohorts, a high degree of Neuroticism (i.e., negative affectivity and anxiety) present in one or both partners within a dyadic romantic relationship fosters a sense of toxicity that adversely impacts marital satisfaction (Shiota & Levenson, 2007; Gattis, Berns, Simpson, & Christensen, 2004). When comparing non-distressed couples and their distressed treatment seeking counterparts, higher levels of Neuroticism were found in the latter (Shiota & Levenson, 2007).

Mixed results have been found regarding partner Extraversion, as some research has indicated that higher levels of partner extraversion can result in decreased marital satisfaction in the other partner. More specifically, a longitudinal

study conducted by Kelley and Conley (1987) as cited in Shiota and Levenson (2007) found that a husband's level of Extraversion was linked to a higher likelihood of divorce in the future. Notably, other studies have found no link between marital satisfaction and Extraversion, further denoting a need for more research regarding this specific factor. Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Conscientiousness have been deemed as beneficial factors that boast marital satisfaction (Shiota and Levenson, 2007; Gattis et al., 2004).

clinical population. A study conducted by Morey et al. (2011) found that upon comparing Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) profiles of combat-deployed military service members and a community-based sample, they scored similarly regarding assessment norms on all subscales except three. Notably, service members demonstrated greater item endorsement amongst subscales that highlighted the presence of antisocial behavior patterns, interpersonal vigilance, and, most importantly in regards to the current study, issues in close relationships.

Balderrama-Durbin et al. (2017) highlighted one particular issue that is presenting within the military population at exponentially higher rates than the general public: infidelity. Length of deployment separation is a known risk factor for marital dissatisfaction and relationship difficulties (Bergmann et al., 2014). Across the span of a deployment, relationship satisfaction and social support, particularly support provided by a spouse or romantic partners, significantly diminishes over time (Andres, 2014). In a study conducted by Balderrama and colleagues (2017), when a year-long military-induced mandated separation is

coupled with a lack of emotional/physical intimacy and extensive geographic distance, the resulting rate of sexual infidelity skyrocketed (22.6%) when compared to non-military community norms (1.5- 4%). While the possibility of infidelity occurring can never be completely discounted for any couple, military couples in which one partner is deployed appear to be experiencing it at significantly higher rates, thus adding another challenge for these couples to overcome.

Bergmann et al. (2014) discussed the impact of several additional factors that specifically impact married couples in the military and their relationship satisfaction, including role transitions, work-life balance, and perception regarding meaningfulness of service. Specific attention was placed on perceived meaningfulness of service as a predictor for marital satisfaction in the study conducted by Bergmann and colleagues (2014) with 606 Army couples comprised of male service members and their female spouses. It was found that regardless of the service member's perception of meaningfulness of service, the spouse's perception of said factor was linked with higher marital satisfaction of said spouse. Additionally, the service member's marital satisfaction was positively linked with their perception of meaningfulness of service, but only if their spouse found the service meaningful as well. Identifying cohesion amongst partners regarding this factor appears to be important when addressing potential obstacles that could impact treatment progression.

Renshaw, Rodrigues, and Jones (2008) also found that partner perception of a spouse's deployment experiences and resulting PTSD symptomatology severity

significantly impacts said partner's personal psychological distress and degree of marital satisfaction. Psychological distress and psychological symptom endorsement were seen to be elevated in non-deployed spouses prior to addressing additional variables. Upon further analysis, psychological symptom severity within spouses was higher when said spouses perceived a high degree of symptom severity in their recently deployed partners, even if the service members indicated low levels of experienced psychological distress. Within this particular population, research repeatedly indicates that partner perceptions seem to be increasingly important when assessing for marital satisfaction.

Impact of Mental Health Difficulties on Relationship Satisfaction

Another important area to consider when discussing factors that play into relationship satisfaction is the mental health status of both partners. For military couples specifically, relationship satisfaction has been found to be a contributor to mental health, such that it can either act as a protective factor to one's mental health or it can exacerbate present difficulties (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). Moreover, depression and anxiety appear to be a specific topic of focus regarding the link between relationship satisfaction and mental health difficulties. Whisman, Uebelacker, and Weinstock (2004), as cited in Edwards-Stewart et al. (2018), reported that a significant relationship between anxiety, depression, and marital satisfaction was present, such that an individual's level of experienced depression and anxiety, in addition to their partner's degree of depression, predicted marital satisfaction outcomes.

posttraumatic stress disorder. Through media exposure, the general public most commonly associates one particular mental health disorder with military service members who have been exposed to combat: Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). According to the National Institute of Mental Health (2019), PTSD is characterized as a disorder that develops often after an individual witnesses or is involved in a potentially life-threatening situation. However, it is important to note that PTSD can also develop without someone having directly experienced what may be deemed a "traumatic" incident. For example, an individual who has unexpectedly lost a loved one via a violent death or even just heard about a traumatic experience involving a close friend or family member may experience PTSD symptoms as well. The disorder itself is characterized by the presence of four symptom categories, including intrusive reexperiencing symptoms, avoidance symptoms, arousal/reactivity symptoms, and negative changes in cognition and mood.

The fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-5) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) denotes specific examples of each of the aforementioned symptom categories. Examples of reexperiencing symptoms include experiencing involuntary and intrusive memories related to the traumatic experience, having dreams, often deemed nightmares, linked to the traumatic event, or experiencing a dissociative state, often times as flashbacks, that cause an individual to feel as if traumatic event is happening again in real time. Avoidance symptomatology may present as avoiding thoughts, feelings, and emotions related

to the traumatic event, and/or avoiding external cues, such as people, places, or objects, that act as reminders of the individual's experienced trauma. Changes in one's arousal level and degree of reactivity may present as hypervigilance, sleep difficulties, self-destructive behaviors, or angry outbursts, amongst others. Lastly, one's cognition and mood are adversely impacted by trauma, thus resulting in symptoms including distorted negative cognitions about oneself, the world, and the traumatic event that often leads to feelings of guilt and invalid self-blaming, a persistent negative emotional state, feelings of detachment from social support, and inability to remember important details of the traumatic experience, etc.

While one may or may not experience each of the aforementioned symptoms or they may experience additional symptoms related to each of the four PTSD categories, it is important to remember that these symptoms are often debilitating in nature and adversely affect all areas of one's life, including daily interpersonal interactions, particularly with one's partner. Notably, and quite shockingly, researchers have found that PTSD symptoms and marital satisfaction are more strongly related than PTSD symptoms and the associated trauma in military service members who were previous prisoners of war, further establishing the importance of relationship functioning between soldiers and their spouses (Dekel & Solomon, 2006).

According to a comprehensive review of present literature compiled by Edwards-Stewart et al. (2018), PTSD has repeatedly been linked to decreased levels of marital satisfaction. One particular review of research examining the link

between relationship satisfaction and PTSD found that a lack of positive affect or positive behavior present within a relationship accounted for greater discrepancies in relationship functioning than the presence of negative affect (Campbell & Renshaw, 2018). Riviere, Merrill, and Clarke-Walper (2006) also found that soldiers who were either presently or previously married and experienced poor marital quality reported experiencing more mental health symptoms indicative of PTSD, in addition to depression, anxiety, and other somatic complaints, while also attending more medical appointments in the month prior to study participation, as compared to their counterparts that experienced high marital quality.

A study previously conducted by Goff, Crow, Reisbig, and Hamilton in 2007 obtained results of particular interest to the present study. A sample of 45 male Army soldiers who recently returned from Iraq and/or Afghanistan deployments in support of OEF and OIF, respectively, and their female partners completed trauma symptom inventories that explored experienced trauma and resulting symptomatology indicative of PTSD, as well as additional assessments evaluating relationship functioning. The results of the study demonstrated a clear unidirectional link between trauma symptoms, particularly sleep difficulties and dissociation, and experienced relationship satisfaction, such that satisfaction is predicted to be lower amongst both partners if the aforementioned symptoms are present. Regarding sleep difficulties, Lind et al. (2017) further identified the presence of a neurotic personality and coping via substance use as two risk factors

that predict greater levels of sleep disturbance, once again highlighting the link between personality functioning and the presence of mental health symptoms.

Relationship Adjustment

Relationship adjustment can be conceptualized as one's ability to adapt to changes within a relationship and potentially overcome obstacles that if not addressed could negatively impact the overall relationship. Within the 16PF CCR, two personality factors considered when determining an individual's relationship adjustment are Emotional Stability (Factor C) and Openness to Change (Factor Q_1). An individual with higher relationship adjustment will often exhibit a personality profile indicative of someone who is more emotionally stable and open to changes occurring within the relationship. Someone who scores on the opposing side of the spectrum regarding the aforementioned factors would typically present with poorer relationship adjustment.

Mental health symptoms once again appear to play a key role in not only present marital satisfaction, but the ability to adjust to relationship changes over time. In 2011, a study published by Erbes, Meis, Polusny, and Compton examined relationship adjustment in combat-deployed National Guard service members returning from Iraq who were experiencing PTSD symptoms upon returning home. Data was collected at two times, once pre-deployment and then again post-deployment. Results of the study indicated that PTSD symptoms deemed dysphoric in nature, particularly symptoms indicative of general psychological distress and difficulties with modulating emotional arousal and numbing, remained a significant

predictor of relationship adjustment across time for soldiers, with greater symptom severity specifically linked to poorer relationship adjustment. While there is presently a sufficient amount of research available regarding relationship adjustment of soldiers as reported by Erbes et al. (2011), it seems their romantic counterparts are not as well studied, indicating a need to further examine the impact aforementioned factors have on the relationship adjustment of military spouses or romantic partners.

Link Between Personality and Marital Satisfaction

similar vs. complementary personalities. At this time, the research appears to be quite mixed regarding personality similarity amongst partners as there are two main schools of thought when it comes to linking marital satisfaction and personality similarity amongst partners. As discussed by Shiota and Levenson (2007), a multitude of researchers have conducted studies that suggest similarities amongst individuals within a romantic dyad predict longer lasting relationships with increased levels of marital satisfaction as the years progress. This concept is more simply depicted in the commonly used phrase “birds of a feather flock together.” Similarity amongst specific domains, including age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, religion, educational background, intelligence, physical attractiveness, values, and attitudes, predict a lower likelihood of separation and divorce and higher levels of marital satisfaction (Shiota & Levenson, 2007). Moreover, a longitudinal study utilizing a sample of newlywed couples found that individuals who possessed personality characteristics that are often deemed more

psychopathic in nature, such as manipulation, deceit, impulsiveness, and aggression, sought out partners that were more similar to them in these regards (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). However, it is important to note that couples who demonstrated greater similarity regarding these traits in particular were more likely to experience less marital satisfaction and, moreover, had a greater likelihood of their marriage ending.

It appears this same fact may not ring true when examining how couples match up regarding their individual nonpathological personality characteristics. Research contradictory to the aforementioned supports the *complementary hypothesis*, which promotes the concept that romantic partners who exhibit differences regarding certain personality characteristics will experience greater marital satisfaction over a longer period of time, compared to those who are similar on the same said traits (Shiota & Levenson, 2007).

A study conducted by Shiota and Levenson (2007) examined the relationship between personality characteristics of partners in long-term relationships and their experienced levels of marital satisfaction across a twelve-year timespan. Marital satisfaction was measured at two points throughout this longitudinal study, once at the initiation of the study and then again after twelve years. While initially personality similarity was not linked with marital satisfaction levels, the more similar a couple was predicted significant decreases in marital satisfaction over the twelve-year time frame amongst middle-aged and older couples.

The 16PF Report

The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) is an objective psychological assessment comprised of 185 multiple-choice questions that provides insight into an individual's personality through sixteen primary personality traits that load onto five global factors. Unlike many other psychological assessments, the 16PF is not meant to assess for psychopathology, but rather allows both examiners and examinees to gain a better understanding of the personality structure of the individual taking the test. The assessment was originally developed by Raymond B. Cattell, Ph.D., D.Sc., in 1949 through the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc. (IPAT), which was specifically developed by Dr. Cattell and family to continue research regarding personality assessment. The 16PF is currently in its fifth edition with over 65 years of research supporting its validity and reliability.

To assess for reliability and validity on an individual testing basis, the 16PF includes three response style indices which provide insight into each examinee's test taking approach: Impression Management, Infrequency, and Acquiescence. Items that load onto the Impression Management index indicate if an examinee is purposefully attempting to portray themselves favorably or unfavorably. If an examinee scores high on the Infrequency index, it is indicative of unusual response choices, which could mean one of many things. Several examples include: engaging in random responding, having difficulty paying attention, or feeling extremely indecisive throughout the testing process. Lastly, the Acquiescence index

identifies individuals who have difficulty making test answer choices that truly describe them potentially due to the lack of a stable self-image or the presence of a high need of approval. Demographic information is also collected during test administration, specifically regarding examinee ethnicity, education level, employment status, and current household income.

The sixteen primary factors include Warmth (A), Reasoning (B), Emotional Stability (C), Dominance (E), Liveliness (F), Rule-Consciousness (G), Social Boldness (H), Sensitivity (I), Vigilance (L), Abstractedness (M), Privateness (N), Apprehension (O), Openness to Change (Q_1), Self-Reliance (Q_2), Perfectionism (Q_3), and Tension (Q_4). These factors are scored on a ten-point scale with scores of one, two, or three, and eight, nine, or ten indicating a more extreme and stable characterization of any said trait, whereas a score of five, six, or seven represents an average, yet flexible degree of trait presentation. For example, a score of two on the Warmth (A) factor would indicate that an individual is more reserved, impersonal, and distant from others, whereas a score of nine would denote a tendency to be more warm, outgoing, and attentive to the needs of others. Fifteen of the sixteen primary factors load onto the five global factors (excluding Reasoning (B)), which include Extraversion (EX), Anxiety (AX), Tough-Mindedness (TM), Independence (IN), and Self-Control (SC). These factors depict an individual's personality at a broader level. Notably, each of the five global factors is scored using the same method as the sixteen primary factors.

The 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR)

The 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR) is a personality assessment primarily utilized with couples in therapy. It expands upon the original 16PF as it not only provides information regarding each partner's personality structure, but it attends to couple personality similarity, current relationship satisfaction, and predicted relationship adjustment. The assessment addresses eleven areas that impact relationship satisfaction: Time Together, Problem-Solving Communication, Caring and Affection, Division of Roles, Finances, Sex, Extended Family, Children, and Alcohol or Drug Use. Each partner rates their satisfaction in each area utilizing a nine-point Likert scale. Lower scores indicate dissatisfaction in a particular area, whereas higher scores indicate greater satisfaction, while a score of five indicates a "Neutral" degree of satisfaction. Examinees are additionally asked to identify which of the aforementioned areas they believe, that if addressed and changed, would result in the greatest change within their relationship. Overall Relationship Satisfaction scores are also obtained for each individual, in addition to an estimate of what each person believes their partner's Overall Satisfaction to be.

Upon completion of the assessment, treatment providers will often review the testing results with the couple section by section. Each partner is provided information regarding their individual 16PF profile, then they are provided graphed depictions of how their personalities compare on each of the sixteen primary factors and the five global factors. The couple is also provided an interpretive narrative that addresses key relationship problems while offering data on partner compatibility.

Specifically, an Overall Similarity score ranging from one to ten, with higher scores indicating greater similarity, is provided. Through the utilization and analysis of two factors, Emotional Stability (C) and Openness to Change (Q_1), a Relationship Adjustment score based solely on personality style ranging from one to ten is also provided to each partner. Higher scores are representative of individuals who will likely find it easier to adjust as their relationship changes over the years, whereas someone with a low score may find this task more difficult.

Research Utilizing the 16PF CCR

While there appears to be minimal research published utilizing the 16PF Couples Counseling Report as a measure of personality functioning, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment amongst couples, a series of unpublished doctoral research projects conducted through the Florida Institute of Technology explores these topics deeply and comprehensively (Alexander, 2015; Arnett, 2008; Carpenter, 2018; Field, 2013; Garofalo, 2014; Hart, 2018; Moore, 2015, Mulholland, 2015; Mullis 2018; Shah, 2009). Amongst the aforementioned studies, a variety of demographic variables were utilized as population specifiers which allowed for more in depth literature reviews and analyses to be performed on minority samples, such as couples belonging to the LGBTQ+ community (Shah, 2009) and deployed combat veterans (Alexander, 2015; Moore, 2015; Mulholland, 2015), as well as male and female clients solely seeking marital therapy (Carpenter, 2018; Hart, 2018; Mullis, 2018).

nonclinical population. Amongst several studies, a positive significant relationship was also found between overall marital satisfaction and the Emotional Stability personality variable for several populations, including females (Field, 2013). Additional demographic factors that appear to have a significant relationship with overall marital satisfaction were relationship length and status (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018). Overall marital satisfaction was found to have significant relationships with specific satisfaction variables, such that division of roles, sex, time spent together, children, caring and affection, extended family, problem-solving communication, and finances demonstrated significant positive relationships with overall marital satisfaction (Arnett, 2008; Field, 2013; Garofalo, 2014; Hart, 2018).

Relationship adjustment was also found to have a significant positive relationship with Emotional Stability for females, in addition to Openness to Change, Dominance, Social Boldness, Rule-Consciousness, and Liveliness, but Apprehension, Tension, Privateness, Self-Reliance, and Vigilance were found to have negative significant relationships with relationship adjustment (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018). Notably, emotional reactivity, which is found on the low end of the spectrum for Emotional Stability, led to poorer relationship adjustment within same-sex couples (Shah, 2009). Overall marital satisfaction and relationship adjustment were found to be positively and significantly correlated as well for females (Field, 2013). According to Hart (2018), personality similarity and relationship adjustment are significantly and positively linked for females,

however, no relationship was found between personality similarity and the sixteen primary personality factors for this population (Field, 2013).

clinical population. Three of the aforementioned doctoral research projects specifically evaluated personality similarity, marital satisfaction, relationship adjustment amongst combat deployed veterans who returned to the United States and were seeking marital counseling. Alexander (2015) examined gender differences amongst male and female combat deployed veterans and found that combat deployed men rated themselves higher on dominance and social boldness, as compared to women, who rated themselves higher in abstract reasoning. Additionally, men within this cohort rated themselves as more independent than women.

Regarding further comparisons between female and male combat veterans, a positive significant relationship was found between overall personality similarity and Openness to Change amongst both genders (Moore, 2015; Mulholland, 2015), and Emotional Stability and Social Boldness solely in female veterans (Mulholland, 2015). Moreover, for female veterans, a significant positive relationship was found between personality similarity and both relationship adjustment and overall marital satisfaction (Mulholland, 2015). Age acted as a demographic variable that significantly positively predicted overall marital satisfaction as well for female veterans (Mulholland, 2015). One of the most notable findings discovered in Moore's (2015) study was that for combat deployed males, overall marital satisfaction and relationship adjustment were significantly and negatively

correlated, such that lower relationship adjustment scores were linked with a higher degree of marital satisfaction. While this finding is solely corollary in nature, it appears to be a potential new insight for this specific population that would benefit from future research and potential replication.

Notably, some contradictory results were produced amongst these studies, particularly between military cohorts and their civilian counterparts, further indicating a need for additional research that will hopefully allow for clarification regarding factors influencing personality similarity, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment amongst couples. Additionally, the current study appears to be the first of its kind specifically evaluating personality similarity, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment amongst female spouses of military veterans.

Statement of Purpose

While there appears to be a significant amount of information present in the current literature regarding personality characteristics that make a "good" soldier, little remains regarding what makes a "good" military spouse. More importantly, even less is known about what makes a happy military spouse and an overall thriving couple. The purpose of the current study is to assist in filling this research gap by clarifying the factors that contribute to and affect marital satisfaction and relationship adjustment among female spouses of male combat veterans following deployment. The deployment process is inherently unique in nature and is marked by challenging obstacles that many couples will never have to face.

Acknowledgment of these difficulties coupled with research outcomes that address the specific lifestyle impacts of deployment will not only provide those seeking treatment with comfort, but will allow treatment providers the opportunity to expand their knowledge base and assist a currently underserved community. Moreover, exploring both intrapersonal and extrinsic factors associated with marital satisfaction, including personality traits, demographic factors, and relationship adjustment ability, prior to deployment periods may provide couples with a preemptive buffer to the difficulties they will face. Overall, building upon the research conducted with this particular population subset could assist treatment providers, as well as military organizations, with the development of preventative measures or therapeutic interventions to better prepare spouses of military service members for the deployment cycle and the inevitable reintegration process.

Hypotheses

Upon reviewing previous literature findings, the following hypotheses are proposed:

1. A significant relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the nine Individual Item Satisfaction scores will be found. A Multiple Regression Analysis will be used to test this hypothesis.
2. There will be a significant relationship found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. This hypothesis will be tested using a Multiple Regression Analysis.

3. There will be a significant relationship found between Personality Similarity scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. This hypothesis will be tested using a Multiple Regression Analysis.
4. There will be a significant relationship found between Relationship Adjustment scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. This hypothesis will be tested using a Multiple Regression Analysis.
5. There will be no significant relationship found between the Overall Marital Satisfaction scores, Personality Similarity scores, and Relationship Adjustment scores. This hypothesis will be tested using a Pearson Correlation analysis.
6. A significant relationship will be found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and demographic variables including length of relationship, age, existence of children, branch of military service, and amount of combat exposure. Differences in Overall Marital Satisfaction scores will be tested with either Pearson Correlations or ANOVAs.

Method

Participants

Data analyzed during this study was provided via an archival data set from the office of Dr. Richard T. Elmore, Jr., Ph.D. Research participants included female spouses of military veterans who were deployed in and experienced combat during OEF, OIF, and/or OND. The sample utilized included 54 participants of various ethnicities, religions, ages, whose husbands served amongst four of the five

military branches and identified as a variety of military ranks. All participants completed the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR).

Instruments/Measures

Each participant within the study completed the 16PF CCR, a non-clinical personality assessment, on a voluntary basis. The assessment measure was taken via computer testing or was completed using a paper version of the test.

Design/Plan of Analysis

A significant amount of data and numerous variables were analyzed during this research, and thus, should be perceived as an exploratory analysis. Several analyses were used to analyze the aforementioned data, including multiple regression analyses, analyses of variance, independent t-tests, and Pearson correlation analyses.

Procedure

Approval from the Florida Institute of Technology Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained prior to data collection. Additional IRB approval was obtained for the current study under Exempt Status as the data is archival. All participants completed the 16PF CCR separate from their partner through the IPAT computer program or via paper and pencil format. Couples were provided feedback regarding their 16PF CCR testing results upon request. The feedback included interpretation of individual personality factors, partner personality comparisons, present relationship satisfaction, and prognosis of potential relationship adjustment by a trained clinician.

Results

Descriptive Frequencies

Descriptive frequencies regarding sample demographic variables are displayed in Table 2. The sample analyzed included a total of 54 female spouses of combat-deployed male soldiers during OEF, OIF, or OND. All female participants completed the 16PF CCR. Regarding race, a majority of participants identified as Caucasian/White (77.8%), while 9.3% identified as Hispanic/Latino, 5.6% identified as African-American/Black, 3.7% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1.9% identified as another race. Amongst the 54 participants, 17.0% reported obtaining a High School Diploma or GED as their Highest Education Level achieved, whereas 20.4% reported obtaining an Associate's or Technical Degree, 31.5% obtained a Bachelor's Degree, 9.3% completed some Graduate-Level Coursework but did not obtain a degree, and 20.4% obtained a Graduate Degree of some type. In reference to participant employment status, a majority either reported Working Full-Time (52.8%) or identified as a Homemaker/Housewife (30.2%). Additionally, 11.3% reported Working Part-Time, 1.9% reported they were Unemployed, and 1.9% identified their current employment status as Other. In terms of current household income, 41.5% of participants reported annual combined earnings of $80,000 or more, 20.4% earned $60,000-$79,999 per year, 18.5% earned $40,000-$59,999 per year, 16.7% earned $20,000-$39,000 per year, and only 1.9% of participants earned $10,000-$19,999 per year.

In reference to participant relationships, a majority of participants reported a relationship length from 8-14 years (52.8%), while an additional 30.2% reported being in their current relationship for 3-7 years. Moreover, 15.1% and 1.9% of female participants reported their current relationship length falling within 15-25 years and 25+ years, respectively. Of these 54 women, 67.9% reported having children and 32.1% denied having children. Regarding the participants' combat-deployed male spouses, 13.5% served in the Air Force, 61.5% served in the Army, 19.2% served in the Marine Corps, and 5.8% served in the Navy. Across these four service branches, 78.0% identified as Enlisted military personnel, whereas 22.0% were Commissioned Officers. Of the 54 male spouses deployed in OEF, OIF, and/or OND, only 26.0% rated their Combat Exposure to have occurred during most or all of the duration of their deployments.

Hypothesis 1

Within this study, it was hypothesized that a significant relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the nine Individual Item Satisfaction scores would be present. Descriptive statistics for the nine individual satisfaction areas can be found in Table 3. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis and the hypothesis was supported as the model was significant and all nine Individual Satisfaction together explained 69% of the variance in Overall Marital Satisfaction ($R^2 = .69$, $F(9, 52) = 10.38$, $p < .001$). Amongst the nine Individual Item Satisfaction scores, satisfaction with Caring and Affection demonstrated a significant positive relationship with Overall Marital

Satisfaction (b = .79, p < .001), while also accounting for 62% of the variance in Overall Marital Satisfaction (R^2 = .62, F(1, 52) = 84.04, p < .001).

Hypothesis 2

Regarding Hypothesis 2, it was hypothesized that a significant relationship would be found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. Means and standard deviations for each of the sixteen Primary and five Global Personality Factors can be found in Table 4. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis and it was not supported, as the overall model was not significant (F(16, 52) = .90, p > .05). Notably, a significant and negative relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and one of the sixteen Primary Personality Factors, such that Sensitivity (Factor I) predicted Overall Marital Satisfaction (b = -.37, p < .05). No additional significant relationships were found amongst the Sixteen Individual Personality Factors and Overall Marital Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3

Within this study it was hypothesized that a significant relationship found between Personality Similarity scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors**.** A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis and the hypothesis was not supported, as the overall model was not significant (F(16, 52) = 1.73, p > .05). However, it should be noted that a significant relationship was found between Personality Similarity scores and two of the sixteen Primary Personality Factors, such that Warmth (Factor A) (b = -.40, p < .05), and Social Boldness

(Factor H) ($b = .57$, $p < .05$), individually predicted Personality Similarity. No additional significant relationships were found amongst the Sixteen Individual Personality Factors and Personality Similarity scores.

Hypothesis 4

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship found between Relationship Adjustment scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. Through the use of a multiple regression analysis, this hypothesis was found to be supported as the overall model was significant and all sixteen Primary Personality Factors together explained a significant amount of variance in Relationship Adjustment ($R^2 = .96$, $F(16, 52) = 59.92$, $p < .001$). Several individual factors also demonstrated significant positive relationships with Relationship Adjustment, including Emotional Stability (Factor C) ($b = 1.02$, $p < .001$), Rule-Conscientiousness (Factor G) ($b = .28$, $p < .001$), Apprehension (Factor O) ($b = .36$, $p < .001$), and Openness to Change (Factor Q1) ($b = .27$, $p < .001$). Amongst the four aforementioned individual factors, Emotional Stability explained 78% of the variance in Relationship Adjustment ($R^2 = .78$, $F(1, 51) = 179.33$, $p < .001$) and Rule-Conscientiousness ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F(1, 50) = 20.98$, $p < .001$), Apprehension ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F(1, 49) = 18.46$, $p < .001$), and Openness to Change ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F(1, 48) = 65.82$, $p < .001$) explained an additional 7%, 4%, and 7% of the variance in Relationship Adjustment, respectively.

Hypothesis 5

It was hypothesized that through conducting a Pearson correlation analysis, no significant relationship would be found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores, Personality Similarity scores, and Relationship Adjustment scores. Descriptive statistics for these variables can be found in Table 5. This hypothesis was not supported as a significant positive relationship was found between Personality Similarity and Relationship Adjustment ($r(53) = .31$, $p < .05$). No significant relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Relationship Adjustment ($r(53) = -.003$, $p > .05$), or Overall Marital Satisfaction and Personality Similarity ($r(53) = -.02$, $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 6

It was hypothesized that a significant relationship would be found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and demographic variables including length of relationship, age, existence of children, deployed spouse's branch of military service, and deployed spouse's amount of combat exposure. The hypothesis was supported regarding relationship length and age, but was not supported in reference to existence of children or combat-deployed male spouse military branch and degree of combat exposure.

relationship length. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Relationship Length. A significant effect was found ($F(3, 52) = 6.40$, $p < .01$), such that current relationship length was found to have an effect on marital satisfaction

levels of female spouses of male combat veterans. Post hoc comparisons were unable to be conducted however, as one group being compared had fewer than two cases (e.g., only one couple was married 25+ years). The means and standard deviations of each group can be found in Table 6.

age. A Pearson Correlation was conducted to explore the relationship between the age of female spouses and their Overall Marital Satisfaction. Overall Marital Satisfaction had a mean of 7.32 and a standard deviation of 1.92, whereas age had a mean of 33.23 and a standard deviation of 7.08. A significant and negative corollary relationship was found between age and Overall Marital Satisfaction ($r(52) = -.42$, $p < .01$), indicating that as female spouses got older, their level of marital satisfaction decreased.

existence of children. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and whether participants had children or not. No significant effect was found ($F(1, 52) = .15$, $p = .700$), such that having children or not was not found to impact marital satisfaction levels.

branch of military service. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and the Brach of Military Service reported my combat-deployed male spouses. No significant effect was found ($F(3, 51) = .56$, $p = .647$), such that military branch of service was not found to have an effect on marital satisfaction levels of female spouses of male combat veterans.

combat exposure. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Level of Combat Exposure reported my combat-deployed male spouses. No significant effect was found ($F(4, 49) = 1.72$, $p = .163$), as the amount of deployment-related combat exposure reported by male spouses was not found to have an effect on marital satisfaction levels of female spouses.

Discussion

The present study examined several predictors of marital satisfaction, including a range of demographic variables, as well as relationship adjustment and personality similarity, amongst female spouses of post-9/11 combat-deployed male veterans. At the present time, research focused on military couples is lacking despite the glaring and ever-increasing difficulties a majority of these couples face. Moreover, even less research is available specifically regarding the female spouses of military personnel who have deployed to combat zones at some point during their service. The current study begins to fill in the gaps evident in present research. The results of the current research project are reviewed and discussed, as well as study limitations and future directions for researchers to explore.

Within this particular population, only one Individual Satisfaction area was found to positively and significantly correlate with Overall Marital Satisfaction: Caring and Affection. As denoted in the 16PF CCR testing packet, the Caring and Affection Individual Satisfaction factor was described as “our ability to express caring and understanding; our ability to show each other support and respect; the

way [our] partner makes [us] feel cared for overall." The description further denoted physical affection as a possible demonstration of Caring and Affection. These results align with previous research which has shown that affection is vital for relationship success, as it promotes bonding and effective communication amongst partners, particularly when experiencing conflict, while also laying the groundwork for overall relationship intimacy (Graber, Laurenceau, Miga, Chango, & Coan, 2011). Notably, Floyd et al. (2007) further denoted the positive psychological effects of affection amongst couples such that overt affection behaviors promote the heightening of cortisol levels which then in turn positively impact stress response and recovery processes. This is particularly important for military couples as both partners are often experiencing chronically heightened stress levels not only during deployments, but pre- and post-deployments as well.

Taken together, the sixteen Primary Personality Factors were not found to predict overall marital satisfaction scores, however, one specific factor alone significantly and negatively predicted female partner satisfaction: Sensitivity (Factor I). In this particular study, it appears that increased sensitivity predicted lower levels of overall marital satisfaction for female spouses of combat veterans. Presently, there appears to have been minimal research conducted regarding the relationship between the 16PF CCR primary factors and overall marital satisfaction. As such, this finding is new and requires further research to explore and potentially support the relationship between Factor I and marital satisfaction. At this time, it can be postulated regarding this particular population that higher

degrees of sensitivity, defined in the 16PF and 16PF CCR as being more sensitive, aesthetic, and sentimental, present in a military spouse could make it more difficult for these individuals to cope with separation from their loved ones, and as such, it could be expected that relationship satisfaction would drop. As previously stated, this preliminary finding highlights a gap in the research that would benefit from further exploration.

Once again, taken together the sixteen Primary Personality factors did not predict personality similarity scores for female spouses of male combat-deployed service members. However, two individual factors predicted personality similarity scores. Within this study, Warmth and personality similarity exhibited a predictive inverse relationship, such that women who scored higher on this particular trait were less similar to their spouses. The 16PF depicts individuals who score high on this factor as warm, outgoing, and attentive to others, whereas their lower scoring counterparts present as reserved, aloof, and detached. It is commonly recognized that military culture often encourages, and even rewards, the latter, and as such, it is understandable that female spouses who scored higher on this trait would be more dissimilar to their husbands in the military. On the contrary, Social Boldness positively predicted relationship similarity, such that higher scores on the Social Boldness scale suggested that female partners would be more similar to their male counterparts. This is particularly interesting as the results of a previous doctoral research project completed Alexander (2015) demonstrated that combat-deployed males rated themselves highly on Social Boldness. The results from Alexander's

(2015) study further support this particular finding within the current research project.

Regarding the sixteen Primary Personality factors and relationship adjustment scores, a significant relationship was found, with four personality factors (Emotional Stability, Rule-Conscientiousness, Openness to Change, and Apprehension) explaining approximately 96% of the variance in relationship adjustment. Within the current study, relationship adjustment is defined as one's ability to adapt to changes within one's relationship over time. Statistically speaking, relationship adjustment scores are comprised of Emotional Stability and Openness to Change scores, which alone explained 85% of the variance in relationship adjustment scores in this study, further demonstrating the strong relationship these two factors have with relationship adjustment. Through deeper examination of what Emotional Stability and Openness to Change measure, high scoring individuals will more readily engage in emotion regulation while remaining calm in the face of obstacles and easily adapt to new or changing situations, respectively. Moreover, these are seen as adaptive qualities in any relationship, but even more so in military relationships as encountering obstacles is quite common and changes occur frequently as a result of temporary duty reassignments, deployments, and permanent change of stations. For female military spouses, Rule-Conscientiousness also positively predicted relationship adjustment. Despite many female military spouses identifying as civilians, they are still expected to conform to the rules and standards of military life and culture. As such, someone who easily

conforms, is rule-bound, and dutiful, as a Rule-Conscientiousness high scorer would be, would adapt well within a relationship that must abide by military regulations. Lastly, Apprehension was also positively predictive of relationship adjustment, however, this finding exists in opposition to prior research conducted (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018). It is important to note, however, that the sample utilized within the current study is unique and has not been evaluated in regards to these variables previously. As such, there are likely specific environmental factors that would deem higher Apprehension to be adaptive in nature for military relationships. This preliminary finding would benefit from further evaluation and investigation.

In accordance with some prior research (Hart, 2018), the present study detected the presence of a positive and significant relationship between personality similarity and relationship adjustment. It is important to note that this relationship is corollary in nature, and thus, a causative or predictive relationship cannot be drawn from the present analysis. However, the results indicate that as personality similarity scores increased for female spouses of combat-deployed male veterans, so did relationship adjustment scores. Notably, this finding is in opposition to results gathered from research conducted by Moore (2015) in which an inverse relationship was found regarding these two variables for combat-deployed male veterans, such that increasing personality similarity scores were linked with declining relationship adjustment scores. Taking the findings of this study and the current study together, it seems that greater personality similarity amongst both

partners may be resulting in conflicting outcomes regarding ability to adjust within a relationship. Exploration of this relationship through further research is highly recommended for the population due to the general lack of research presently available.

While length of relationship was found to impact overall marital satisfaction amongst female spouses of male combat veterans, the present study, due to the limited population size, was unable to provide results specifying whether greater time spent within a relationship leads to higher levels of satisfaction. Notably however, a significant and negative corollary relationship was found between age and marital satisfaction, such that as participant age increased, marital satisfaction decreased. This is in direct opposition to the present literature, as aging has often been linked to increasing marital satisfaction, however, it is important to note that the relationship between age and marital satisfaction is often described as U-shaped, such that satisfaction is present early on, drops, and then rises again after a certain age (Henry, Berg, Smith, & Florsheim, 2007). It is possible that the current study was unable to detect this U-shaped pattern as the oldest female spouse was only 52 years old. Contrary to the literature, this study also did not detect a significant relationship between the existence of children and marital satisfaction. Moreover, no relationship was found between amount of combat exposure of male spouses and overall marital satisfaction of female partners. Degree of combat exposure has been previously linked to mental health difficulties in combat veterans, and as previously discussed within the literature review of the current

study, the presence of mental health difficulties, particularly PTSD, has negatively impacted marital satisfaction amongst military couples. As such, it is somewhat surprising that no relationship was detected, however, this is a particularly important area for future researchers to explore as both the presence of mental health difficulties within the military population and the relationship between mental health difficulties and marital satisfaction have been demonstrated repeatedly.

Study Limitations and Future Research Directions

Several limitations of note are present within the current study. As previously discussed, minimal research is available regarding military spouses, particularly female spouses. Even less research has been conducted regarding differences between female civilian and military personnel spouses of male-combat veterans. Throughout the present study, it was assumed that all female spouses were civilian, however, no differentiation was made during prior data collection. This is important regarding generalizability as factors that impact marital satisfaction, relationship adjustment, and personality similarity may differ amongst these two smaller subgroups. Further investigation regarding this topic is warranted.

Another limitation to the present study includes a lack of attention paid to mental health diagnoses present within either the combat-deployed veterans or their spouses during the data collection process. As research has indicated, mental health symptom severity can negatively impact overall relationship satisfaction, however,

this factor was not further explored in this study. Future researchers should investigate the impact mental health difficulties have on marital satisfaction, relationship adjustment, and personality similarity, while also exploring the effects of therapeutic treatment engagement for both individual mental health difficulties and potentially joint couples counseling as well.

Additional limitations to the current research that impact generalizability to a larger proportion of military couples include the fact that a majority of respondents within this study were Caucasian (77.8%) and reported their annual monetary income to be $60,000+ (61.9%). This not only limits racial generalizability, but socioeconomic status generalizability as well. It is suggested that a larger population comprised of a more diverse group of participants be used in future studies to combat generalizability limitations as much as possible. Moreover, only post-9/11 service member spouses participated within this study. A difference in service era may impact marital satisfaction, relationship adjustment, and personality similarity, and thus, should be assessed further.

The information gathered as a result of this study and all future studies that focus on military personnel, Active Duty or otherwise, and their spouses will be incredibly useful to not only the couples involved directly in the research process, but all individuals amongst the greater military population across the U.S., in addition to providers that work with them pre-, during, and post-deployment. Program development, specifically focused on military couples who are facing

deployment difficulties, is a personal area of interest that I would like to continue exploring and researching throughout my career.

References

Alexander, D. (2015). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Combat Veterans Following Deployment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

American Psychiatric Association: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition. Arlington, VA, American Psychiatric Association, 2013.

American Psychological Association. (2019). *Marriage and divorce.* Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/topics/divorce/

Andres, M. (2014). Distress, support, and relationship satisfaction during military-induced separations: A longitudinal study among spouses of Dutch deployed military personnel. *Psychological Services, 11*(1), 22-30. doi:10.1037/a0033750

Arnett, S. M. (2008). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Balderrama-Durbin, C., Snyder, D. K., Cigrang, J., Talcott, G. W., Tatum, J., Baker, M., … Smith Slep, A. M. (2013). Combat disclosure in intimate relationships: Mediating the impact partner support on posttraumatic stress. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*(4), 560-568. doi:10.1037/a0033412

Balderrama-Durbin, C., Stanton, K., Snyder, D. K., Cigrang, J. A., Talcott, G. W., Smith Slep, A. M., … Cassidy, D. G. (2017). The risk for marital infidelity across a year- long deployment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 31*(5), 629-634. doi:10.1037/fam0000281

Bergmann, J. S., Renshaw, K. D., Allen, E. S., Markman, H. J., & Stanley, S. M. (2014). Meaningfulness of service and marital satisfaction in army couples. *Journal of Family Psychology, 28*(5), 701-706. doi:10.1037/fam0000013

Bouchard, G., Sabourin, S., Lussier, Y., Wright, J., & Richer, C. (1998). Predictive validity of coping strategies on marital satisfaction: Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*(1), 112-131.

Campbell, S. B, & Renshaw, K. D. (2012). Distress in spouses of Vietnam veterans: Associations with communication about deployment experiences. *Journal of Family Psychology, 26*(1), 18-25. doi:10.1037/a0026680

Campbell, S. B., & Renshaw, K. D. (2018). Posttraumatic stress disorder and relationship functioning: A comprehensive review and organizational framework. *Clinical Psychology Review, 65*, 152–162. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2018.08.003

Carpenter, D. (2018). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Males in Marital Therapy.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Connor-Smith, J. K., & Flachsbart, C. (2007). Relations between personality and coping: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(6), 1080-1107. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.1080

Dekel, R., & Solomon, Z. (2006). Marital relations among former prisoners of war: Contribution of posttraumatic stress disorder, aggression, and sexual satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 709–712. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.20.4.709

Department of Defense. (2017). *Active duty family marital status report* [Data file]. Retrieved from https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/active-duty-marital-status

Department of Defense. (2019). *DoD personnel, workforce reports & publications: Armed forces strength figures for February 28, 2019.* Retrieved from https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/dwp_reports.jsp

Edwards-Stewart, A., Rennebohm, S. B., DeSimone, J., Willey, B., Smolenski, D. J., & Hoyt, T. (2018). Relationship satisfaction and mental health treatment among active-duty military. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice, 7*(3 & 4), 201-211. doi:10.1037/cfp0000108

Erbes, C. R., Meis, L. A., Polusny, M. A., & Comptom, J. S. (2011). Couple adjustment and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in National Guard veterans of the Iraq war. *Journal of Family Psychology, 25*(4), 479-487. doi:10.1037/a0024007

Field, S. L. (2013). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment among Females.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Floyd, K., Mikkelson, A. C., Tafoya, M. A., Farinelli, L., L. A. Valley, A. G., Judd, J., . . . Wilson, J. (2007). Human affection exchange: XIV. Relational affection predicts resting heart rate and free cortisol secretion during acute stress. Behavioral Medicine, 32, 151–156. doi:10.3200/BMED.32.4.151-156

Garofalo, A. (2014). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Gender Differences in Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Gattis, K. S., Berns, S., Simpson, L. E., & Christensen, A. (2004). Birds of a feather or strange birds? Ties among personality dimensions, similarity, and marital quality. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*(4), 564-574. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.18.4.564

Goff, B. S. N., Crow, J. R., Reisbig, A. M. J., & Hamilton, S. (2007). The impact of individual trauma symptoms of deployed soldiers on relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 344–353. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.344

Graber, E. C., Laurenceau, J., Miga, E., Chango, J., & Coan, J. (2011). Conflict and love: Predicting newlywed marital outcomes from two interaction contexts. *Journal of Family Psychology, 25*(4), 541-550. doi:10.1037/a0024507

Hart, M. (2018). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Females in Marital Therapy.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Henry, N. J. M., Berg, C. A., Smith, T. W., & Florsheim, P. (2007). Positive and negative characteristics of marital interaction and their association with marital satisfaction in middle-aged and older couples. *Psychology and Aging, 22*(3), 428-441.

Kelly, E. L., & Conley, J. J. (1987). Personality and compatibility: A prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 27–40.

Larsen, J. L., Clauss-Ehlers, C. S., & Cosden, M. A. (2015). An exploration of army wives' responses to spousal deployment: Stressors and protective factors. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice, 4*(4), 212-228. doi:10.1037/cfp0000049

Lind, M. J., Brown, E., Farrell-Carnahan, L., Brown, R. C., Hawn, S., Berenz, E., … Amstadter, A. B. (2017). Sleep disturbances in OEF/OIF/OND veterans: Associations with PTSD, personality, and coping. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine, 13*(2), 291-299. doi:10.5664/jcsm.6466

Moore, K. M. (2015). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment among Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Morey, L. C., Lowmaster, S. E., Coldren, R. L., Kelly, M. P., Parish, R. V., & Russell, M. L. (2011). Personality assessment inventory profiles of deployed combat troops: An empirical investigation of normative performance. *Psychological Assessment, 23*(2), 456-462. doi:10.1037/a0022173

Mulholland, M. F. (2015). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment among Female Combat Veterans Following Deployment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Mullis, C. (2018). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Couples in Marital Therapy.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

National Institute of Mental Health. (2019). Post-traumatic stress disorder. Retrieved from https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/post-traumatic-stress-disorder-ptsd/index.shtml

Poponoe, D., & Whitehead, R. D. (2010). The state of our unions 2010. Piscataway, NJ: National Marriage Project, Rutgers University.

Riviere, L. A., Merrill, J. C., & Clarke-Walper, K. (2017). Marital status and marital quality differences in the postdeployment mental and physical health of service members. *Military Behavioral Health, 5*, 254–264. doi:10.1080/21635781.2017.1316803

Renshaw, K. D., Rodrigues, C. S., & Jones, D. H. (2008). Psychological symptoms and marital satisfaction in spouses of Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans: Relationships with spouses' perceptions of veterans' experiences and symptoms. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(3), 586-594. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.586

Russell, M. T. (1995). 16PF Couple's Counseling Report user's guide. Champaign, IL: The Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc.

Shah, K. B. (2009). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment in Gay and Lesbian Couples.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

Shiota, M. N., & Levenson, R. W. (2007). Birds of a feather don't always fly farthest: Similarity in big five personality predicts more negative marital satisfaction trajectories in long-term marriages. *Psychology and Aging, 22*(4), 666-675. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.22.4.666

Whisman, M. A., Uebelacker, L. A., & Weinstock, L. M. (2004). Psychopathology and marital satisfaction: The importance of evaluating both partners. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*, 830–838. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.72.5.830

Table 1
Personality Factor Scale Descriptors

Factor	Lower Scores (1-3)	Higher Scores (8-10)
A: Warmth	Reserved, Impersonal, Distant	Warm, Outgoing, Attentive to Others
B: Reasoning	Concrete	Abstract
C: Emotional Stability	Reactive, Emotionally Changeable	Emotionally Stable, Adaptive, Mature
E: Dominance	Deferential, Cooperative, Avoids Conflict	Dominant, Forceful, Assertive
F: Liveliness	Serious, Restrained, Careful	Lively, Animated, Spontaneous
G: Rule-Consciousness	Expedient, Nonconforming	Rule-Conscious, Dutiful
H: Social Boldness	Shy, Threat-Sensitive, Timid	Socially Bold, Thick-Skinned, Venturesome
I: Sensitivity	Utilitarian, Objective, Unsentimental	Sensitive, Aesthetic, Sentimental
L: Vigilance	Trusting, Unsuspecting, Accepting	Vigilant, Suspicious, Skeptical, Wary
M: Abstractedness	Grounded, Practical, Solution-Focused	Abstracted, Idea-Oriented, Imaginative
N: Privateness	Forthright, Genuine, Artless	Private, Discreet, Non-Disclosing
O: Apprehension	Self-Assured, Unworried, Complacent	Apprehensive, Self-Doubting, Worried
Q1: Openness to Change	Traditional, Attached to Familiar	Open to Change, Experimenting
Q2: Self-Reliance	Group-Oriented, Affiliative	Self-Reliant, Solitary, Individualistic
Q3: Perfectionism	Tolerates Disorder, Unexacting, Flexible	Perfectionistic, Organized, Controlled
Q4: Tension	Relaxed, Placid, Patient	Tense, High Energy, Impatient, Driven
EX: Extraversion	Introverted	Extraverted
AX: Anxiety	Low Anxiety	High Anxiety
TM: Tough-Mindedness	Receptive, Open-Minded	Tough-Minded, Resolute
IN: Independence	Accommodating, Agreeable	Independent, Persuasive
SC: Self-Control	Unrestrained	Self-Controlled

Note: Adapted from the 16PF Couples Counseling Report Administrator's Manual (p. 18) by M.T. Russell and D.L. Karol, 1994, Champaign, IL: The Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc. Copyright by IPAT, Inc.

Table 2
Descriptive Frequencies for Female Spouses of Combat-Deployed Male Veterans

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Race		
African-American/Black	3	5.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	3.8%
Caucasian/White	42	79.2%
Hispanic/Latino	5	9.4%
Other	1	1.9%
Education Level		
High School Diploma/GED	9	17.0%
Associate's/Technical Degree	11	20.8%
Bachelor's Degree	17	32.1%
Graduate Coursework w/o Degree	5	9.4%
Graduate Degree	11	20.8%
Current Employment Status		
Working Full-Time	28	52.8%
Working Part-Time	6	11.3%
Homemaker/Housewife	16	30.2%
Unemployed	1	1.9%
Other	2	3.8%
Current Household Income		
$10,000-$19,999	1	1.9%
$20,000-$39,000	9	17.0%
$40,000-$59,000	10	18.9%
$60,000-$79,000	11	20.8%
$80,000+	22	41.5%
Relationship Length		
3-7 years	16	30.2%
8-14 years	28	52.8%
15-25 years	8	15.1%
25+ years	1	1.9%
Existence of Children		
Yes	36	67.9%
No	17	32.1%
Husband's Branch of Service		
Air Force	7	13.5%
Army	32	61.5%
Marine Corps	10	19.2%
Navy	3	5.8%
Coast Guard	0	0.0%

Table 2 continued
Descriptive Frequencies for Female Spouses of Combat-Deployed Male Veterans

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Husband's Rank		
Enlisted	39	78.0%
Commissioned (Officer)	11	22.0%
Husband's Combat Exposure		
Little/No Exposure	6	12.0%
Mild Combat Exposure	9	18.0%
Moderate Combat Exposure	12	24.0%
Severe Combat Exposure	10	20.0%
Most/All Combat Exposure	13	26.0%

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Individual Item Satisfaction Ratings

Variables	Mean	SD
Time Together	6.60	2.38
Problem-Solving Communication	5.92	2.50
Caring and Affection	6.72	2.37
Division of Roles	6.94	1.97
Finances	6.32	2.60
Sex	6.21	2.70
Extended Family	6.40	2.14
Children	7.08	2.16
Alcohol and Drug Use	7.80	1.93

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of 16PF Primary and Global Personality Factors

Variables	Mean	SD
Primary Factors		
Warmth (A)	4.74	2.10
Reasoning (B)	5.42	1.80
Emotional Stability C	4.79	1.65
Dominance (E)	4.55	1.76
Liveliness (F)	5.42	1.80
Rule-Conscientiousness (G)	5.79	1.59
Social Boldness (H)	4.94	2.29
Sensitivity (I)	5.17	2.20
Vigilance (L)	6.43	1.82
Abstractedness (M)	5.19	1.82
Privateness (N)	5.77	1.99
Apprehension (O)	5.89	1.63
Openness to Change (Q1)	4.87	1.64
Self-Reliance (Q2)	6.17	2.20
Perfectionism (Q3)	5.91	1.92
Tension (Q4)	5.81	1.49
Global Factors		
Extraversion (EX)	4.96	1.97
Anxiety (AX)	6.34	1.81
Tough-Mindedness (TM)	6.30	1.68
Independence (IN)	4.81	1.82
Self-Control (SC)	5.87	1.64

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variables

Variables	Mean	SD
Overall Marital Satisfaction	7.32	1.92
Personality Similarity	6.64	2.40
Relationship Adjustment	4.74	1.63

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics of Relationship Length

Variables	Mean	SD
3-7 Years	7.38	2.16
8-14 Years	7.92	0.77
15-25 Years	5.00	0.96
25+ Years	8.00	*N/A*

Tables for Hypothesis 1

Table 7
Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Nine Individual Satisfaction Areas

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.827[a]	.685	.619	1.18511

a. Predictors: (Constant), IS_AlcoholDrugUse, IS_ExtendedFamily, IS_Children, IS_DivisionOfRoles, IS_TimeTogether, IS_Finances, IS_Sex, IS_ProblemSolvingCommunication, IS_CaringAndAffection

Table 8
Multiple Regression for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Nine Individual Satisfaction Areas

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	131.154	9	14.573	10.376	.000[b]
	Residual	60.393	43	1.404		
	Total	191.547	52			

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), IS_AlcoholDrugUse, IS_ExtendedFamily, IS_Children, IS_DivisionOfRoles, IS_TimeTogether, IS_Finances, IS_Sex, IS_ProblemSolvingCommunication, IS_CaringAndAffection

Table 9
Coefficients for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Nine Individual Satisfaction Areas

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.300	.870		4.943	.000
	IS_TimeTogether	-.032	.142	-.039	-.224	.824
	IS_ProblemSolving Communication	.032	.124	.042	.261	.795
	IS_CaringAndAffection	.683	.166	.845	4.113	.000
	IS_DivisionOfRoles	-.216	.114	-.222	-1.893	.065
	IS_Finances	.092	.109	.124	.841	.405
	IS_Sex	.035	.121	.049	.287	.775
	IS_ExtendedFamily	.056	.093	.063	.602	.550
	IS_Children	.001	.100	.002	.015	.988
	IS_AlcoholDrugUse	-.156	.104	-.156	-1.502	.141

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

Table 10
Correlations for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Caring and Affection Satisfaction Area

Correlations

		OverallSatisfaction	IS_CaringAndAffection
Pearson Correlation	OverallSatisfaction	1.000	.789
	IS_CaringAndAffection	.789	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	OverallSatisfaction	.	.000
	IS_CaringAndAffection	.000	.
N	OverallSatisfaction	53	53
	IS_CaringAndAffection	53	53

Table 11
Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Caring and Affection Satisfaction Area

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.789[a]	.622	.615	1.19098	.622	84.042	1	51	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), IS_CaringAndAffection

Table 12
Multiple Regression for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Caring and Affection Satisfaction Area

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	119.207	1	119.207	84.042	.000[b]
	Residual	72.340	51	1.418		
	Total	191.547	52			

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), IS_CaringAndAffection

Table 13
Coefficients for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Caring and Affection Satisfaction Area

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.035	.495		6.126	.000
	IS_CaringAndAffection	.638	.070	.789	9.167	.000

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

Tables for Hypothesis 2

Table 14
Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.535[a]	.286	-.031	1.94874

a. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Self-Reliance, Openness to Change, Sensitivity, Reasoning, Rule-Conscientiousness, Abstractedness, Dominance, Privateness, Emotional Stability, Perfectionism, Warmth, Apprehension, Vigilance, Liveliness, Social Boldness

Table 15
Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and 16 Primary Personality Factors

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	54.834	16	3.427	.902	.572[b]
	Residual	136.713	36	3.798		
	Total	191.547	52			

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Self-Reliance, Openness to Change, Sensitivity, Reasoning, Rule-Conscientiousness, Abstractedness, Dominance, Privateness, Emotional Stability, Perfectionism, Warmth, Apprehension, Vigilance, Liveliness, Social Boldness

Table 16
Coefficients for Overall Marital Satisfaction and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.499	3.930		2.926	.006
	Warmth	.037	.182	.041	.205	.839
	Reasoning	-.023	.168	-.022	-.140	.890
	Emotional Stability	.084	.239	.072	.350	.728
	Dominance	-.194	.220	-.178	-.880	.384
	Liveliness	-.107	.284	-.100	-.377	.709
	Rule-Conscientiousness	-.123	.227	-.102	-.543	.591
	Social Boldness	.065	.236	.078	.277	.783
	Sensitivity	-.326	.151	-.366	-2.156	.038
	Vigilance	-.013	.219	-.012	-.060	.953
	Abstractedness	.196	.192	.185	1.017	.316
	Privateness	-.219	.174	-.227	-1.258	.216
	Apprehension	.106	.255	.089	.414	.681
	Openness to Change	-.282	.210	-.241	-1.342	.188
	Self-Reliance	-.082	.211	-.094	-.389	.700
	Perfectionism	.270	.244	.271	1.110	.274
	Tension	-.189	.245	-.147	-.770	.446

a. Dependent Variable: OverallSatisfaction

Tables for Hypothesis 3

Table 17
Model Summary for Personality Similarity and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.659[a]	.434	.183	2.172

a. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Self-Reliance, Openness to Change, Sensitivity, Reasoning, Rule-Conscientiousness, Abstractedness, Dominance, Privateness, Emotional Stability, Perfectionism, Warmth, Apprehension, Vigilance, Liveliness, Social Boldness

Table 18
Multiple Regression for Personality Similarity and 16 Primary Personality Factors

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	130.346	16	8.147	1.727	.086[b]
	Residual	169.843	36	4.718		
	Total	300.189	52			

a. Dependent Variable: Personality Similarity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Self-Reliance, Openness to Change, Sensitivity, Reasoning, Rule-Conscientiousness, Abstractedness, Dominance, Privateness, Emotional Stability, Perfectionism, Warmth, Apprehension, Vigilance, Liveliness, Social Boldness

Table 19
Coefficients for Personality Similarity and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.459	4.380		1.246	.221
	Warmth	-.455	.203	-.398	-2.235	.032
	Reasoning	-.015	.187	-.012	-.083	.935
	Emotional Stability	.194	.267	.133	.728	.471
	Dominance	-.084	.245	-.062	-.343	.734
	Liveliness	-.554	.316	-.416	-1.753	.088
	Rule-Conscientiousness	.186	.253	.123	.733	.468
	Social Boldness	.598	.263	.570	2.276	.029
	Sensitivity	.044	.168	.039	.259	.797
	Vigilance	.063	.244	.048	.258	.798
	Abstractedness	-.346	.214	-.262	-1.614	.115
	Privateness	.140	.194	.116	.720	.476
	Apprehension	-.015	.284	-.010	-.054	.957
	Openness to Change	.316	.235	.216	1.346	.187
	Self-Reliance	.063	.235	.058	.267	.791
	Perfectionism	-.469	.272	-.376	-1.729	.092
	Tension	.540	.273	.336	1.974	.056

a. Dependent Variable: Personality Similarity

Tables for Hypothesis 4

Table 20
Model Summary for Relationship Adjustment and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.982[a]	.964	.948	.373

a. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Self-Reliance, Openness to Change, Sensitivity, Reasoning, Rule-Conscientiousness, Abstractedness, Dominance, Privateness, Emotional Stability, Perfectionism, Warmth, Apprehension, Vigilance, Liveliness, Social Boldness

Table 21
Multiple Regression for Relationship Adjustment and 16 Primary Personality Factors

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	133.297	16	8.331	59.924	.000[b]
	Residual	5.005	36	.139		
	Total	138.302	52			

a. Dependent Variable: Relationship Adjustment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Self-Reliance, Openness to Change, Sensitivity, Reasoning, Rule-Conscientiousness, Abstractedness, Dominance, Privateness, Emotional Stability, Perfectionism, Warmth, Apprehension, Vigilance, Liveliness, Social Boldness

Table 22
Coefficients for Relationship Adjustment and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-6.308	.752		-8.390	.000
	Warmth	.057	.035	.073	1.629	.112
	Reasoning	.036	.032	.040	1.119	.270
	Emotional Stability	1.014	.046	1.023	22.131	.000
	Dominance	-.050	.042	-.054	-1.189	.242
	Liveliness	-.007	.054	-.008	-.129	.898
	Rule-Conscientiousness	.283	.043	.275	6.498	.000
	Social Boldness	.059	.045	.084	1.319	.196
	Sensitivity	.014	.029	.019	.485	.630
	Vigilance	-.007	.042	-.008	-.166	.869
	Abstractedness	.028	.037	.032	.771	.446
	Privateness	-.002	.033	-.003	-.070	.944
	Apprehension	.362	.049	.360	7.413	.000
	Openness to Change	.266	.040	.268	6.603	.000
	Self-Reliance	.044	.040	.059	1.087	.284
	Perfectionism	-.038	.047	-.045	-.813	.421
	Tension	.073	.047	.067	1.558	.128

a. Dependent Variable: Relationship Adjustment

Table 23
Model Summary for Relationship Adjustment and 4 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.882[a]	.779	.774	.775	.779	179.328	1	51	.000
2	.919[b]	.844	.838	.657	.065	20.984	1	50	.000
3	.942[c]	.887	.880	.565	.043	18.455	1	49	.000
4	.976[d]	.952	.948	.371	.066	65.819	1	48	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability

b. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability, Rule-Conscientiousness

c. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability, Rule-Conscientiousness, Apprehension

d. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Stability, Rule-Conscientiousness, Apprehension, Openness to Change

Table for Hypothesis 5

Table 24
Correlations amongst Overall Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment

Correlations

		Overall Satisfaction	Personality Similarity	Relationship Adjustment
Overall Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	-.016	-.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.908	.982
	N	53	53	53
Personality Similarity	Pearson Correlation	-.016	1	.309*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.908		.024
	N	53	53	53
Relationship Adjustment	Pearson Correlation	-.003	.309*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.982	.024	
	N	53	53	53

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Tables for Hypothesis 6

Table 25
One-Way Analysis of Variance between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Length of Relationship

ANOVA

OverallSatisfaction

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	53.940	3	17.980	6.402	.001
Within Groups	137.607	49	2.808		
Total	191.547	52			

Table 26
Correlations between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Age of Female Spouses of Male Combat Veterans

Correlations

		Overall Satisfaction	Spouse Age
Overall Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	-.415**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	53	52
Spouse Age	Pearson Correlation	-.415**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	52	52

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 27
One-Way Analysis of Variance between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Existence of Children

ANOVA

OverallSatisfaction

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.562	1	.562	.150	.700
Within Groups	190.985	51	3.745		
Total	191.547	52			

Table 28

One-Way Analysis of Variance between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Combat-Deployed Male Spouse Branch of Service

ANOVA

OverallSatisfaction

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.784	3	1.928	.555	.647
Within Groups	166.735	48	3.474		
Total	172.519	51			

Table 29

One-Way Analysis of Variance between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Amount of Combat Exposure for Combat-Deployed Male Spouses

ANOVA

OverallSatisfaction

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	22.454	4	5.614	1.718	.163
Within Groups	147.066	45	3.268		
Total	169.520	49			