5-2021

16PF Couples Counseling Report: Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Dual-Veteran Couples Following Deployment

Bliss Quintana

16PF Couples Counseling Report: Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Dual-Veteran Couples Following Deployment

by

Bliss Quintana

Bachelor of Arts
Psychology
Florida International University
2013

Master of Science
Clinical Psychology
Barry University
2017

Master of Science
Psychology
Florida Institute of Technology
2019

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
May 2021

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

16PF Couples Counseling Report:
Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity and Relationship Adjustment of Dual Veteran Couples Following Deployment

by

Bliss Quintana

_____	_____
Richard T. Elmore, Jr., Ph.D.	Barbara M. Paulillo, Psy.D.
Associate Professor	Associate Professor
School of Psychology	School of Psychology
Committee Chair	Committee Member

_____
Robert A. Taylor, Ph.D.
Professor and Interim Dean
College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
Committee Member

Abstract

TITLE: 16PF Couples Counseling Report: Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Dual-Veteran Couples Following Deployment

AUTHOR: Bliss Quintana, M.S.

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

The present study utilized the 16 Personality Factor Couple's Counseling Report (16PF CCR) to contribute to the limited amount of research evaluating gender differences on personality factors which may influence relationship adjustment and marital satisfaction between males and females in dual-veteran couples following deployment. Results were obtained from a total of 23 heterosexual dual-veteran couples (23 males and 23 females) who volunteered to participate in the present study. Statistically significant gender differences were found for one of the Global Personality Factors, Independence; however, there were no significant findings in the Individual Satisfaction Items, Primary Personality Factors, Relationship Adjustment scores, or Overall Marital Satisfaction scores of the 16PF CCR. Therefore, the present findings suggest there could be more personality similarities amongst partners in dual-military marriages rather than differences. Limitations of this study, clinical implications, and areas for further research are also discussed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

"The pain and stress of graduate school is inevitable, suffering is optional."

- Richard T. Elmore, Ph.D.

Graduate school is not easy; however, the degree to which we can manage the suffering throughout the journey drives the level of happiness and meaning we are able to extract from of our time. There are particular people along the way who not only facilitate our journey but also enhance the experience and Dr. Elmore is one of those individuals. In his roles as an educator, mentor, and friend, Dr. Elmore has made a profound impact on my life that is life long. He is the type of educator who has the ability to encourage students to venture outside of their comfort zones and make them feel safe while they are there. I am grateful for the opportunities to learn from you, but most importantly, to work alongside you. You have reminded me why I love what I do, you inspire me to be better, and you make me excited for the journey ahead and, for that, I thank you. I salute you, it has been an honor.

To my doctoral research project committee, Dr. Barbara M. Paulillo and Dr. Robert A. Taylor, thank you for your time, effort, and insightful commentary along the way. In addition, to my DRP colleagues and "Dream Team", thank you for your support and guidance throughout this process. You have helped me extract true meaning from this journey. I wish you the best of luck in all of your future endeavors, although I doubt you'll need it.

To the class of 2022, I am humbled to be a part of such a talented group of individuals. I am excited for the impact you will continue to make and the lives you

will change. To my closest friends, because of you, I have had the opportunity to develop lasting friendships and memories that I will forever cherish and promise to always maintain. Spending time with you has made this journey significantly better. From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

To my family, thank you for all that you are and everything you do. You are the greatest support system anyone could ask for. I love you endlessly. I appreciate your words of encouragement, morale boosts, and much needed distractions. I truly believe I am who I am because of you. I hope I've made you proud, Dad.

Chapter 1

Introduction

"I take you to be my lawfully wedded (husband/wife) to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and health, until death do us part" (Serratelli, 2016). These are the words couples exchange on their wedding day symbolic of a lifelong, inseparable unification. However, for couples in military marriages, frequent time apart is inevitable. Military couples are compelled to communicate by any means necessary, whether via telephone, electronic mail, or letters. Often times, contact and communication are most successful in person. Yet, for the deployed men and women who fearlessly serve our country, their options to connect to the outside world are limited.

More often than not, when people think about military marriages, they imagine one spouse in the service. In most heterosexual, traditional marriages in the military, the wife is a civilian and is left to care for the children and/or home, while her husband is deployed. Yet, in dual-military marriages, both partners identify as military personnel and could be deployed at any given time. As defined by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) (2018) Military Demographics Report, "a dual-military marriage refers to an Active Duty member who is married to another Active Duty member or to a Reserve or Guard member (p.49)." Although the overall number of married Active Duty members in the military has decreased from 56.4% in 2010 to 51.5% in 2018, the percentage of dual-military marriages

has increased across all Service branches since 2005 (DoD, 2018). In fact, of the 1,304,418 Active Duty members of the military, 6.7% of Active Duty members are involved in dual-military marriages (DoD, 2018). Yet, while the upsurge of military personnel tying the knot is indicative of a steadily growing trend, the existing literature on this population is remarkably scarce.

For the past few decades, a majority of research in the military has explored the physical and psychological effects of service on military personnel; thus, there seems to be a gap in the literature regarding the effect service has on the relationships these soldiers fight to sustain throughout deployment. In particular, there is limited information about the challenges deployment brings to a dual-military marriage on the home front. Notably, even less research has been conducted exploring the interactions between spousal personality factors, personality similarity, relationship adjustment, and overall marital satisfaction in dual-military couples following deployment.

To promote further research in this area, the present study will utilize the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR) completed by couples comprised of male and female combat-deployed military veteran couples who are seeking marital therapy post-deployment. The assessment will be used as a means to identify personality factors, aspects of relationship satisfaction, and demographic variables as they relate to and impact overall marital satisfaction. As previously mentioned, this study will focus on exploring the aforementioned factors and related gender differences between members of a dual-military marriage.

Differences may exist between the post-deployment relationship adjustments of male veterans and female veterans in committed, heterosexual relationships; therefore, understanding the factors that contribute to either member's experience may serve to instigate further research on this underreported topic. Moreover, the following literature review was conducted in order to identify relevant findings in an effort to expand the current literature.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Population Demographics

nonclinical population. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2017), the number of marriages reported in the United States represents 6.5% of the overall population, whereas the number of divorces reported represents 2.9% of the population. When examining gender differences, 51.5% of males and 47.7% of females over the age of 15 are married (CDC, 2017). In addition, the separation rate is 1.8% for males and 2.5% for females (CDC, 2017).

clinical population. According to a report published by the Department of Defense (DoD) (2018), 83.5% of Active Duty members are male, whereas only 16.5% of members are female. In addition, of the overall 51.5% of Active Duty personnel who are married, 52.8% of males and 44.8% of females are married. Of the 1,304,418 Active Duty members of the military, 6.7% of Active Duty members are involved in dual-military marriages (DoD, 2018). Across all Service branches, a higher percentage of female members are in dual-military marriages than male members, where over half of married female members in the Marine Corps (59.1%) and Air Force (53.0%) are involved in dual-military marriages (DoD, 2018). Contrastingly, 3% of Active Duty members divorced, although all Active Duty branches of the military report a general decrease in divorce rates since 2010, likely due to a similar decrease in marriage rates (DoD, 2018). Specifically, 11% of

Active Duty personnel were involved in dual-military marriages in 2002, which has decreased by approximately half in the present day (Britt et al., 2006).

Although service members comprise less than 1% of the population in the United States (DoD, 2019), those involved in dual-military marriages spouses are likely to experience significant psychological distress and relationship difficulties to the same degree, if not greater, than the general public (Campbell & Renshaw, 2012). Andres (2014) suggests several factors that are believed to contribute to these difficulties, which include time apart, intimacy reduction, inadequate communication, and differences in availability that often exacerbate work-family conflict. Apart from examining psychological distress, a great deal of research has been done to examine the impact of combat on military personnel over the past couple of decades. More recently, the conflicts in Iraq (Operation Iraqi Freedom; OIF) and Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom; OEF and Operation New Dawn; OND) led to the highest rates of military mobilizations and deployments reported since the Vietnam War (Gerwitz et al., 2010). Therefore, OIF, OEF, and OND veterans have gained increased attention in the psychological research community.

Marital Satisfaction

It seems in almost every culture, there exist various forms of committed relationships, including formal marriage arrangements between men and women (Bell, 1997). However, while marital unions are heavily influenced by culturally

determined customs and expectations, marital satisfaction is a construct that is nearly exclusively researched in Western countries and societies (Bradbury et al., 2000; Fiske et al., 1998). For many couples embarking on the road to marriage, achieving marital satisfaction serves as the ultimate goal for both partners. Due to its complex nature, marital satisfaction is considered a multi-dimensional construct that has been defined and explored extensively in the field of psychology (Rebello et al., 2014). According to Schoen (1989), upon evaluating the state of one's marriage, marital satisfaction is defined as the reflection of marital happiness and healthy functioning. Other researchers choose to define marital satisfaction from an evolutionary lens that accounts for the perceived benefits and costs of the marriage to each partner (Zainah et al., 2012). Nevertheless, most experts on this topic assert that marital satisfaction serves as a subjective assessment of the overall quality of a marriage (Rebello et al., 2014).

Similar to the practice of formal marriage arrangements, the factors that impact reported marital satisfaction also differ cross-culturally. Nonetheless, individuals from all cultures seem to place greater value on marital satisfaction and success more than the marriage itself. This means that low levels of reported marital satisfaction have the capacity to result in an unhealthy family climate and subsequent discord or divorce (Zaheri et al., 2016). With this in mind, identifying and understanding the factors that create marital satisfaction are essential for strengthening the basis of married life. As it relates to couples in the military, research about marital satisfaction in this population associating is rare and often

inconsistent. To clarify, a majority of the present research on marriages in the military community focuses on divorce rates due to difficulties with deployment and mental health rather than examining the specific factors that affect marital satisfaction (Trails, 2019).

Deployment Difficulties and Marital Satisfaction

Of those deployed during OEF, OIF, and OND, approximately 46.5% of soldiers reported several, consecutive deployments, while others reported deployments enduring six months at minimum (Bergmann et al., 2014). Longer deployments notably increase the likelihood of repeated exposure to traumatic experiences and subsequent stress. According to Bergmann et al., (2014), adverse outcomes such as general decreases in marital dissatisfaction, functioning, stress recovery, and health have been linked to increased stress due to military-mandated separations and have resulted in a greater likelihood of divorce (Bergmann et al., 2014). Yet, receiving orders to deploy is often an essential component of employment for military personnel as soldiers are provided an opportunity to sharpen and apply their skills in the field (Bouvard, 2012). Often times, military life revolves around the looming awareness of upcoming deployments and the growing stress that accompanies this awareness as time passes (Bouvard, 2012). While deployment preparations vary from person to person, most military personnel and their families acknowledge the advent of shifted roles and responsibilities (MacDermid & Riggs, 2014). Specifically, preparation following

deployment orders require physical, mental, and professional planning and often requires additional time dedicated to pre-deployment training, which results in less time spent with loved ones (MacDermid & Riggs, 2014). Not only have the deployments of United States military personnel increased in frequency and length, but the amount of time between deployments appears to have decreased as well (Xenakis, 2016). For these reasons, a majority of military personnel have experienced deployment more frequently and for longer periods of time than in previous military involvement in the United States (Xenakis, 2016). To demonstrate, the repeated deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan have not only been stressful for military personnel, but they have negatively impacted the physical and psychological health of service members (Steenkamp, 2016).

Deployed personnel and their loved ones are said to experience a unique set of challenges in addition to often conflicting emotions throughout each stage of deployment (Larsen et al., 2015). In an effort to combat these challenges, each branch of the military works to enroll dual-military couples in a Married Couples Program or Join Spouse Assignment Program, which allows couples the opportunity to be stationed near each other and maintain a joint residence (HT Digital Streams Limited, 2011). These programs help place married service members in proximal units, where some couples have the advantage of being deployed together as well (HT Digital Streams Limited, 2011). As time apart seems to be one of the most commonly reported stressors for couples in a dual-military marriage, having the potential to be deployed together could likely reduce marital

distress, although more research in this area is needed. Nevertheless, spouses are generally said to experience a form of loss anticipation during the pre-deployment phase, a greater sense of independence throughout actual deployment, and lastly role transitioning pressures upon reaching post-deployment as reintegration takes place (Steenkamp, 2016). In other cases, the failure to discuss expectations regarding child rearing, financial management, or intimacy concerns following deployment can result in misperception, distortion, and hurt. Once loved ones in the military have deployed, their counterparts have also demonstrated a higher prevalence of depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, adjustment difficulties, sleep disorders, and acute stress (Larsen et al., 2015).

Bouchard et al. (1998) states that when faced with a stressful event such as deployment, the use of specific coping strategies can be associated with either an exacerbation or reduction of psychological distress. One's coping style is represented by the typical behavioral and cognitive efforts one makes in attempting to tolerate or reduce internal or external demands. In particular, coping strategies that involve escape or avoidance have been associated with higher levels of psychological symptoms, whereas problem-focused strategies have been associated with lower levels of distress (Bouchard, 1998). Coping responses have also impacted the marital domain as these strategies have demonstrated a relationship with reported marital satisfaction among couples. More specifically, Bouchard et al. (1998) suggested that, when confronted with marital difficulties, there is a direct link between the use of coping strategies and the marital satisfaction of both

partners. Men and women tend to rely on different types of coping strategies that have varying effects on marital satisfaction. In general, optimistic comparisons and negotiation have been positively related to marital satisfaction as opposed to resignation and selective ignoring, which have been negatively related to marital satisfaction (Allen et al., 2011). Further, it has been argued that men and women in committed relationships resort to utilizing specific coping strategies when handling stress. In traditional coping theories, men were described as using more effective strategies like problem-focused coping and women engaged in less effective tactics like passive coping (Hobfoll et al., 1994.) However, contemporary coping theories have portrayed men as more task-oriented, competitive, and sometimes aggressive problem-solvers whereas women are depicted as using more pro-social, empathetic, and assertive coping mechanisms in their interpersonal relationships (Allen et al., 2011). Putting aside the differences found between genders, the most significant factor impacting marital satisfaction ratings seems to be the frequency of coping strategy usage by each individual within the relationship (Bouchard et al., 1998). Thus, more frequent usage of problem-focused coping strategies by either partner resulted in higher marital satisfaction ratings (Bouchard et al., 1998).

Apart from coping, psychological resilience serves as another protective factor to withstand mental health problems during all stages of deployment. The definition adopted by De Kruijff et al., (2019) and other U.S. military health care providers is “resilience is the capacity to adapt successfully in the presence of risk and adversity.” Moreover, the factors that promote resilience can be identified

within an individual or in his/her social support system and are divided into individual-level, family-level, unit-level, and community-level factors. In general, research on resiliency in military couples is often correlated with the use of positive coping skills. Larsen et al. (2015) identified reconstructing roles and responsibilities, seeking social support, and increasing open communication during and post-deployment as contributors to effective, positive coping. Additionally, they described the post-deployment reintegration period, which presents military couples and dual-military couples with a distinctive set of challenges unique to military personnel. Upon attempting to return to life on the home front, it is becomes difficult to offer support in addition to redefining each partner's roles and responsibilities. Confusion often accompanies this period as partners attempt to express their sentiments about the time apart and empathize with their partner's experiences as well (Larsen et al., 2015).

Relationship/Marital Adjustment Following Deployment

The post-deployment stage is regarded as the time following the return of the service member and subsequent reintegration of the service member into the family system. For many soldiers, the post-deployment phase is often referred to as a period of "family stabilization" (Macdermid, 2006). More often than not, service members and their spouses are called to reconsider how to effectively communicate the reconfiguration of roles and responsibilities in the home (Macdermid, 2006). In specific cases, there is added pressure to achieve stabilization and cohesion in the

family system if service members are expected to serve consecutive deployments. For military couples, difficulties re-adjusting to life on the home front stem from the conflict between the needs of the individual and the demands imposed by the environment. This complex phenomenon is referred to as marital adjustment, which is a central component in determining the success of marital life. Macdermid (2006) defined marital adjustment as the ability to adapt to changes and overcome obstacles within a relationship. The stability of a marital life promotes wellbeing within the family and in turn to society. Well-adjusted couples will have a high quality of life, which leads to satisfaction, happiness, and peace of mind in their relationship.

As pre-deployment preparations often incite unwanted tension and dread, recent studies suggest that 25% of returning soldiers experience particular difficulty readjusting post-deployment (MacLean et al., 2014). A great deal of the difficulty experienced by returning veterans regards role distribution, specifically, as it relates to the roles wished to be relinquished versus those wished to be maintained (Gambardella, 2008). Often times, this conflict ensues as a product of an unwillingness to negotiate and compromise. More notably, a subsequent study by Castro et al. (2014) revealed that various problems exist with programs designed to assist veterans on their return to the home front. In essence, military personnel are not being properly primed for their readjustment to civilian life and support organizations are ill equipped to address the complex needs of those seeking assistance. Instead, veterans are given short-term solutions rather than

individualized care to address their intersecting mental health, financial, physical, occupational, and housing concerns. For these reasons, a need remains for an all-encompassing operation that not only addresses soldiers' present physical and psychological needs but makes an effort to address future problems before they occur.

Unlike what is often demonstrated by social media, reunion after deployment is not always a positive experience. Many relationships do not survive deployment, yet many of those that do can crumble beneath the weight of reunification. In a revolutionary study using the relationship turbulence model, Knobloch and Theiss (2011) were able to draw a qualitative connection between soldiers' depressive symptoms and their relationship satisfaction. Their results suggested that the connection was negative in nature and that the negative association was mediated by relational uncertainty and interference from partners. The most harmful factors to healthy relationship adjustment were emotional numbing and aggression as they result in decreased intimacy, validation and communication. Knobloch and Theiss (2011) defined this as "relational turbulence" and suggested that, if left untreated, it could lead to relationship dissolution.

Although many soldiers struggle with deployment difficulties, some strategies have been successful in helping to combat these difficulties. Sometimes, a set of values and principles called BATTLEMIND are taught to soldiers prior to deployment in an effort to bolster their emotional and physical safety (Knobloch and Theiss, 2011). Originally conceptualized by researchers at the Walter Reed

Army Medical Center in Washington D.C, the acronym is made up of the following statements: Buddies, Adding/subtracting family roles, Taking control, Talking it out, Loyalty and commitment, Emotional balance, Mental health and readiness, Independence, Navigating the army system, and Denial of self. Together, these principles would weave a cloak of resilience that, if followed, could work to protect soldiers by developing the awareness and protective factors needed to endure the transitions during and following deployment (Knobloch and Theiss, 2011).

Marital Satisfaction in Dual-Career Couples

nonclinical population. Over the past few decades, organizations have experienced profound changes in the demographics of the workforce. This is prevalent as organizations are encountering difficulties retaining their staff because of the competitive nature of the economy as well as the recent influx of nontraditional employees in the workplace (Aluko, 2009). In the same fashion, perceptions of employees are also changing, as men and women recognize the importance of work and family in their attempts to achieve balance between the two (Aluko, 2009). Due to these apparent shifts, Gordon et al. (2007) suggests that work-family issues have emerged as a notable concern for both employees and the organizations for which they work.

Similar to the changes in the workforce, the dual-career pattern of family life has become more firmly established as marriages have shifted away from more traditional unions and roles. According to the 2018 Bureau of Labor Statistics

Report by the U.S. Department of Labor, 48.8% of couples are in dual-career marriages. In a dual-career family, the family unit operates around two jobs rather than just one, which provides family members with a different experience than those in traditional family systems. A central feature of dual-career marriages is the division of family and work life in an effort to achieve balance. Following the feminist movement in the 1960s, women began to enter the workforce along with their male counterparts; therefore, the first studies exploring this topic reviewed the impact of women's work on their psychological well-being and social status as a result of their role reallocation in the household (Guilder, 1986).

Recently, marital research has focused more on the quality of marital life and satisfaction in dual-career households. As defined by Herzhberg (2013), marital satisfaction refers to the extent to which couples are content and fulfilled in their relationship as it relates to communication, dyadic coping, conflict resolution, and parenting. Often times, marital satisfaction decreases due to an inability to effectively balance multiple pressures in a relationship. Empirical evidence from Majhi and Panda (2015) suggest that dual-career families face role overload and work-family pressures, which results in a change in family functioning. In more traditional dual-career marriages, women consider maintaining the household their primary duty in addition to caring for the family, while men view financially supporting the family as their primary, or sometimes, sole responsibility. Therefore, women are sometimes overburdened with the challenge of fulfilling various expectations for their dual-roles: to excel at home and in the workplace (Majhi &

Panda, 2015). To prove her proficiency on both the fronts, women are facing the problem of being overworked and stressed to keep up. Even then, they could find themselves unable to match the expectations in either environment.

Research also states that their male counterparts are also faced with role conflict when their overworked wives' distress increases and productivity decreases. In the present day, women are increasingly handling career-related demands while maintaining their family roles and men are becoming more involved in family roles than in previous years. Dual-career couples carry out the three main roles: a homemaker, caregiver, and breadwinner (Majhi & Panda, 2015). Therefore, these particular couples experience a great deal of stress at home and at work as their roles change continuously and are equally demanding. These stressors could incite conflict or drive dual-career couples with dependents in the home desire to revert back to more traditional practices and roles to ease marital distress. However, a study by Beegam et al. (2017) revealed no significant differences in marital satisfaction between dual-career and single-earner couples or between husbands and wives in dual-career and single-earner relationships. Based on the literature, there are factors that more significantly impact reported marital satisfaction, such as the number of children, duration of the marriage, socioeconomic status, nature of the career, and personality factors (Beegman et al., 2017).

clinical population. Dual-military marriages can be regarded as a subset of what is known in the civilian sector as "dual-career" or "dual-earner" marriages. Research on the stresses of a dual-career marriage has suggested that having both

partners in the workforce can apply additional pressure on an employee and his/her spouse (Viers & Prouty, 2001). Individuals in dual-career and dual-military marriages share common demands such as the balancing of multiple roles. For example, partners in a dual-military marriage describe the following conflicting roles: being an employee and a parent; successfully managing multiple careers, and navigating decreased amounts of time to commit to family issues. Yet, the major difference between dual-career marriages and dual-military marriages is that individuals in a dual-military marriage are required to manage the stressors associated with being in the military such as handling deployments and separations in addition to their experience of common marital stressors (Viers & Prouty, 2001). Most notably is the reality that both partners in a dual-military marriage necessitate frequent, involuntary transitions and relocations for career advancement, which may not be as common for their civilian counterparts (Viers & Prouty, 2001). Other researchers identify relatively low pay and unpredictable work hours as other sources of stress especially for dual-military parents deployed at the same time (Britt et al., 2006). Military spouses are also expected to conform to spousal norms such as hosting events, mentoring new spouses, and attending military functions (Britt et al., 2016). In addition to these common work stressors, military personnel are susceptible to distinct dangers inherent to military training and operations, which leads to subsequent psychological and interpersonal strain. Ultimately, while some research has been conducted in this area, a great deal more time and resources should be spent better understanding dual-military couples and their fight to sustain

a healthy and successful marriage. Specifically, more research is needed to better understand the benefits and costs of dual-military status when couples are deployed concurrently or at different times.

In a longitudinal study conducted by Cigrang et al. (2014), combat effectiveness was appraised based on partners' pre-deployment relationship functioning and communication frequency during deployment. Researchers suggested that soldiers whose relationships were in distress prior to deployment communicated less with their partners while deployed and experienced lower levels of effectiveness in combat. Specifically, lower levels of combat effectiveness included feeling distracted during military missions, increased conflict with comrades and authority, and a failure to satisfy job performance expectations (Cigrang et al., 2014). In short, researchers concluded that the presence of marital difficulties prior to deployment is likely to interfere with a soldier's ability to communicate openly and function effectively while deployed. Because the military emphasizes the importance of group cohesion and interdependence so intensely, it becomes apparent that less than optimal military service from individual team members poses serious danger to the system as a whole.

Role theory can be used to help us understand how military personnel interact with their work and home lives (Britt et al., 2006). Partners in dual-military marriages are expected to take on at least two roles, one as a spouse and the other as a service member. The potential for "spillover" across these two roles is highly probable and has the potential to influence each domain positively or negatively

(Britt et al., 2006). Positive spillover occurs when interacting in one domain yields positive outcomes in the other domain, such as a female employee receiving a confidence-boosting compliment at work, which increases her mood, and later results in pleasant interactions with her family. On the other hand, positive spillover can also exist in the home, where a new father learns how to better manage his time following the birth of his child and applies these effective time management strategies in the workplace. Researchers have identified several reasons for why individuals with multiple roles experience positive spillover. First, these individuals are said to have a greater likelihood of being exposed to more experiences in which they have the opportunity to develop and learn new things (Britt et al., 2006). Military researchers have suggested that separation can have a positive effect on the spouse left behind as it allows the spouse at home to develop autonomy and novel skills, which likely spills over into his/her work domain. Second, multiple roles provides partners with a broader frame of reference of their shared work and home challenges and thus, allows partners to understand, accept, and support each other.

In the same vein, the spillover from one role to another is not always positive. A partner may experience a stressful, negative event in one domain, which may later manifest itself as a negative behavior in the other domain. Role strain theory suggests that people have limited resources; therefore, more roles reduce the probability one has to effectively deal with daily functioning (Britt et al., 2006). Further, the roles from the two domains, such as in a dual-military relationship,

may not complement each other. For example, for dual-military couples with children, it might be impossible to fulfill parental role expectations when the individual is fulfilling military member role requirements that involve training or deployment away from the family, especially when these separations are frequent.

Mental Health Difficulties and Marital Satisfaction

One of the key components in sustaining marital satisfaction is safeguarding the mental health stability of both partners in a marriage. Edwards-Stewart et al. (2018) suggests that for military couples, relationship satisfaction significantly contributes to mental health, whether acting as a protective factor to one's mental health or as an exacerbating factor to existing difficulties. Most commonly, anxiety and depression are the main foci of discussion when examining the connection between mental health difficulties and marital satisfaction. Whisman et al. (2004) highlighted the significant association between anxiety, depression, and marital satisfaction. Specifically, Whisman and colleagues (2004) suggested that one partner's depth of experienced anxiety and depression combined with their spouse's degree of depression were correlated with marital satisfaction outcomes.

stress in the military For many soldiers coping with difficulties within their marriages, some members of the military endure deeper struggles within themselves. Military women and men are exposed to a wide range of stressful trainings and taxing experiences. In fact, Bray and colleagues' (2001) appraisal of perceived stress in the military indicated that approximately 22% to 40% of military men and women experience high levels of stress in their interpersonal

relationships at work or in the home. More specifically, military men and women were virtually twice as likely to endorse experiencing high levels of stress in their military work compared to their family life, where women perceived more family-related stress compared to men (Bray et al., 2001).

Women in the military are subjected to experience secondary stressors related to being a female in a traditionally and predominantly male work environment (Bray et al., 2001). The connection between perceived work-related stress and impaired job functioning is widely known, where the most efficient military personnel experience a moderate degree of job stress, while those who experience either low or high work-related stress demonstrate reduced work efficiency. Additionally, recent research in psychological health has revealed that, compared to men, women report higher levels of stress and depressive symptoms, whereas men describe more substance abuse disorders (Srivastava & Krishna, 1991). As it relates to job functioning in general, lower work performance is typically related to depressive symptoms. As reported by Kessler and McLeod (1984), the foundational research regarding gender and depression suggests that the onset of depression is heavily influenced by quality of negative life events experienced for men and women respectively, rather than the quantity of negative life events experienced. Although there are numerous studies that have examined stress and subsequent psychological manifestations experienced by men and women in civilian populations, more research is needed in military psychology to effectively make steps towards anticipating and addressing these difficulties for

soldiers before they arise. Ultimately, it is unclear whether women's experiences of military stress is due to gender-related disparities in stress or coping appraisals, women's greater willingness to disclose stress and symptoms, or their increased exposure to chronic stressors or taxing life events relative to men (Bray et al., 2001). While gender differences exist in the reporting of stress and depression, the performance of military men and women is equally likely to deteriorate as a result of depression or exposure to work- and health-related stressors.

Xenakis (2016) described how certain principles make it difficult for military personnel to identify and work through the psychological effects of combat. Each branch of the military possesses its own creed, which is an oath or saying that provides a value structure and standard by which members are expected to live or work (Dod, 2017). Each creed serves to set the tone of life for each branch of the service. For example, the Army and Army National Guard have *The Soldier's Creed* as the main principles of the creed state, "I will always place the mission first; I will never accept defeat; I will never quit; I will never leave a fallen comrade; I am disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained and proficient in my warrior tasks and drills" (Xenakis, 2014, p. 242). However, while each creed is intended to build camaraderie and create a climate of strong-minded fighters, therein lies the conflict that confronts soldiers who have endured physical or psychological injury. For many soldiers, acknowledging pain undermines the core strength of the fighting force and the mission it serves. Further, the endurance, perseverance, and commitment to others above oneself serve to strengthen the

mission as well. However, the specifics of each creed seem to unintentionally promote the idea that oneself is not a priority. This idea reinforces the notion that soldiers who are actually in need of help do not seek help. Left to endure their own pain and suffering in silence, soldiers are then marginalized further from the supportiveness of their companions. For some, there seems to be no way to escape the inner turmoil, aside from violence or suicide. Consequently, for the military as a whole, the power of the operation also suffers when so many of its wounded personnel are not receiving the attention and care they need. (Xenakis, 2014, p. 242).

psychological conditions following deployment. Zamorski and colleagues (2014) sought to determine what specific health problems were most commonly experienced amongst service members. The researchers described the following six prevalent mental health difficulties: post-traumatic stress disorder (2-17%), major depressive disorder (3.2%), minor depression (3.3%), suicidal ideation (2.4%), panic disorder (1.8%), and generalized anxiety disorder (1.9%) (Zamorski et al., 2014). In addition, Zamorski and colleagues (2014) found that 10.2% of service members endorsed the presence of at least one of the previously mentioned psychological difficulties.

While any psychological difficulty has the ability to impact the marital relationship, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), appears to be the most commonly recognized and researched affliction in the military. As stated by the National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH] (2019), PTSD is described as a

disorder that develops following the witnessing or involvement in a potentially life-threatening event. It is also important to note that this condition could develop without direct exposure to the traumatic event. In order to diagnose PTSD, the following four symptom categories must be present: intrusive re-experiencing symptoms, avoidance symptoms, arousal/reactivity symptoms, and negative changes in cognition and mood (NIMH, 2019).

Specific examples of each of the aforementioned symptom categories are detailed in the fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-5) (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2013). The first of the four symptom categories, intrusive re-experiencing symptoms, includes the experience of involuntary and disturbing memories related to the traumatic event, recurrent nightmares, and dissociative states in the form of flashbacks that feel like traumatic event is reoccurring in real time (APA, 2013). The second symptom category, avoidance symptoms, regard the active avoiding of thoughts, feelings, and emotions related to the traumatic event in addition the evasion of external cues that serve as reminders of the experienced trauma (APA, 2013). Arousal/reactivity symptoms encompass the third symptom category and include fluctuations in one's arousal level and degree of reactivity (APA, 2013). Common indications of these symptoms include: self-destructive behavior, sleep difficulties, hyper vigilance, and/or outward displays of aggression. Lastly, the fourth symptom category regards negative changes in cognition and mood inclusive of distorted negative cognitions about oneself and the world, often leading to feelings of guilt, dysphoria, and

detachment from social support in addition to difficulty recalling details of the traumatic event (APA, 2013).

In the context of a marital relationship, PTSD appears to have effects that can be moderated by partners' perceptions of the traumatic event. Campbell and Renshaw (2018) suggest that the psychological and relational distress experienced in a military marriage could be moderated if empathy and understanding of the difficulties from the traumatic experience are demonstrated. Other researchers have found that the effect of PTSD symptoms on marital satisfaction are more strongly correlated than PTSD symptoms and the trauma experienced by prisoners of war, further establishing the importance of relationship functioning between soldiers and their spouses (Dekel & Solomon, 2006).

Edwards-Stewart and colleagues (2018) conducted a comprehensive literature review on PTSD and reduced marital satisfaction from couples in military marriages. In particular, positive affect and behavior accounted for a larger variability in relationship functioning than the presence of negative affect (Edwards-Stewart, 2018). To combat the potential impact of PTSD on a military marriage, efforts have been made to treat the disorder in couple's therapy. In its early conceptualization, PTSD was deemed to be an individual experience and yet, in the present day, this disorder is more readily theorized in the context of the individual's home environment (Edwards-Stewart, 2018). Therefore, it is understood that PTSD symptoms have the ability to permeate a marriage because of the potentially deleterious effects this disorder has on one's surrounding

relationships. Therefore, Sautter and colleagues (2011) designed an approach to be used in couple's therapy to treat the symptoms of PTSD called Structural Approach Therapy. In particular, this mode of therapy is based on the principles of stress inoculation and empathic communication, and is primarily used to reduce emotional numbing and better cope with anxiety (Sautter et al., 2011). Military couples who sought this form of therapy reported significant improvements in their relationships due to increased comfort, intimacy, communication, and confidence addressing difficulties in the future (Sautter, et al., 2011). In an effort to better conceptualize and treat military personnel for these psychological conditions, Edwards-Stewart et al. (2018) suggest that health professionals should view service members as having a mental injury that inhibits their ability to connect with others, rather than having a specific diagnosis.

Apart from PTSD, Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) is another of the difficulties encountered by veterans following deployment. Interestingly, Perlick et al. (2011) suggest that the cause of most marital conflict, interpersonal isolation, and psychological distress stems from this condition going undetected. Therefore, significant changes in social functioning and self-esteem often accompany the physical symptoms of this injury (Perlick et al., 2011). Similar to the work executed by Sautter and colleagues in 2011, evidence-based programs like Multifamily Group Treatment (MFGT) have been adapted to best treat TBI victims and their partners as it focuses on the system as a whole rather than the individual alone. The techniques utilized in this modality of treatment are empowerment,

support, acceptance, education, and commitment (Perlick et al., 2011). According to the research executed on MFGT in the Veterans Administration (VA) system, results showed that recipients of this treatment were better equipped to problem solve difficulties resulting from their injuries and reported feeling closer to their loved ones (Perlick et al., 2011).

Link Between Personality and Marital Satisfaction

Marital satisfaction is a mental state that is not achieved automatically, but requires the couple's ongoing efforts to realize it (Sayhemiri, 2020). Understanding that marital satisfaction is developed mentally, when assessing one's partner, long-term and ideal romantic relationships require that individuals go beyond physical characteristics and consider personality traits. Sayhermiri et al. (2020) concluded that not only are personality traits a known factor influencing relationship satisfaction, but they are also used to predict life satisfaction. Taking into account that partners enter a marriage with varied personality traits, researchers often refer to marriage as "a bond between two different personalities" (Gholizadeh et al., 2010). Yet, when partners demonstrate a tendency to impose personality-related expectations onto their partner, personality itself can serve to create tension in a marriage. More specifically, personality characteristics are commonly identified as a significant predictor of marital trajectories, which stems from the personality characteristics each partner contributes to the union (Kelly & Conley, 1987).

In an effort to define personality, researchers have developed numerous approaches to understand and explain this concept. Although many different

personality traits have been identified, most researchers agree that the five-factor model of personality most adequately describes this universal construct (Shiota & Levenson, 2007). Also referred to as the Big Five, this model asserts that personality is comprised of five distinct dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (McCrae & John, 1992). The first of the five, neuroticism, refers to one's tendency to experience such feelings as anxiety, hostility, impulsivity, depression, and low self-esteem. The second, extraversion, refers to those who are more likely to be positive, assertive, and gregarious. Openness is the third dimension and is related to characteristics like curiosity, loving art, and wisdom. The fourth is agreeableness, which is related to traits like kindness, generosity, empathy, and altruism. The final dimension, conscientious, refers to those people who tend to be trustworthy and self-disciplined, and show aim for achievement. As it relates to marital satisfaction, researchers have also found that people who demonstrate different personality traits possess distinct attitudes toward variable aspects of relationship satisfaction.

As indicated by Kelly and Conley (1987), cross-sectional findings from two large meta-analyses indicated that neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion are correlated with both individual and partner marital satisfaction. In the same manner, significant associations between Big Five personality characteristics and marital satisfaction were also indicated, where neuroticism was reported to be the strongest personality predictor of marital dissatisfaction. Further, personality traits such as agreeableness, extraversion, and

conscientiousness were also found to exhibit a statistically significant impact on marital satisfaction (Kelly & Conley, 1987).

The current research also suggests a negative correlation between neuroticism and reported marital satisfaction. In a longitudinal study by Fisher and McNulty in 2008, high levels of neuroticism predicted low levels of marital satisfaction one year later. Relatedly, neuroticism is believed to account for approximately 10% of the variance in the reported marital satisfaction of couples (Sayhemiri, 2020). Therefore, understanding that individuals high in neuroticism often experience feelings as sorrow, anger, and dissatisfaction with self, it is apparent that this trait has the potential to reduce overall life satisfaction. This may be due to these individuals' tendency to place more emphasis on negative life events, which results in moodiness, irritably, and general sadness. For members of the military, there is no one personality type that defines those who serve, but there are particular characteristics common to many soldiers. In order to attain success in the military, service members must possess certain traits that allow them to manage living and working in stressful environments. More specifically, in order to adapt to the structured and hierarchical environment of the military, researchers state soldiers should be flexible, adventurous, disciplined, and adaptable (Morey et al., 2011).

Despite these enlightening associations, the available research has only examined how initial levels of personality characteristics are associated with marital satisfaction, not how changes in personality over time are independently

associated with marital satisfaction. Many partners in a marriage are forced to adapt to each other and "meet in the middle," which often results in individual changes in areas like personality, whether they are positive or negative. Thus, failing to consider personality change over time may neglect an important source of variability in marital satisfaction because these fluctuations are equally important in understanding marital quality (Lavner et al., 2018). Which means, how satisfied spouses are with their marriage is a reflection of each member's initial personality characteristics in conjunction with how these traits shift over time. The result of such changes in personality for both partners may lead to individuals being more satisfied or less satisfied with their marriage as members grow older; therefore, it is a significant topic that deserves more attention in future research (Lavner et al., 2018).

Whether their personality traits shift over time or not, those couples who demonstrate more dissimilar characteristics rather than similar ones are more likely to experience marital satisfaction. Developed by Shiota and Levenson (2007), the complementary hypothesis promotes the concept that couples who exhibit differences regarding specific personality traits will experience greater marital satisfaction over a longer period of time than those couples with similar traits. Namely, the researchers examined the relationship between personality characteristics and marital satisfaction of couples in long-term relationships at the beginning and end of a twelve-year timespan. While personality similarity was not linked with marital satisfaction levels at the outset of the study, researchers found a

negative correlation between personality similarity and marital satisfaction over the 12-year span as a decrease in satisfaction was noted for couples with more similar traits. In an effort to add to the existing body of literature, future research endeavors might want to consider examining if decreases in marital satisfaction over time results in personality changes or if personality changes over time leads to lower rates of marital satisfaction.

The 16PF Report

Formerly developed by Dr. Raymond B. Cattell (1949) and published by the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc. (IPAT), the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) is an objective, psychological assessment containing 185 multiple-choice questions. As per the literature, the 16PF is currently in its fifth edition and possesses over 65 years of research supporting the measure's renowned validity and reliability. While it was designed to detect variations in stable personality characteristics, the measure was not originally intended to identify psychopathology, which was common for most personality measures at that time. The measure provides information about individual personality structure using sixteen primary personality factors that load onto five global factors of personality. 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 where scores of one through three and eight through ten are indicative or more embedded and constant characterizations of each personality trait. Conversely, a score of four through seven is indicative of an average degree of personality trait presentation, although it is considered to be more flexible in nature. For example, a score of two on the Emotional Stability (C) factor would indicate that an individual is more reactive and emotive, whereas a score of nine would indicate a tendency to be more emotionally stable and logical. Additionally, 15 of the 16 primary factors, excluding Reasoning (B), load onto the five global factors, which examine personality at a broader, more universal level. The five global factors are assessed using a similar ten-point scale as the aforementioned personality factors and include: Extraversion (EX), Anxiety (AX), Tough-Mindedness (TM), Independence (IN), and Self-Control (SC).

In addition to the personality scales, the 16PF includes validity measures in the form of three response style indices, which provide insight into the response style of each participant. The three indices to assess used are the Impression Management scale (IM), Infrequency scale (INF), and Acquiescence scale (ACQ) (Cattell, 1989). Items that load onto the Impression Management scale indicate purposeful portrayal of oneself in a favorable or unfavorable light. The Infrequency scale indicates inconsistencies in responding. Therefore, if a participant scores high on this index, it is indicative of unusual or inconsistent response choices, which is often seen in random responding, attention difficulties, or indecisiveness

throughout the testing. The Acquiescence scale is used to indicate difficulties in responding due to the absence of a stable self-image or presence of a high need for approval. Lastly, demographic information is also collected during test administration regarding ethnicity, education level, employment status, and income.

The 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR)

The 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR) is a more specific personality assessment used for couples in psychotherapy. 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. It is used to educated couples and clinicians about the various factors interfering with marital satisfaction.

The report consists of two components, the first is a 16PF report unique to each partner and the second is a comparison of the personality traits and perceptions that contribute to the couple's functioning and satisfaction. In the second component, relationship satisfaction ratings are collected from each partner regarding nine different areas which include: Time Together, Problem-Solving Communication, Caring and Affection, Division of Roles, Finances, Sex, Extended Family, Children, and Alcohol or Drug Use. Level of satisfaction is rated in each of these areas using a ten-point scale, where lower scores indicate relationship

dissatisfaction and higher scores indicate relationship satisfaction. More "neutral" degrees of satisfaction are indicated by a median score of five. Participants are also asked to identify their overall relationship satisfaction and make a presumption about their partner's overall relationship satisfaction. The report itself provides the reader with a Similarity score and a Relationship Adjustment score which both use a one to ten point scale, where one indicates low levels of each factor and ten indicates high levels of each factor, respectively. The Relationship Adjustment score is used to estimate the couple's ability to adapt to relationship demands over time and is derived from the following personality factors: Emotional Stability (C) and Openness to Change (Q_1). The 16PF CCR also includes a demographic questionnaire that takes into account the qualities of the relationship that may not otherwise be indicated and could likely impact marital satisfaction like children and the length of the relationship (Alexander, 2015). Upon completion of the assessment, treatment providers review the testing results with the couple, where each partner is provided with information depicted by graphed depictions of individual personality traits, comparisons, and overall compatibility.

Research Utilizing the 16PF CCR

Upon examining the current body of literature on the 16PF CCR, there is very limited information regarding the use of this measure to evaluate personality functioning, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment amongst couples. Yet, a series of unpublished doctoral research projects from doctoral students enrolled in

the Psy.D. program at Florida Institute of Technology have explored these topics profoundly (Arnett, 2008; Shah, 2009; Field, 2013; Garofalo, 2014; Moore, 2015; Alexander, 2015; Mulholland, 2015; Carpenter, 2018; Hart, 2018; Mullis 2018; Dungee, 2019). Amid the abovementioned studies, in depth literature reviews and analyses of minority population samples were conducted due to the variable nature of demographic variables of participants. The research has extended from couples belonging to the LGBTQ+ community (Shah, 2009), to deployed combat veterans (Alexander, 2015; Moore, 2015; Mulholland, 2015), to heterosexual couples seeking marital therapy (Carpenter, 2018; Hart, 2018; Mullis, 2018).

nonclinical population. For many of the studies conducted at Florida Tech, a positive, significant relationship was found between overall marital satisfaction and the Emotional Stability personality variable (Field, 2013). Demographic factors that demonstrated a significant relationship with overall marital satisfaction were relationship length and status (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018). Additionally, overall marital satisfaction was positively correlated with the following variables: division of roles, sex, time spent together, caring and affection, extended family, problem-solving communication, and finances (Arnett, 2008; Field, 2013; Garofalo, 2014; Hart, 2018). Therefore, increases in these variables was linked to an increase in overall marital satisfaction.

When discussing gender differences, relationship adjustment also demonstrated a significant, positive relationship with Emotional Stability, Openness to Change, Liveliness, and Social Boldness in females (Field, 2013; Hart,

2018). On the other hand, Apprehension, Tension, Privateness, Self-Reliance, and Vigilance were negatively correlated with relationship adjustment (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018). In same-sex couples, emotional reactivity, which is a component of the Emotional Stability factor, led to poorer relationship adjustment (Shah, 2009). In general, marital satisfaction and relationship adjustment were positively and significantly correlated in female populations (Field, 2013).

clinical population. The remaining doctoral research projects aimed to assess personality similarly, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment among combat deployed veterans who received marital counseling services following deployment. For example, Alexander (2015) observed gender differences in personality between male and female combat deployed veterans. It was determined that males in this population sample rated themselves higher on traits like dominance, independence, and social boldness whereas females rated themselves higher in traits related to abstract reasoning. Additionally, a positive relationship was observed between overall personality similarity and Openness to Change between genders in heterosexual relationships (Moore, 2015; Mulholland, 2015). Further, a positive relationship was found amid personality similarity as well as relationship adjustment and overall marital satisfaction in females (Mulholland, 2015). Specifically, age of female veterans served as the demographic variable that most accurately predicted overall marital satisfaction (Mulholland, 2015).

Although the doctoral research projects conducted at Florida Tech have been expansive and novel in nature, no research has been done to better understand

the unique dynamic of dual-military couples. Specifically, clarification is needed regarding the factors that influence personality similarity, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment amongst dual-military couples following deployment. With this in mind, the current study is the first of its kind to examine these factors in the context of a heterosexual, dual-military marriage.

Chapter 3

Statement of Purpose

The aim of this study is to determine whether gender differences exist amid the various factors that influence marital satisfaction in dual-military couples. A more thorough understanding of the dynamics between members in a dual-military relationship may better educate and equip clinicians who serve this population. Although the current literature describes the damaging impact military service can have on couples in general, the available literature on dual-military couples is extremely limited. Further, the current research on this topic does not clarify how a dual-military couple's experience may be differentiated if the partner deployed is male or female and whether they are deployed simultaneously. This study should serve to identify a variety of factors that contribute to fulfilled, dual-military marriages and highlight those factors most affected by military service. Accordingly, these findings will be used to provide clinicians who work with dual-military couples, the information necessary to better understand and address the impact of military service on marriage back on the home front.

Chapter 4

Hypotheses

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

1. There will be a significant main effect of gender on the nine individual satisfaction items. This hypothesis will be tested utilizing a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance.
2. There will be a significant main effect of gender on the sixteen Primary Personality factors. This hypothesis will be tested utilizing a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance.
3. There will be a significant main effect of gender on the five Global Personality Factors. This hypothesis will be tested utilizing a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance.
4. There will be a significant difference in the Relationship Adjustment Scores between men and women in dual-military couples. This will be tested utilizing a paired samples t-test.
5. There will be a significant difference in the Overall Satisfaction Scores between men and women in dual-military couples. This will be tested utilizing a paired samples t-test.

Chapter 5

Method

Participants

The data to analyzed in the present study was provided via an archival data set from the office of Dr. Richard T. Elmore, Jr., Ph.D. Research participants included dual-military couples who were deployed in and experienced combat during OEF, OIF, and/or OND. The sample utilized included 23 dual-military couples, or 46 individual participants belonging to various ethnicities, age groups, and military branches. 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 will be analyzed during this research, and thus, should be perceived as an exploratory analysis. At this time, two types of analyses are expected to be used to test the aforementioned hypotheses: a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance and a paired samples t-test.

Procedure

Approval from the Florida Institute of Technology Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained prior to data collection. Additional IRB approval will be 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.

Chapter 6

Results

Descriptive Frequencies

Descriptive frequencies regarding sample demographic variables are displayed in Table 2. The sample analyzed included a total of 23 dual-veteran combat-deployed couples (i.e., both male and female groups) during OEF, OIF, or OND. All participants completed the 16PF CCR. For both groups, 71.7% of participants identified as Caucasian (66.7% males; 77.8% females), while 13.0% identified as African-American/Black (20.8% males; 5.6% females), 8.7% identified as Hispanic/Latino (8.3% males; 9.3% females), 2.2% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander (1.1% males; 3.7% females), 2.2% identified as Native American (1.6% males; 0.0% females), and 2.2% identified as another race (1.6% males; 1.9% female).

Amongst the 46 participants, 15.2% reported obtaining a High School Diploma or GED as their Highest Education Level achieved (20.8% male; 17.0% female), whereas 17.4% reported obtaining an Associate's or Technical Degree (12.5% males; 20.4% females), 28.3% obtained a Bachelor's Degree (29.2% males; 31.5% females), 8.7% completed some Graduate-Level Coursework but did not obtain a degree (9.3% males; 9.3% females), and 30.4% obtained a Graduate Degree of some type (29.2% males; 20.4% females).

When examining participant employment status, a majority reported working Full-Time at 67.4% (66.7% males; 52.8% females). Whereas 10.9% of

participants reported working Part-Time (12.5% males; 11.3% females), 10.9% identified as Housewives/Househusbands (4.2% males; 30.2% females), 4.3% reported they were Unemployed (8.3% males; 1.9% females), 2.2% identified as Retired (4.2% males; 0.0% females), and 4.3% described their current employment status as Other (4.2% males; 1.9% females). As for identifying participants' Branch of Service relative to their combat-deployment, 78.3% of participants served in the Army (75.0% males; 61.5% females), 13.0% served in the Air Force (16.7% males; 13.5% females), 6.5% served in the Marine Corps (4.2% males; 19.2% females), and 2.2% served in the Navy (4.2% males; 5.8% females). Of the 46 participants deployed in OEF, OIF, and/or OND, 32.6% of veterans reported Moderate Exposure to Combat Exposure to have occurred during their deployments. Relatedly, 19.6% of participants reported Little or no Exposure, 17.4% reported an Unknown level of Combat Exposure, 15.2% reported Some Exposure, 13.0% reported Moderately High Exposure, and 2.2% reported High Exposure. Lastly, when regarding current household income, 67.4% of participants reported annual combined earnings of $80,000 or more, 8.7% earned $60,000-$79,999 per year, 4.3% earned $40,000-$59,999 per year, and 19.6% earned $20,000-$39,000 per year.

When examining the relationship length the couples, a majority of participants reported a relationship length from 8-14 years (65.2%); however, 28.3% reported maintaining their current relationship for 3-7 years. Additionally, 4.3% of couples reported their current relationship length is within 15-25 years and

only 2.2% of couples reported a span of 0-2 years. Of the 23 dual-veteran couples, 56.5% reported having children whereas 23.9% denied having children, yet 19.6% reported Other, likely indicative of the presence of children outside their current relationship.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 examined the relationship between gender and the 16 PF-CCR nine Individual Satisfaction items. Members of each dual-veteran couple were divided into two groups by their gender: female and male. The independent variable used was gender, whereas the dependent variables included the nine Individual Satisfaction items on the 16PF CCR (i.e., time together, problem-solving communication, caring and affection, division of roles, finances, sex, extended family, children, and alcohol or drug use). It was predicted that there would be a significant main effect of gender on the nine Individual Satisfaction items. The means and standard deviations for the nine Individual Satisfaction items can be found in Table 3.

A one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (Table 9), and the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met for eight of the nine Individual Satisfaction items, including Time Together (Levene's statistic = .403, p = .529), Communication (Levene's statistic = .325, p = .572), Caring and Affection (Levene's statistic = .034, p = .854), Division of Roles (Levene's statistic = .000, p = .992), Finances (Levene's statistic = .036, p = .851), Sex (Levene's statistic = .607, p = .440), Children (Levene's statistic = .007, p =

.933), and Alcohol or Drug Use (Levene's statistic = .046, p = .832).

The item that violated the assumption of homogeneity included Extended Family (Levene's statistic = 5.085, p = .029); therefore, a Mann-Whitney U was conducted for this item. The Mann-Whitney U test indicated that this Individual Satisfaction item did not demonstrate a significant difference between males and females in dual-veteran couples (Table 7; Table 8). Specifically, males were not significantly different on Extended Family (*Mn Rank* = 22.26) compared to females on Extended Family (*Mn Rank* = 24.74, U = 236.00, z = -.644, p = .024).

ANOVA results showed that there was not an overall significant mean difference among the two group means for the nine Individual Satisfaction items. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Results from this analysis can be found in Table 9.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 examined the relationship between gender and the 16PF CCR Primary Personality Factors. Members of each dual-veteran couple were divided into two groups by their gender: female and male. The independent variable used was gender, whereas the dependent variables included the 16 Primary Personality Factors of the 16PF CCR (see Table 1 for a list of the 16 dependent variables). It was predicted that there would be a significant main effect of gender on the 16 Primary Personality Factors. Means and standard deviations for the 16 Primary Personality factors can be found in Table 4.

A one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was

conducted, and the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met for 15 of the 16 Primary Personality Factors (Table 12), including Reasoning (Levene's statistic = .454, p = .504), Emotional Stability (Levene's statistic = .083, p = .774), Dominance (Levene's statistic = 1.462, p = .233), Liveliness (Levene's statistic = .216, p = .645), Rule Consciousness (Levene's statistic = .446, p = .508), Social Boldness (Levene's statistic = .214, p = .646), Sensitivity (Levene's statistic = 3.578, p = .065), Vigilance (Levene's statistic = .477, p = .493), Abstractedness (Levene's statistic = .000 p = .992), Privateness (Levene's statistic = 2.974, p = .092), Apprehension (Levene's statistic = .514, p = .477), Openness to Change (Levene's statistic = .249, p = .621), Self-Reliance (Levene's statistic = .400, p = .530), Perfectionism (Levene's statistic = .120, p = .731), and Tension (Levene's statistic = .066, p = .799).

The factor that violated the assumption of homogeneity was Warmth (Levene's statistic = 6.948, p = .012); therefore, a Mann-Whitney U was conducted for this item. The Mann-Whitney U test indicated that this Primary Personality Factor was not significantly different between males and females in dual-veteran couples (Table 10; Table 11). Specifically, females were not significantly different on Warmth (*Mn Rank* = 25.74) compared to males on Warmth (*Mn Rank* = 21.26, U = 213.00, z = -1.15, p = .250).

ANOVA results showed that there was not an overall significant mean difference among the two group means for the 16 Primary Personality Factors. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Results from this analysis can be found

in Table 12.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 examined the relationship between gender and the 16PF CCR five Global Personality Factors. Members of each dual-veteran couple were divided into two groups by their gender: female and male. The independent variable used was gender, whereas the dependent variables included the five Global Personality Factors of the 16PF CCR (i.e., extraversion, anxiety, tough-mindedness, independence, self-control). It was predicted that there would be a significant main effect of gender on the five Global Personality Factors. Means and standard deviations for the five Global Personality factors can be found in Table 4.
A one-way between groups multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted, and the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met for three of the five Global Personality Factors (Table 16), including Extraversion (Levene's statistic = .001, p = .975), Anxiety (Levene's statistic = .639, p = .428), and Self-Control (Levene's statistic = .000, p = 1.000).

The factors that violated the assumption of homogeneity included Tough-Mindedness (Levene's statistic = 4.206, p = .046) and Independence (Levene's statistic = 4.730, p = .035); therefore, a Mann-Whitney U was conducted for these factors. The Mann-Whitney U test indicated that the Tough-Mindedness Global Personality Factor was not significantly different between males and females in dual-veteran couples (Table 14; Table 15). Specifically, males were not significantly different on Tough-Mindedness (*Mn Rank* = 24.91) compared to

females on Tough-Mindedness (*Mn Rank* = 22.09, U = 232.00, *z* = -.728, *p* = .467).

However, the Mann-Whitney U test indicated that the Independence Global Personality Factor was significantly different between males and females in dual-veteran couples (Table 14; Table 15). Particularly, females reported significantly lower scores on Independence (*Mn Rank* = 19.52) compared to males on Independence (*Mn Rank* = 27.48, U = 173.00, *z* = -2.058, *p* = .04). ANOVA results showed that there was an overall significant mean difference among the two group means for only one of the five Global Personality Factors. This includes Independence, $F(1, 46) = 4.97$, $p = .031$, with an eta-squared of .101, suggesting that 10.1% of the variance on Independence was explained by gender. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported as only one of the five Global Personality Factors (i.e., Independence) was significantly different between both groups. Results from this analysis can be found in Table 15.

Hypothesis 4

A paired samples t-test was performed to compare mean Relationship Adjustment scores between males and females in dual-veteran couples. Levene's test (Table 17) indicated that variances in Relationship Adjustment for males and females were not statistically equivalent; therefore, they were not assumed to be equal $F(22) = 1.898$, $p = .175$.

Results from 46 participants (23 male, 23 female) belonging to 23 dual-veteran couples indicated that males ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 1.78$) were not significantly different from females ($M = 4.83$, $SD = 1.64$; Table 18) on their level of

Relationship Adjustment, $t(22) = 1.54$, $p = .137$, with the difference to have a 95% CI [-.24, 1.63]. The difference presents a small-sized effect, Cohen's $d = 0.40$. Thus, Hypothesis 4, that asserted males and females would report significantly different levels of Relationship Adjustment, was not supported. The results from this analysis can be found in Table 18. For additional information regarding the means and standard deviations of the continuous variables, see Table 5.

Hypothesis 5

A paired samples t-test was performed to compare mean Overall Marital Satisfaction scores between males and females in dual-veteran couples. Levene's test (Table 19) indicated that variances in Overall Marital Satisfaction for males and females were not statistically equivalent; therefore, they were not assumed to be equal $F(22) = .585$, $p = .449$.

Results from 46 participants (23 male, 23 female) belonging to 23 dual-veteran couples indicated that males ($M = 7.09$, $SD = 1.99$) were not significantly different from females ($M = 7.52$, $SD = 1.86$; Table 20) on their level of Overall Marital Satisfaction, $t(22) = -1.55$, $p = .135$, with the difference to have a 95% CI [-1.02, .15]. The difference presents a small-sized effect, Cohen's $d = 0.22$. Thus, Hypothesis 5, that asserted males and females would report significantly different levels of Overall Marital Satisfaction, was not supported. The results from this analysis can be found in Table 20. For additional information regarding the means and standard deviations of the continuous variables, see Table 5.

Chapter 7

Discussion

The current study examined multiple predictors of marital satisfaction, including a range of demographic variables in addition to relationship adjustment and personality similarity, among males and females in dual-veteran couples following deployment. At present, the available literature on dual-veteran couples is extremely limited despite the notable challenges military service poses to dyadic relationships. Further, the minimal research available on this topic does not examine the effects of gender on marital satisfaction in dual-veteran couples. Understanding that the concept of dual-veteran couples in the military is a relatively recent trend, the current study begins to generate and contribute to the literature in this overlooked area of military research. Accordingly, the statistical findings from this study are valuable to clinical practice as the gender differences and similarities that contribute to satisfied, heterosexual dual-veteran marriages are highlighted. These findings are helpful in paving the way for future research on this topic, including those results that were not found to be significant. The following includes an overview and discussion of the results, study limitations, as well as an inclusion of future directions for continued research in this area.

When discussing the nine Individual Satisfaction items, statistical analyses revealed no significant differences between males and females of dual-veteran couples on each of the Individual Satisfaction items. However, despite the lack of significant gender difference on these items, evaluation of group means relative to

gender suggested that both males and females endorsed scores that ranged from 6.22 to 7.83 out of 10 for all items for this factor. Additionally, females reported slightly higher scores for 8 out of the 9 Individual Satisfaction domains apart from Communication. These results support foundational couples research that examined conflict-resolution communication approaches in couples as a predictor of marital satisfaction (White, 1989). Studies on this topic assert that marital satisfaction in couples is distinguished by the degree of coercive versus affiliative communication in dyadic relationships. White (1989) suggested that each partner's communication pattern differs on the basis of gender, where females and males are traditionally found to demonstrate different styles of response to dissatisfaction in marriage. Specifically, while males were found to assume a more forceful stance toward their partners, females were found to take a more socially reinforcing approach and reported lower communication satisfaction as a result (White, 1989). While each dyad in the present study reported being, at minimum, fairly satisfied in their marriages, these finding suggest that communication should be an area of focus particularly for female military personnel in marital therapy.

As for the Primary Personality Factors, no significant differences were revealed with regard to gender. While the statistical analyses revealed no significant differences between males and females on each of the aforementioned factors, an evaluation of the mean differences of the Primary Personality Factors revealed relevant findings. Specifically, this evaluation indicated that males endorsed lower scores on Warmth (A), Liveliness (F), and Sensitivity (I) whereas

females reported lower scores on Emotional Stability (C) and Dominance (E). Realistically, particular personality factors that are advantageous in the military may negatively impact a romantic relationship. In the context of the military, dominance and emotional stability are adaptive attributes that equip soldiers to handle and overcome multiple challenges yet, in the context of a relationship this combination of traits could denote aloofness and dismissiveness.

Further, the findings from the present study are commensurate with previous research that explored the differences in personality and language across gender (Park et al., 2016). The researchers identified two dimensions of gender-specific language and personality traits, affiliation and assertiveness. Affiliation was described as a predisposition towards valuing more interpersonal closeness, warmth, and affection, while assertiveness was defined as a tendency towards demonstrating more dominance, ambition, and interpersonal efficacy. Ultimately, the researchers found that female participants were more affiliative than their male counterparts as they demonstrated interpersonally warmer language (Park et al., 2016). Additionally, while both groups used assertive language, male participants were more likely to use language that was both assertively colder, with occasional swearing and criticism, while women were more likely to use language that was highly assertively warmer with expressions of positive emotion (Park et al., 2016). Social role theory is an evolutionary perspective that asserts that societal pressures and expectations drive men and women into contrasting social roles that maintain stereotypically gender-specific behavior (Eagly, 1987). Because the military is a

male-dominated field, social roles are often amplified where females are sometimes viewed as inferior, which can be distressing for female military personnel. Therefore, this theory may better explain gender differences in language and personality in couples that suggests these differences transcend the battlefield and prompt couples to seek marital therapy on the home front.

Upon evaluating the five Global Personality factors, significant differences were found for gender. Primarily, Independence was the only factor that yielded significantly different scores between males and females, where gender explained 10.1% of the variance. More notably, upon evaluating the mean differences of this factor for both groups, males were found to endorse higher ratings on Independence than females. This finding suggests the male participants were reportedly more self-determined and self-reliant in comparison to their spouses. In his review of the literature, Johnson et al. (1999), examined those personality characteristics of personnel that the most determine success in military careers. The researchers found that urgency (i.e., dominance, assertiveness) and emotional stability (i.e., emotional balance, self-confidence, independence) were steady correlates of success in leadership roles in the military (Johnson et al., 1999). While there are many factors that contribute to the socially constructed view of "ideal masculinity", the military has significant and growing impact not only on military personnel, but on norms of what it means to "be a man" in society. For these reasons, these traits are more highly regarded and revered as these factors are not only correlated with

greater job effectiveness but, for those on the front lines, doing's one's job well increases the rate of survival.

Conversely, no significant differences in Relationship Adjustment scores between males and females were detected. Despite the lack of significant gender differences on this factor, there was a small effect indication, which supports the notion that there could be gender differences in Relationship Adjustment within dual-veteran couples. For this reason, more expansive research is warranted to identify if there are extraneous variables that mitigate the effects of relationship maladjustment in this population. It would also be advantageous to explore whether adjusting to the military has positively or negatively impacted couples' ability to adapt to the changes of their marriage.

Comparatively, when evaluating Overall Marital Satisfaction, no significant differences were indicated. Although minor, there was a small effect indication for this factor; therefore, there could exist gender differences within dual-veteran couples. Vest and colleagues (2017) examined Overall Marital Satisfaction in veteran couples and they identified an association between marital satisfaction and mood difficulties. Particularly, higher marital satisfaction was significantly associated with lower depression, anxiety, anger, and PTSD for soldiers (Vest et al., 2017). In addition, three additional resiliency factors (i.e., family support, unit support, and deployment preparation) were identified that positively impacted marital satisfaction in military personnel (Vest et al., 2017). Moreover, it would beneficial to distinguish those factors that might be playing a role in promoting

resiliency against marital dissatisfaction and negative mental health outcomes in military populations.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although the findings from the present study offer valuable information for clinicians working with dual-veteran couples, there were various limitations that should be noted. Keeping in mind that there is extremely limited information available about gender differences in relationship adjustment, personality similarity, and marital satisfaction in military marriages, there has been even less research conducted on dual-veteran couples. Moreover, there is no existing data to compare the present findings to, which stands as the first limitation. Another limitation regards the recruitment of married, heterosexual partners whom have both experienced military deployment, which was difficult to execute and resulted in a relatively small sample group (i.e., N = 23 males, N= 23 females) and total size (N= 23 dual-veteran couples). Additionally, a greater majority of participants identified as Caucasian, fell in middle class bracket of socioeconomic status, obtained a graduate degree, and were members of the Army. Other than the presence of children in the household, minimal information was obtained regarding the amount of children reported for each couple. Thus, these aforementioned demographic constraints limit the generalizability of the present findings to more diverse dual-veteran couples. For this reason, future research should aim to focus on more dynamic differences across dual-veteran couples such as exploring same-

sex couples in addition to couples from differing socioeconomic classes and race/ethnicity.

Further, no information was obtained regarding combat-related diagnoses, disability, medication, or mental health conditions, which could likely impact reports of relationship adjustment and marital satisfaction in military couples. Future research should also explore therapeutic approaches that would be effective in mitigating individual mental health difficulties that could potentially exacerbate relationship adjustment and satisfaction in married couples. More importantly, because the present study's findings suggest that there are no gender differences in marital satisfaction, personality similarity, and relationship adjustment in dual-veteran couples apart from independence, future studies could benefit from identifying the underlying reason for this occurrence. Namely, researchers should examine if there are shared personality characteristics amongst those that are drawn to the military, if personality is molded as a result of experiences in the military, or if the present study's findings are attributed to a combination of the two.

Because the current study's findings are preliminary in nature, military researchers are encouraged to corroborate and expand on these findings. Ultimately, these results provide important implications for future studies aiming to understanding the different mechanisms that bolster and challenge effective communication, conflict resolution, and personality similarity between males and females in dual-veteran marriages.

References

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

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.

Allen, E. S., Rhoades, G.K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2011). On the homefront: Stress for recently deployed army couples. *Family Process*, *2*, 235- 247. American Psychological Association. (2019). *Marriage and divorce.* Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/topics/divorce/

Aluko, Y.A. (2009). Work-family conflict and coping strategies adopted by women in academia. *Gender and Behaviour*, *7*(1), 2095-2324.

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.

Beegam, H., Muqthar, M., & Wani, M. A. (2017). Marital Adjustment among single and dual working couples. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *4*. doi:10.25215/0404.155

Bell, D. (1997). Defining marriage and legitimacy. *Curr. Anthropol*. *38*, 237–253. doi:10.1086/204606

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.

Bouvard, M. G. (2012). *The invisible wounds of war: Coming home from Afghanistan*. New York, NY: Prometheus Books.

Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. *62*, 964-980. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x

Bray, R. M., Camlin, C. S., Fairbank, J. A., Dunteman, G. H., & Wheeless, S. C. (2001). The effects of stress on job functioning of military men and women. *Armed forces and society*, *27*(3), 397–417. doi:10.1177/0095327X0102700304

Britt, T. W., Adler, A. B., & Castro, C. A. (2006). *Military life: the psychology of serving in peace and combat*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.

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

Castro, C. A., Kintzle, S., & Hassan, A. (2014). The state of the American veteran: The Los Angeles county veterans study. *USC School of Social Work: Center for Innovation and Research on Veterans & Military Families*, 1-64.

Cattell, H. B. (1989). The 16PF: Personality in depth. Champaign, Ill: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017, January 13). Marriage and Divorce Statistics in the United States.

Cigrang, J., Talcott, G. W., Tatum, J., Baker, M., Cassidy, D., Sonnek, S., Snyder, D., Balderamadurbin, C., Heyman, R., & Slep, A. (2014). Intimate partner communication from the war zone: A prospective study of relationship functioning, communication frequency, and combat effective. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *40*(3), 332-343.

McCrae, R. R. & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications". *Journal of Personality*. 60, 175-215. doi:10.1111/j.14676494.1992.tb00970.x.

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

De Kruijff, L., Moussault, O., Plat, M. J., Hoencamp, R., & van der Wurff, P. (2019). Coping strategies of Dutch servicemembers after deployment. *Military Medical Research*, *6*, 9. doi:10.1186/s40779-019-0199-4

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, American Forces Information Service (AFIS). (2018). *U.S. Department of Defense 2018 Military Demographics Report*, (pp. 49–55). Alexandria, VA.

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

Eagly AH. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. [Google Scholar]

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

Fisher, T. D., & McNulty, J. K. (2008). Neuroticism and marital satisfaction: The mediating role played by the sexual relationship. *J Fam Psychol, 22*, 112-113.

Fiske, A. P., Shinob,m K., Hazel, R. M., Nisbett, R. E. (1998). The cultural matrix of social psychology, in The Handbook of Social Psychology. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill. 915–981.

Gambardella, L. C. (2008). Role-exit theory and marital discord following extended military deployment. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, *44*(3), 169-174.

Gerwitz, A. H., Polusny, M. A., DeGarmo, D. S., Khaylis, A., & Erbes, C. R. (2010). Posttraumatic stress symptoms among National Guard soldiers deployed to Iraq:Associations with parenting behaviors and couple adjustment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *78*(5), 599-610.

Gholizadeh, B., Hasan, G., & Jalil, B. K. (2010). The relation between five factor of personality and marital satisfaction. *J Shahed Univ*, *17*, 57-66.

Gordon, J.R., Whelan-Berry, K.S. & Hamilton, E.A. (2007). The relationship among work family conflict and enhancement, organizational work-family culture, and work outcomes for older working women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*(4), 350-364.

Guilder, G. (1986, September). Women in the Work Force. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1986/09/women-in-the-workforce/304924/

Herzberg, P. Y. (2012). Coping in relationships: the interplay between individual and dyadic coping and their effects on relationship satisfaction. Anxiety, Stress & Coping, 26, (2), 136–153. doi: 10.1080/10615806.2012.655726

Hobfoll, S. E., Dunahoo, C. L., Ben-Porath, Y, & Monnier, J. (1994). Gender and coping: The dual-axis model of coping. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 22,* 49-81.

HT Digital Streams Limited. (2011, May 20). Dual-Military Marriages. *US Fed News Service*, pp. 20-21. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/867709038?accountid=27313

Johnson, B., Lall, R., Holmes, E., Brinkmyer, K., Yatko, B. (1999). Personality characteristics of future military leaders. *Military Medicine*, *164*, 906.

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.

Kessler, R. C., & McLeod, J. D. (1984). Sex Differences in Vulnerability to Undesirable Life Events. *American Sociological Review*. 1984;49:620–631

Knobloch, L. K., & Theiss, J. A. (2011). Depressive symptoms and mechanisms of relational turbulence as predictors of relationship satisfaction among returning service members. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25(4), 470-478.

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

Lavner, J. A., Weiss, B., Miller, J. D., & Karney, B. R. (2018). Personality change among newlyweds: Patterns, predictors, and associations with marital satisfaction over time. *Developmental psychology*, *54*(6), 1172–1185. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000491

MacDermid, S., & Riggs, D. S. (2014). *Military deployment and its consequences for families*. New York: Springer.

MacLean, M. B., Van Til, L., Thompson, J. M., Sweet, J., Poirier, A., Sudom, K., & Pedlar, D. J. (2014). Post military adjustment to civilian life: Potential risks and protective factors. *Physical Therapy*, *94*(8), 1186-1195.

Majhi, G., & Panda, B. (2015). Marital Satisfaction in Dual Earner Family. *ISOR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *20*(3), 1-4. doi: 10.9790/0837-20310104

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

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

Park, G., Yaden, D. B., Schwartz, H. A., Kern, M. L., Eichstaedt, J. C., Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D., Ungar, L. H., & Seligman, M. E. (2016). Women are warmer but no less assertive than men: Gender and language on Facebook. *PloS one*, *11*, doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155885

Perlick, D. A., Straits- Tröster, K., Dyck, D. G., Norell, D. M., Strauss, J. L., Henderson, C., & Cristian, A. (2011). Multifamily group treatment for veterans with traumatic brain injury. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 42 (1).* 70-78.

Rebello, K., Silva Jr., M. D., & Brito, R. C. S. (2014). Fundamental factors in marital satisfaction: An assessment of Brazilian couples. *Psychology*, *5*(7), 777–784. doi:10.4236/psych.2014.57088.

Riviere, L. A., Merrill, J.C., Thomas, J. L., Wilk, J. E., & Bliese, P. D. (2012). 2003-2009 marital functioning trends among U.S. enlisted soldiers following combat deployments. *Military Medicine*, *177*, 1169-77.

Sautter, F.J., Armelie, A.P., Glynn S.M,. & Wielt, D.B. (2011). The development of a couple based for PTSD in returning veterans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,42 (1),* 63-69.

Sayehmiri, K., Kareem, K.I., Abdi, K., Dalvand, S., & Ghanei, R. G. (2020). The relationship between personality traits and marital satisfaction: A systematic review and meta analysis. *BMC Psychol*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-0383-z

Serratelli, A. (2016). *The order of celebrating matrimony*. Retrieved from https://litpress.org/Products/GetSample/4641/9780814646410

Schoen, R. (1989). Marriage choices in North Carolina and Virginia. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 465. doi:10.2307/352508

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

Srivastava, A. K., & Krishna, A. (1991). A test of inverted 'u'-hypothesis of stress performance relationship in the industrial context. *Psychological Studies*, *36*, 34–38.

Steenkamp, M. M. (2016). True evidence-based care for posttraumatic stress disorder in military personnel and veterans. *JAMA Psychiatry*,*73*, 431.

Trail, T. E. (2019). The impact of deployments on military marriages. Retrieved December 19, 2019, fromhttps://militaryfamilieslearningnetwork.org/2019/04/08/military-marriages-matter-how-deployment-affects-marriages-and-couples/

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Report. (2018). *Employment Characteristics of Families*. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/famee.pdf

Vest, B. M., Heavey, S. C., Homish, D. L., & Homish, G. G. (2017). Marital Satisfaction, Family Support, and Pre-Deployment Resiliency Factors Related to Mental Health Outcomes for Reserve and National Guard Soldiers. *Military behavioral health*, *5*, 313–323. doi.org/10.1080/21635781.2017.1343694

Viers, D., & Prouty, A. M. (2001). We‘ve come a long way? An overview of research of dual career couples‘ stressors and strength. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, *13*(3), 169-190.

White, B. B. (1989). Gender differences in marital communication patterns. *Family Process, 28*, 89–106. doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1989.00089.x

Xenakis, S. N. (2016). At risk for violence in the military. *Psychiatry Clinical North America*, *7*, 193-195. doi: 10.1016/j.psc.2016.07.008

Zaheri, F., Dolatian, M., Shariati, M., Simbar, M., Ebadi, A., & Azghadi, S. B. (2016). Effective factors in marital satisfaction in perspective of Iranian women and men: A systematic review. *Electronic physician*, *8*(12), 3369–3377. doi:10.19082/3369

Zainah, A. Z., Nasir, R., Hashim, R., Suliza, M., Yusof, N. (2012). Effects of demographic variables on marital satisfaction. *Asian Social Science, 8*(9), 46–49. doi:10.5539/ass.v8n9p46.

Zamorski, M. A., Rusu, C., & Garber, B. G. (2014). Prevalence and correlates of mental health problems in Canadian forces personnel who deploy in support of the mission in Afganistan: Findings from post deployment screenings, 2009-2012. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *59*(6), 319-326.

Table 1
16PF CCR 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 Male and Females in Dual-Veteran Couples

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Race/Ethnicity		
African American	6	13.0%
Caucasian	33	71.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	2.2%
Hispanic or Latino	4	8.7%
Native American	1	2.2%
Other	1	2.2%
Education Level		
High School/GED	7	15.2%
Associate Degree	8	17.4%
Bachelor's Degree	13	28.3%
Graduate Course work w/o Degree	4	8.7%
Graduate Degree	14	30.4%
Current Employment Status		
Full Time	31	67.4%
Part Time	5	10.9%
Housewife/Househusband	5	10.9%
Unemployed	2	4.3%
Retired	1	2.2%
Other	2	4.3%
Current Household Income		
$20,000-$39,999	9	19.6%
$40,000-$59,999	2	4.3%
$60,000-$79,999	4	8.7%
$80,000+	31	67.4%
Relationship Length		
0-2 years	1	2.2%
3-7 years	13	28.3%
8-14 years	30	65.2%
15-25 years	2	4.3%
Existence of Children		
No	11	23.9%
Yes	26	56.5%

Other	9	19.6%
Branch of Service		
Army	36	78.3%
Navy	1	2.2%
Marine Corps	3	6.5%
Air Force	6	13.0%
Combat Exposure		
Unknown	8	17.4%
Little or no Exposure	9	19.6%
Some Exposure	7	15.2%
Moderate Exposure	15	32.6%
Moderately High Exposure	6	13.0%
High Exposure	1	2.2%

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Item Satisfaction Ratings

	Mean		SD	
Variables	Males	Females	Males	Females
Time Together	6.65	7.00	2.08	2.47
Problem-Solving Communication	6.39	6.35	2.54	2.62
Caring and Affection	6.57	7.09	2.29	2.31
Division of Roles	6.39	7.13	2.02	2.08
Finances	6.43	6.78	2.73	2.70
Sex	6.22	6.52	2.04	2.45
Extended Family	6.70	7.26	2.03	1.51
Children	6.87	7.13	1.82	2.18
Alcohol and Drug Use	7.52	7.83	1.70	2.10

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of 16PF Primary and Global Personality Factors

	Mean		SD	
Variables	Males	Females	Males	Females
Primary Factors				
Warmth (A)	3.96	4.52	1.30	2.09
Reasoning (B)	5.57	6.26	1.90	1.63
Emotional Stability (C)	5.52	4.78	1.68	1.68

Dominance (E)	5.35	4.70	1.11	1.58
Liveliness (F)	4.96	5.30	1.92	1.85
Rule-Conscientiousness (G)	5.30	5.65	1.92	1.75
Social Boldness (H)	5.83	5.09	2.02	2.15
Sensitivity (I)	4.96	5.17	1.64	2.35
Vigilance (L)	6.91	6.13	1.65	1.46
Abstractedness (M)	5.61	5.30	1.95	1.96
Privateness (N)	5.96	5.61	1.61	2.25
Apprehension (O)	5.26	5.87	1.66	1.87
Openness to Change (Q_1)	6.00	5.22	1.79	1.95
Self-Reliance (Q_2)	6.57	6.30	1.97	2.20
Perfectionism (Q_3)	5.87	5.74	2.05	2.28
Tension (Q_4)	5.96	5.87	1.58	1.63
Global Factors				
Extraversion (EX)	4.39	4.87	1.88	2.10
Anxiety (AX)	6.04	6.22	2.08	1.81
Tough-Mindedness (TM)	5.83	6.17	1.34	2.01
Independence (IN)	5.96	4.96	1.26	1.75
Self-Control (SC)	5.57	5.70	1.88	1.92

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Factors

	Mean		SD	
Variables	Males	Females	Males	Females
Relationship Adjustment	5.52	4.83	1.78	1.64
Personality Similarity	6.67	6.64	2.73	2.40
Overall Marital Satisfaction	7.09	7.52	0.42	0.39

Table 6

Hypothesis 1: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Source	Levene Statistic	*df 1*	*df 2*	*p*
Time Together	.403	1	44	.529
Communication	.325	1	44	.572
Caring and Affection	.034	1	44	.854
Division of Roles	.000	1	44	.992
Finances	.036	1	44	.851
Sex	.607	1	44	.440
Extended Family	5.085	1	44	.029
Children	.007	1	44	.933
Alcohol or Drug Use	.046	1	44	.832

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

Table 7

Hypothesis 1: Mann-Whitney Test-Rank

Item	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Extended Family	Male	23	22.26	512.00
	Female	23	24.74	569.00
	Total	46		

Table 8

Hypothesis 1: Mann-Whitney Test – Test Statistics[a]

Item	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	*p*
Extended Family	236.000	512.000	-.644	.520

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

Table 9

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Individual Items by Gender

Item	Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	η^2
Time Together	Between Groups	1	1.39	1.39	0.27	
	Within Groups	44	229.22	5.21		
	Total	45	230.61			
Communication	Between Groups	1	0.02	0.02	0.00	
	Within Groups	44	292.70	6.65		
	Total	45	292.72			
Caring and Affection	Between Groups	1	3.13	3.13	0.59	
	Within Groups	44	233.48	5.31		
	Total	45	236.61			
Division of Roles	Between Groups	1	6.28	6.28	1.50	
	Within Groups	44	184.09	4.18		
	Total	45	190.37			
Finances	Between Groups	1	1.39	1.39	0.19	
	Within Groups	44	323.57	7.35		
	Total	45	324.96			
Sex	Between Groups	1	1.07	1.07	0.21	
	Within Groups	44	223.65	5.08		
	Total	45	224.72			
Children	Between Groups	1	0.78	0.78	0.19	
	Within Groups	44	177.22	4.03		
	Total	45	178.00			
Alcohol or Drug Use	Between Groups	1	1.06	1.07	0.29	
	Within Groups	44	161.04	3.66		

	Total	45	162.11	

**p <.05; **p <.01; ***p <.001*

Table 10

Hypothesis 2: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Source	Levene Statistic	*df 1*	*df 2*	*p*
Warmth	6.948	1	44	.012*
Reasoning	.454	1	44	.504
Emotional Stability	.083	1	44	.774
Dominance	1.462	1	44	.233
Liveliness	.216	1	44	.645
Rule Consciousness	.446	1	44	.508
Social Boldness	.214	1	44	.646
Sensitivity	3.578	1	44	.065
Vigilance	.477	1	44	.493
Abstractedness	.000	1	44	.992
Privateness	2.974	1	44	.092
Apprehension	.514	1	44	.477
Openness to Change	.249	1	44	.621
Self-Reliance	.400	1	44	.530
Perfectionism	.120	1	44	.731
Tension	.066	1	44	.799

**p <.05; **p <.001*

Table 11

Hypothesis 2: Mann-Whitney U Test – Rank

Item	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Warmth	Male	23	22.26	512.00
	Female	23	24.74	569.00
	Total	46		

Table 12

Hypothesis 2: Mann-Whitney Test – Test Statistics[a]

Item	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	*p*
Warmth	236.000	512.000	-.644	.520

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

Table 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Primary Personality Factors by Gender

Item	Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	η^2
Reasoning	Between Groups	1	5.57	5.57	1.77	
	Within Groups	44	138.09	3.14		
	Total	45	143.65			
Emotional Stability	Between Groups	1	6.28	6.28	2.24	
	Within Groups	44	123.65	2.81		
	Total	45	129.94			
Dominance	Between Groups	1	4.89	4.89	2.62	
	Within Groups	44	82.09	1.87		
	Total	45	86.98			
Liveliness	Between Groups	1	1.39	1.39	0.39	
	Within Groups	44	155.83	3.54		
	Total	45	86.98			
Rule Consciousness	Between Groups	1	1.39	1.39	0.41	
	Within Groups	44	148.09	3.37		
	Total	45	149.48			
Social Boldness	Between Groups	1	6.28	6.28	1.45	
	Within Groups	44	191.13	4.34		

	Total	45	197.41		
Sensitivity	Between Groups	1	0.54	0.54	0.13
	Within Groups	44	180.26	4.10	
	Total	45	180.80		
Vigilance	Between Groups	1	7.04	7.04	2.91
	Within Groups	44	106.44	2.42	
	Total	45	113.48		
Abstractedness	Between Groups	1	1.065	1.07	0.28
	Within Groups	44	168.35	3.83	
	Total	45	169.41		
Privateness	Between Groups	1	1.39	1.39	0.36
	Within Groups	44	168.44	3.83	
	Total	45	169.83		
Apprehension	Between Groups	1	4.26	4.26	1.37
	Within Groups	44	137.04	3.12	
	Total	45	141.30		
Openness to Change	Between Groups	1	7.04	7.04	2.01
	Within Groups	44	153.91	3.50	
	Total	45	160.96		
Self-Reliance	Between Groups	1	0.78	0.78	0.18
	Within Groups	44	192.52	4.38	
	Total	45	193.30		
Perfectionism	Between Groups	1	0.20	0.20	0.04
	Within Groups	44	207.04	4.71	
	Total	45	207.24		
Tension	Between Groups	1	0.09	0.09	0.03
	Within	44	113.57	2.58	

	Groups		
	Total	45	113.65

**p <.05; **p <.01; ***p <.001*

Table 14

Hypothesis 3: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Source	Levene Statistic	*df 1*	*df 2*	*p*
Extraversion	0.00	1	44	0.98
Anxiety	0.64	1	44	0.43
Tough-Mindedness	4.21	1	44	0.05*
Independence	4.73	1	44	0.04*
Self-Control	0.00	1	44	1.00

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

Table 15

Hypothesis 3: Mann-Whitney U Test – Ranks

Item	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Tough-Mindedness	Male	23	22.09	508.00
	Female	23	24.91	573.00
	Total	46		
Independence	Male	23	27.48	632.00
	Female	23	19.52	449.00
	Total	46		

Table 16

Hypothesis 3: Mann-Whitney Test – Test Statistics[a]

Item	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	*p*
Tough-Mindedness	232.00	508.00	-0.73	0.47
Independence	173.00	449.00	-2.06	0.04*

**p <.05*

Table 17

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Global Personality Factors by Gender

Item	Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	η^2
Extraversion	Between Groups	1	2.63	2.63	0.67	
	Within Groups	44	174.09	3.96		
	Total	45	176.72			
Anxiety	Between Groups	1	0.35	0.35	0.09	
	Within Groups	44	166.87	3.79		
	Total	45	167.22			
Self-Control	Between Groups	1	0.20	0.20	0.82	
	Within Groups	44	158.52	3.60		
	Total	45	158.72			

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

Table 18

Hypothesis 4: Relationship Adjustment Means and Standard Deviations

Group	N	M	SD
Males	23	5.52	1.78
Females	23	4.83	1.64

Table 19

Hypothesis 4: t-test Results Comparing Relationship Adjustment Between Genders

F	*p*	*t*	*df*	*p* (2-tailed)	Std. Error Mean	*SED*	95% CI of Difference	
							Lower	Upper
1.898	0.175	1.54	22	.137	0.451	2.162	-0.24	1.63

Note. SED= Standard Error of Difference; CI= Confidence Interval

Table 20

Hypothesis 5: *Overall Marital Satisfaction Means and Standard Deviations*

Group	N	M	SD
Males	23	7.09	2.00
Females	23	7.52	1.86

Table 21

Hypothesis 5: t-test Results Comparing Overall Marital Satisfaction Between Genders

F	*p*	*t*	*df*	*p* (2-tailed)	Std. Error Mean	*SED*	95% CI of Difference	
							Lower	Upper
0.585	0.449	-1.55	22	0.135	0.280	1.343	-1.02	0.15