Florida Institute of Technology

Scholarship Repository @ Florida Tech

6-2020

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

Julian Enrique Vives

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

by

Julian Enrique Vives

Bachelor of Arts
Psychology
Binghamton University
2011

Master of Science
Counseling
Barry University
2014

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
June 2020

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

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

by

Julian Enrique Vives

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

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

_____
Robert A. Taylor, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Arts and Communication
Committee Member

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

Abstract

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

AUTHOR: Julian E. Vives, M.S.

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

The current literature regarding military populations often neglects the difficulties the spouses of service members face with less emphasis on male spouses of female service members. The current research project utilized the 16 Personality Factor Couple's Counseling Report (16PF CCR) variables to aid in expounding the factors that influence relationship functioning among male spouses of female combat veterans post-deployment. The results of the present study demonstrated a significant correlation between the nine satisfaction scores and the Overall Marital Satisfaction score, whereby Caring and Affection accounted for the majority of the variance explained in Overall Marital Satisfaction. Tension (Factor Q_4) significantly and positively predicted male partner Personality Similarity. A significant relationship between four of the sixteen primary personality factors and Relationship Adjustment existed. A significant relationship was found between the length of a relationship and Overall Marital Satisfaction scores. Limitations, implications, and future research directions centered on the current study are explored.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgments

The entire faculty has been instrumental in my continued development as a mental health practitioner, where they have shown me the areas I must continue to improve upon to be the most knowledgeable and conscientious practitioner I can be. I want to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Richard T. Elmore Jr., my advisor, for his creativity and his calm and collected presence since I had met him three years ago. Dr. Elmore has always supported me in my academic and personal endeavors, and for that, I am eternally grateful. You have set the standard for the type of clinician I want to become. I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to Dr. Barbara Paulillo and Dr. Robert A. Taylor, my committee members, as they have offered thoughtful insights and support, which is reflected in this project. Thanks should also go to members of my cohort with special thanks to members of my research team. You were with me every step of the way and provided emotional support to see this project come to fruition. To my parents, Julio and Santa, thank you for being the perfect example of persistence, perseverance, and success. The way you live your lives has provided me with a solid foundation to which I am continuously building. You two are the best parents this kid from The Bronx could ever ask for! To my brother, Cisco, thank you for your continued support and being the very first person I had to learn to take care of and set a positive example for. The relationship we have is priceless, and I always thank God for giving me an amazing little brother. Asasha, my beautiful wife, you have supported every single endeavor I have ever started since we met in 2009. You have allowed me to

become the man and professional I am today by caring for my mind, body, soul,

and beautiful children. Through the ups and downs we have encountered, you've

remained steadfast, and I am proud to have grown with you and look forward to the

years to come. Finally, to my daughters, Kari-Jolie, Autumn, Riley, and Harper.

You girls are my greatest inspiration and motivation to be the best version of

myself. I am madly in love with each one of you and I hope that, when you read

this one day and reflect on everything daddy has done in life, know that having you

by my side every step of the way and knowing that you are looking to me for

guidance has fueled my desire to be the greatest father, husband, and man I can be.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Traditional gender roles have changed since the 1950s. These changes are due to the ever-changing economic needs of families where dual-income households are required to maintain one's quality of life. Within the military, women have commonly been perceived as homemakers who are supportive of their husbands. However, the military has seen an increase in female service members of 18% since 1974. As of January 2016, all military occupation specialties have been open to women, where there has been an increase in women serving in combat-related positions. Women in the Department of Defense account for 16% of the active-duty force and 20% of the Selected Reserve. Compared to male military members, female military members are less likely to be married, more likely to get divorced, and more likely to be married to other military members (Military Demographics Profile, 2018). With women serving in combat-related positions comes a new change in dynamics within their relationships.

In a general sense, women have typically been classified as warm and nurturing, whereas men are seen as stoic. The need to adopt a sense of stoicism runs deep within the military culture and is often the primary means of coping with the difficulties of combat. Little is known about the dynamics that occur within the households of men who are married to female combat veterans. There appears to be an absence of research regarding the spouses of female combat veterans and even less research investigating the interactions between spousal personality factors,

personality similarity to their veteran partner, relationship adjustment ability, demographic variables, and overall marital satisfaction.

The present study will utilize the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR) completed by couples comprised of female combat-deployed military veterans and their male spouses seeking marital therapy post-deployment. The instrument will be used as a tool to identify personality factors, individual areas of current relationship satisfaction, and demographic variables that are affecting overall marital satisfaction. This study will focus on exploring the factors mentioned above regarding female spouses, which is novel compared to the existing research that is commonly performed with military veterans. The following literature review includes both the clinical and general non-clinical populations to provide a comprehensive overview of the research conducted over the last few decades. Notably, the clinical population discussed includes information on both military members and their spouses, as the research available on the latter is minimal at this time.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Population Demographics

Nonclinical population. The institution of marriage has existed for approximately four millennia. It is one of the most common ceremonies performed to publicly and culturally unite two people. Women and men often hold marriage as a goal that is to be obtained in early adulthood, which would afford them romantic stability along with certain rights and privileges that accompany the sanctioned union. The American Psychological Association (APA) (2019) reports that, by age 50, approximately 90% of individuals in Western cultures will become married. The number of people that eventually divorce is an astonishing 40-50%. It was also found that in subsequent marriages, the divorce rates become even higher.

Clinical population. According to the Department of Defense (DoD) (2019), there are 1,333,351 individuals currently serving in the United States Armed Forces as Active Duty personnel. The DoD reported 51.5% classified as Active Duty personnel in the United States military were married (2018 Demographics Report). The recent era of heavy deployments has negatively affected military couples, and the need to understand the factors related to marital satisfaction has increased exponentially (Bergmann et al., 2014). Mental health concerns, mainly depression and trauma, have been linked to lower relationship satisfaction (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). Service members' discussions of their psychological distress have a negative impact on their spouses, and the increased

number of deployments and traumatic experiences service members face makes this population more susceptible to marital challenges than the general population (Campbell & Renshaw, 2012). Service members denote less than 1% of the total United States population (DoD, 2019) and factors such as military-induced separations, work-family conflict and a decrease of social support for service members and spouses alike are some of the factors that have a greater impact on service members as opposed to members of the general public (Andres, 2014).

As it pertains to soldiers deployed during Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), and Operation New Dawn (OND), 44.9% deployed an average length of 6 to 11 months each time, with 46.5% of military personnel reporting being deployed multiple times (Bergmann et al., 2014). Military couples have the unique challenge of managing the pervasive nature of military service, which is 24 hours a day and 365 days of the year (Bergmann et al., 2014). Deployment forces the spouse at home to adjust to new roles, promotes feelings of loss of control, leads to a perception of a threat to the deployed spouse due to the uncertainty of the exact nature of the deployed service member's well-being and job responsibilities (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015). pervasive Regarding male spouses of female combat veterans, the difficulties faced at home look different than what a "military wife" has had to face. Among these difficulties are feeling uneasy due to the spouse spending so much time with other men, having the role in the marriage clash with the man's identity as a male, and lack of social

support groups as most of the spousal supports systems are geared towards women (Adjusting to Being A Male Civilian Spouse, 2018).

Deployment Difficulties

It is well known that deployments have an unfavorable effect on the members, spouses and families. Due to the increasing presence of social media, many have become increasingly aware of the dangers service members face, albeit physical dangers, social dangers, and mental health difficulties. The rise of mental health awareness in our society has allowed the general public to become more sensitive to the afflictions that cannot be seen. However, what remains unseen are the nuances that military service members and their spouses face in contrast to the general public. Spouses whose partners face deployment experience a myriad of emotional reactions that include emotional distress, fear, and grief in anticipation of the service member's departure and uncertainty of arriving back home safely (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015). For example, before a service member is deployed, spouses reported a lack of ability to control major decisions related to family life, a sense of uneasiness due to not knowing when the service member will leave, a fear of being alone for an extended period, and rumination of the service member's safety due to the precariousness of their work (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015). Other experiences that are not widely known amongst military spouses with deployed service members are an increase in adjustment disorders, sleep disorders, depressive disorders, anxiety, and acute stress reactions (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015). Another distinctive facet of being a military

spouse that civilian married couples do not face is the post-deployment reintegration period. During this time, families must relearn to adjust to individual changes and how to make sense of each other's deployment experiences (Aducci et al., 2011).

Among the most protective factors for military spouses during deployments is resilience (Larsen, Clauss-Ehlers, & Cosden, 2015). Psychological resilience is the ability to mentally or emotionally cope with a crisis or return to pre-crisis status quickly (De Terte & Stephens, 2014). According to Robertson, Cooper, Sarkar, and Curran (2015), resilience exists when a person uses mental processes and behaviors to promote personal assets and protect oneself from the potential adverse effects of stressors. Larsen et al. (2015) identified factors that contribute to effective coping such as utilizing social support, reestablishing roles once unified after deployment, establishing stability, and using technology to communicate during and post-deployment.

Openness and honesty in communication between spouses are often seen to be the pillars for a healthy marriage. Campbell and Renshaw (2012), in their study using 465 couples consisting of combat-deployed Vietnam Era services members and their spouses, found that excessive discussion of traumatic experiences from deployment may have a negative effect on partners. There was a link found between the discussion of Vietnam events with their spouse and the service member's increased psychological distress and PTSD symptoms. However,

discussing events during deployment did not affect the partner's relationship distress. These findings are important to consider when discussing potentially traumatic events. The research provides that the couple's general communication seems to factor more heavily in partner's overall level of relationship satisfaction than does communication about Vietnam, or in this era, OIF, OEF, OND (Campbell and Renshaw, 2012). These findings are essential to this current study as it further impresses upon married military couples to increase the effectiveness of their communication styles prior to deployment to cope with discussing potentially challenging and distressing events service members endure upon arriving back home. It promotes the notion that traumatic events can be discussed with the spouses, not just in a therapeutic setting, as long as the military couple has a healthy foundation in the manner in which they communicate.

Marital Satisfaction

    Nonclinical population. People from all backgrounds, regardless of any distinguishing factors, be it race, culture, socioeconomic status, all look for means of coping with relationships and personal stressors. The use of coping strategies differs between men and women, where men are described as using a more problem-focused coping and women were described as using passive coping, such as denial (Bouchard, Sabourin, Lussier, Wright, and Richer, 1998). Although these traditional coping theories may not be ascribed to all men and women, it is known that individual coping skills set the stage for how a married couple chooses to handle any presented difficulties. The manner in which problems are dealt with in

marriage determines the couple's overall marital satisfaction. Bouchard, Sabourin, Lussier, Wright, and Richer (1998) found that men tend to use two main coping strategies; distancing-avoidance and confrontation-seeking social support, which are associated with a decrease in marital satisfaction. The same study revealed similar findings for women, as their utilization of distancing-avoidance also led to less marital satisfaction, but a lesser degree when compared to men. Other peripheral factors that often impact levels of marital satisfaction include having children early in a marriage, the presence of mental health symptoms in either spouse and the level of external social support a partner might have (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). What is abundantly evident is that one's individual coping mechanisms impact his or her partner. It was shown that the influence of the partner's coping appears systematic, whereby if one strategy is harmful to the person who uses it, it will also be harmful to the partner (Bouchard, Sabourin, Lussier, Wright, and Richer, 1998).

Connor-Smith and Flachsbart (2007) expressed that personality may directly facilitate or constrain coping; however, there is a notable difference between personality and coping. Previous theories of personality, notably psychodynamic theory, posited that coping and personality were the same. Contemporary theories utilize the Five-Factor model, or "Big Five," when discussing personality traits, the ability to cope, and how one goes about the same.

The five-factor model of personality includes the following domains: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Openness to Change, Conscientiousness, and

Agreeableness. A meta-analysis including 165 studies examining the relationship between one's coping mechanisms and one's personality indicated only a small but direct effect of personality on coping. Personality may indirectly affect coping by influencing stress exposure, stress reactivity, or perceptions of coping. Stress is pervasive in daily life and individuals implement coping strategies based on what challenge is presented and not entirely based on one's personality.

Within the last thirty years, there have been differing results regarding certain Big Five Factors and marital satisfaction, which represents a need for further research regarding the interactions between marital satisfaction and one's personality traits. Within the general population, studies have found that neuroticism and extraversion have negative associations with marital well-being, in contrast to openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness, which are positively associated with marital well-being (Gattis, Berns, Simpson, & Christensen, 2004). The same study reported neuroticism to be the most consistent personality predictor for marital satisfaction. Neuroticism is a proclivity to experience a constellation of negative emotions, including anxiety, anger, disgust, sadness, and embarrassment (Costa & McCrae, 1985). It was also shown that neuroticism was higher in distressed couples who sought counseling as opposed to non-distressed couples (Shiota & Levenson, 2007). Lester, Haig, and Monello (1989) found that a husband's extraversion was associated with an increased likelihood of divorce. However, a cross-sectional study indicated that no effect of extraversion on marital satisfaction was found (Gattis et al., 2004).

Clinical population. Research conducted by Morey et al. (2011) found that samples of community adults and soldiers deployed to Iraq were relatively similar in comparison to their scores on the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI). However, the Iraq service member sample demonstrated significant differences from the community sample in subscales that endorsed hypervigilance, antisocial behaviors, and problems with close relationships. The results of this study provided clinicians and researchers a side by side comparison of the emotional and behavioral issues shared by the general population and service members who have been subjected to combat experiences.

It has been widely known that military deployment can cause significant relationship strain. One particular issue that negatively affects members in the military population is sexual and emotional infidelity, which was emphasized in a 2017 study by Balderrama-Durbin et al. In this study, the researchers found that the prevalence of sexual infidelity of members in the military population was extraordinarily high (22.6%) when compared to the annual community estimates of (1.5%-4%). Additionally, approximately 75% of service members who experienced infidelity over the deployment cycle divorced between 6 and 9 months post-deployment compared to 5% of service members divorcing without having experienced infidelity in the same period. Bergmann et al. (2014) reported that a known risk factor for marital dissatisfaction and relationship difficulties is the length of one's deployment. Work-family conflict, psychological distress, social support, and spousal interaction accounted for substantial contributions to

explaining relationship satisfaction after military-induced separations (Andres, 2014). The longer a service member is away from his or her spouse, the more the level of spousal support begins to diminish over time due to the challenges associated with communication and physical presence in one's life.

Meaningfulness of service is a unique consideration in military couples as it pertains to the sacrifices both spouses endure. This concept of meaningfulness of service and its relationship to marital satisfaction was explored in the Bergmann et al. (2014) study with 606 Army couples comprised of female spouses and male service members. The research showed that the spouse's perception of the service's meaningfulness, independent of the service member's perception, was associated with the spouse's higher marital satisfaction. Interestingly, the service member's perception of meaningfulness of service was positively correlated with increased marital satisfaction with the caveat that their spouse found the service meaningful as well. This factor demonstrates the importance of both spouses finding meaning in the unique sacrifices they are making as a military couple. This information can be utilized when addressing potential hurdles a military couple may face should they seek counseling.

Moreover, a spouse's perception of the service member's activity during their deployment appears to be a significant factor in overall marital satisfaction. Renshaw, Rodrigues, and Jones (2008) found that spouses' marital satisfaction was negatively linked to the service member's self-reported symptom severity of PTSD only when spouses perceived that service members had experienced low levels of

combat activity when deployed. In addition, the authors found that spouses experienced greater symptom severity of psychological distress when they perceived high levels of PTSD symptoms in service members while the service members endorsed low levels of PTSD symptoms. As it pertains to marital satisfaction, the research points to the importance of the perception of both partners when measuring marital satisfaction.

Impact of Mental Health Difficulties on Relationship Satisfaction

The mental health of both parties in a relationship is a vital area to consider when discussing the various factors that go into overall relationship satisfaction. Research has shown that married individuals usually demonstrate better mental and physical health than those who are separated, divorced, or widowed (Akhtar-Danesh & Landeen, 2007). As it relates specifically to military couples, research has shown that marital satisfaction may intensify or safeguard against mental health symptoms (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). That is, when a couple perceives their marriage to be healthy, they are less likely to be afflicted by physical or mental health illnesses. Allen, Rhoades, Stanley, and Markman (2010), as cited in Edwards-Stewart et al. (2018), found a relationship between PTSD symptoms and lower marital satisfaction for husbands. Klaric and colleagues (2011) found that wives' marital adjustment was best explained by their depressive and re-experiencing symptoms as well as their spouse's avoidance symptoms. The abundant body of literature that examines a couple's relationship satisfaction always takes each spouse's mental health into account.

Posttraumatic stress disorder. Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, more commonly referred to as PTSD, has consistently been associated with lower relationship satisfaction (Edwards-Stewart et al., 2018). The National Institute of Mental Health (2019) categorized PTSD as a disorder that develops in some people after a shocking, scary, or dangerous event. It is important to note that PTSD can also develop in a person who has been directly exposed to a shocking, scary, or potentially life-threatening event. For example, within the context of military life, an individual who has lost a service member due to a violent death or learning about a traumatic experience involving a service member might experience PTSD. PTSD is illustrated by the presence of the following four symptom categories: avoidance symptoms, arousal/reactivity symptoms, adverse changes in mood and cognition, and intrusive re-experiencing symptoms.

The fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-5) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) assigns specific examples of each of the aforementioned symptom categories. Avoidance symptoms may present as avoidance of or efforts to avoid distressing memories, thoughts, or feelings about or closely associated with the traumatic event and/or avoidance of or efforts to avoid external reminders such as people, places, conversations, activities, objects, or situations that arouse distressing memories, thoughts, or feelings about or close association with the traumatic event. Arousal/reactivity symptoms may present as having problems with concentration, irritable behavior and angry outbursts, self-destructive or reckless behavior, exaggerated startle response, sleep disturbance,

and hypervigilance. Negative changes in mood and cognition may present itself as an inability to remember and important aspect of the traumatic event, persistent and exaggerated negative expectation or beliefs about oneself, others, or the world, a notable decrease in interest or participation in significant activities, feelings of estrangement or detachment from others, persistent inability to experience positive emotions, and persistently being in a negative emotional state such as fear, horror, anger, guilt, or shame. Lastly, intrusion symptoms may present as recurrent, involuntary, and intrusive distressing memories of the traumatic event, recurrent distressing dreams where the content of the dreams are related to the traumatic event, flashback or dissociative reactions where an individual feels or acts as if the traumatic event were recurring, prolonged or intense psychological distress when exposing to internal or external cues that symbolize or resemble an aspect of the traumatic events, and discernable physiological reactions to internal or external cues.

A diagnosis of PTSD is often incapacitating to the person who is experiencing any of the symptoms within the four categories. It often negatively affects multiple areas of functioning, such as occupational functioning, intrapersonal functioning, and interpersonal functioning, especially with one's significant other. A study conducted by Dekel and Solomon (2006) demonstrated that the military couple's marital problems are related and heavily influenced by PTSD symptoms when comparing prisoners of war to service members who were not prisoners of war.

14

A study conducted by Riviere, Merrill, and Clarke-Walper (2006) found that service members who are married or previously married and endorsed having poor marital quality expressed feeling an increase in mental health symptoms that are suggestive of a diagnosis of PTSD, along with having anxiety, somatic complaints, depression, and other medical difficulties in comparison to service members that experienced high marital quality. Research conducted by Goff, Crow, Reisbig, and Hamilton (2007) demonstrated that increased symptoms of trauma, mainly sleep difficulties, dissociation, and severe sexual issues, in OIF and OEF service members predicted lower marital satisfaction for both the service member and their female spouse. This information is vital in assessing and treating military couples seeking counseling, and for the general knowledge of all military couples.

Relationship Adjustment

According to Lampis, Cataudella, Busonera, and Carta (2017), relationship adjustment is a continuous and changing process that can be conceptualized as the ability of the partners to solve problems, to manage relational and daily developmental tasks and to accept the different roles based on the changing developmental tasks of each stage of the family life cycle. Lampis and colleagues aimed to examine the partner's similarities and their romantic relationship adjustment throughout different phases of the couple's life cycle. A sample of 92 heterosexual pairs was chosen for the study, and the duration of the couple's

relationships ranged from 0 to 35 years. The data revealed that partners reporting increased levels of similarity in openness and conscientiousness showed the highest levels of romantic relationship adjustment during the first years of their relationship while showing diminishing levels of romantic relationship adjustment as the relationship advanced. It appears that different life events, over time, activate specific relational processes.

When examining the 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16 PF CCR), Openness to Change (Factor Q_1) and Emotional Stability (Factor C), are the two personality factors measured when defining an individual's relationship adjustment. A partner with an increased level of relationship adjustment is apt to display a personality profile suggestive of someone who is more emotionally stable and open to changes within the context of the relationship. In contrast to this, someone who places on the opposite end of the continuum regarding openness to change and emotional stability would demonstrate inferior relationship adjustment.

Erbes, Meis, Polusny, and Compton, (2011), studied relationship adjustment in National Guard service members who were deployed and experienced combat in Iraq and experienced PTSD upon arriving back to the United States. The data was collected at two different junctures, which were pre and post-deployment. The results revealed that the service member's symptoms of general psychological distress and issues with regulating emotional arousal continued to remain a significant predictor of relationship adjustment from pre to post-deployment. Furthermore, the increase in the severity of PTSD symptoms was associated with

poorer relationship adjustment. Mental health conditions continue to play a major role in marital satisfaction and relationship adjustment. Although there is a wide array of research studying the effects of deployment on relationship adjustment in service members, there is a gap in literature examining the specific impacts the deployment has on the spouses of the service member.

Link Between Personality and Marital Satisfaction

Similar vs. complementary personalities. There have been numerous theories regarding compatibility, namely, whether similar personalities or contrasting personalities provide for more solid marriages. The theory of similarity proposes that individuals choose their partners due to the attributes they have in common. Research has exhibited that individuals are inclined to marry those of similar education, race, religion, socioeconomic status, age, culture, attitudes, and physical attractiveness and physique (Antill, 1983). Another explanation supporting the theory of compatibility is that we are more likely to initiate a relationship with someone when we notice those who reflect similar qualities and attributes.

Conversely, the theory of complementary, which aligns with the complementary hypothesis, asserts that individuals align themselves with partners of differing values and attributes. This is the notion that both individuals, differing in nature, utilize their individual traits and values to form a dynamic system that is complementary and well-adjusted within the context of the relationship. Research conducted by Russell (1995) found that significant differences have been shown to cause conflict and difficulties in relationships. Moreover, studies have found that

the greater the dissimilarity between the spouses, the higher the risk for divorce (Clarkwest, 2007).

While the 16PF CCR would technically fall into the category of utilizing the similarity theory, the assessment allows us to view the marital satisfaction through analyzing the individual's personality profile. Previous research suggests that conflict and dissatisfaction in a marriage are much more prevalent when assessing personality differences as opposed to conflict and satisfaction when assessing personality similarity.

The 16PF Report

In 1949 Dr. Raymond B. Cattell, a psychologist and researcher widely known for his research on the basic dimensions of personality, developed an assessment with assistance from the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc (IPAT). The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) includes 185 multiple-choice questions and is an objective psychological assessment that provides information into an individual's personality using sixteen principal personality traits that are related to the five basic dimensions of personality. This assessment is distinctive from other personality measures because it provides the examinees and clinicians a broadband measure of personality traits without measuring for psychopathology. There have been approximately 70 years of research supporting the psychometric properties of the assessment, and the 16PF is currently in its fifth edition.

Three primary response style indicators provide a more in-depth look into how each participant approaches taking the assessment. Impression Management, Infrequency, and Acquiescence are the response styles that a clinician will examine to assess for validity and reliability on an individual basis. The Impression Management Index and the items associated with the same are responsible for determining the level in which a participant attempts to portray themselves unfavorably or favorably. Participants who have elevated scores on the Infrequency index may have made abnormal response selections on the assessment. For example, abnormal or unusual responses may include those who are indecisive, individuals who respond to items randomly, or participants who experience issues in maintaining focus and attention when taking the assessment. The Acquiescence index detects participants who may have self-esteem issues, self-worth, or an increased need for approval from others. Moreover, the demographic information obtained during the assessment would include current household financial status and income, level of education, occupational status, and cultural factors such as ethnicity, all of which assist in placing the participant's traits into a better perspective.

Within the assessment lies the sixteen primary factors which are 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). The primary factors are

recorded on a ten-point scale with scores of one to three labeled as the trait on the left side of the scale and scores of eight to ten being labeled as the trait on the right side of the scale. The remaining scores, four through seven, are classified as being "within normal limits" and imply that the participant is not fixed to the specific trait being measured. To provide a clear example, a score of three on the Openness to Change (Q_1) factor would suggest that the participant is more traditional, are in accordance with "tried and true" ways of doing things, and prefer a familiar and predictable lifestyle. In contrast, a score of nine would signify a participant who is open to change and enjoys new ways doing things, someone who enjoys experimenting and finding ways to improve situations, and are apt to change if things seem unsatisfactory or dismal. The five global traits, or "Big Five," are also scored using the same system as the sixteen primary factors. The five global traits are Extraversion (EX), Anxiety (AX), Tough-Mindedness (TM), Independence (IN), and Self-Control (SC). In contrast to the sixteen personality factors in the 16PF, which tend to home in on specific personality traits of the participant, the five global factors take a much broader look at one's personality.

The 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR)

The 16PF Couples Counseling Report (16PF CCR) is a personality assessment that can be used for couples' therapy. It provides a deeper look into each participant's overall level of satisfaction in the relationship and personality. The data is especially helpful to be used as a valuable tool in treatment planning and to provide valuable feedback to the couple and the individual member from an

objective perspective. The Relationship Satisfaction Rating section of the 16PF CCR is an expansion of the 16PF and is useful in providing information regarding expected relationship adjustment, personality similarity, and relationship satisfaction. The 16PF CCR attends to eleven areas that influence relationship satisfaction to include Children, Sex, Extended Family, Caring and Affection, Finances, Alcohol and Drug use, Division of Role, Time Together, Communication, Overall Satisfaction, and speculation of their partner's overall level of satisfaction in the relationship. Through utilizing a nine-point Likert scale, each member of the couple rates their satisfaction in each individual area. Higher scores suggest greater satisfaction, whereas lower scores indicate dissatisfaction in each individual area. Furthermore, the 16PF CCR includes a Similarity score, which determines the couple's similar personality factors. The scores range from a 1, which denotes low similarity to a 10, which denotes high similarity. In addition to the Similarity score, the assessment includes a Relationship Adjustment score that is derived from each member's response to Q_1, Openness to Change, and to Scale C, Emotional Stability. Scores can range from a 1, which is indicative of low adjustment to a 10, which is indicative of high adjustment and provides crucial information regarding the level to which a couple is able to adjust to the cooperative element in the relationship.

The 16PF CCR includes general demographic questions such as level of education, household income level, race/ethnicity, and current employment status. Moreover, nine questions relate particularly to relationship demographics to

include the number of children from the current relationship, the number of children from previous relationships, length of the current relationship, and status of the current relationship. The most crucial component of the assessment process with the 16PF CCR is the direct feedback provided to the couple. The feedback delivered on the specific areas gives both members greater insight into how their individual qualities or traits impact their relationship. Feedback is provided by giving each member the results of their personal 16PF profile, then comparing their personality traits to the five global factors and the sixteen primary factors. Moreover, the couple is given an interpretive description that speaks to the major relationship problems and provides information regarding the compatibility they have with their partner.

Research Utilizing the 16PF CCR

There is a general lack of published research where the 16PF Couples Counseling Report is utilized to examine the relationships between relationship adjustment in couples, marital satisfaction, and personality functioning. It should be noted that there have been multiple unpublished doctoral research projects conducted through the Clinical Psychology department at the Florida Institute of Technology, where the 16PF CCR was thoroughly examined (Alexander, 2015; Arnett, 2008; Carpenter, 2018; Cavazos, 2013; Dungee, 2019, Field, 2013; Garofalo, 2014; Hart, 2018; Moore, 2015, Mulholland, 2015; Mullis 2018; Shah, 2009). The demographic variables within the studies mentioned above, such as deployed combat veterans (Alexander, 2015; Dungee, 2019, Moore, 2015;

Mulholland, 2015), along with female and male patients seeking couples therapy (Carpenter, 2018; Hart, 2018; Mullis, 2018) allowed for thorough analyses to be conducted on these minority samples.

Nonclinical population. Significant positive relationships were found between overall marital satisfaction and the variables that load onto overall marital satisfaction to include sex, time spent together, division of roles, children, extended family, finances, problem-solving communication, and caring and affection (Arnett, 2008; Field, 2013; Garofalo, 2014; Hart, 2018). A significant positive relationship was seen between the Emotional Stability personality factor and overall marital satisfaction for some populations (Field, 2013). Status of relationship and relationship length are some of the demographic factors that have a significant relationship with overall marital satisfaction. (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018).

Relationship adjustment and overall marital satisfaction appeared to be positively and significantly correlated for females (Field, 2013). In females, a significant positive relationship with Emotional Stability and Relationship Adjustment existed regarding Dominance, Openness to change, Rule-Consciousness, Liveliness, and Social Boldness, but Tension, Privateness, Vigilance, Self-Reliance, and Apprehension appeared to have a significant negative relationship with Relationship Adjustment (Field, 2013; Hart, 2018). Within same-sex couples, emotional reactivity was found to lead to a decrease in the quality of relationship adjustment (Shah, 2009). There is a general lack of gender differences within marital satisfaction. However, as it pertains to gender differences within the

primary personality factors, females endorsed items suggesting they were more aesthetic, sensitive, sentimental, attentive to others, outgoing, and warm in comparison to their male partners (Mullis, 2018).

Clinical population. Four of the abovementioned doctoral research projects specifically evaluated marital satisfaction, relationship adjustment, and personality similarity in combat deployed veterans who returned to the United States and sought marital counseling.

Dungee (2019) examined marital satisfaction, personality similarity, and relationship adjustment among spouses of male combat veterans and found that Caring and Affection were the only areas to yield a positive and significant correlation with overall marital satisfaction. In the same study, as it pertains to relationship adjustment scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors, a significant relationship was found within the personality factors of Rule-Conscientiousness, Openness to Change, Apprehension, and Emotional Stability. Moreover, it was found that as personality similarity scores increased for female spouses, so did relationship adjustment scores increase. The research conducted by Dungee (2019) set a precedent for examining marital satisfaction, personality similarity, and relationship adjustment in spouses of deployed combat veterans. It sparked the interest of this current study and necessity for further research for this particular population that often goes unnoticed.

Carpenter (2018) examined predictors of marital satisfaction, personality similarity and relationship adjustment of females who sought marital therapy and

found a positive relationship between marital satisfaction and personality similarity, which suggested that males who have a heightened ability to adjust and adapt in relationships are apt to have more similarity to their partners. Mullis, (2018) found that men appeared to be more impatient, tense, more likely to be private, non-disclosing, discrete (N), high-energy (Q_4), less reactive (C), and more emotionally stable and mature, on average, than their female partners. Moore (2015) researched males who experienced combat in deployment and found that relationship adjustment and overall marital satisfaction were significantly and negatively correlated, being that lower scores on relationship adjustment were correlated with a higher degree of marital satisfaction. Perhaps this current study will provide further insight into males and the relationship between this unique finding.

Chapter 3

Statement of Purpose

There is a well-established body of published research pertaining to the specific difficulty military spouses face, especially as it pertains to the nuances of relationship adjustment, marital satisfaction, and personality similarity. However, there is little to no research on the impact of relationship adjustment, marital satisfaction, and personality similarity as it pertains to the spouses of female combat veterans after deployment. The military is ever-changing, and the presence of females in the military, specifically in combat positions, has been on the rise since the ban on females working in combat positions was lifted in 2015. Men have distinct coping strategies in comparison to women, and the additional nuance of being a military husband has not yet been thoroughly explored. Support groups for military spouses are still heavily focused on the women, where men are instructed to learn to connect with others and engage in personal development without the assistance of a structured group or trained mental health professional. Understanding the effect deployment has on men (i.e., traditional gender roles being challenged, time spent away from one another, readjustment) is crucial for offering appropriate service to this minority population. The purpose of this study is to fill the gap for this specific population and provide military treatment providers a further look into the needs of this new and growing population. In exploring the external and internal factors associated with personality similarity, marital satisfaction, and relationship adjustment, it is anticipated that this research

will offer couples the tools needed to best manage their difficulties before, during,

and after deployments.

Chapter 4

Hypotheses

Upon reviewing literature findings, the following hypotheses are proposed:

1. A significant relationship between overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the nine individual item satisfaction scores will found. This hypothesis will be tested by means of a Multiple Regression Analysis.

2. There will be a significant relationship found between overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. A Multiple Regression Analysis will be utilized to test this hypothesis.

3. There will be a significant relationship found between Personality Similarity Scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. A Multiple Regression Analysis will be utilized to test this hypothesis.

4. There will be a significant relationship found between Relationship Adjustment scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. A Multiple Regression Analysis will be utilized to test this hypothesis.

5. There will be no significant relationship found between the overall Marital Satisfaction scores, Personality Similarity scores, and Relationship Adjustment scores. A Pearson Correlation analysis will be utilized to test this hypothesis.

6. A significant relationship will be found between demographic variables to include the existence of children, length of relationships, amount of combat exposure, and the branch of military service and overall Marital Satisfaction

scores. ANOVAs will be the analyses utilized to examine differences in

overall Marital Satisfaction scores.

Chapter 5

Method

Participants

A sample of 24 participants will be examined, which includes a variety of demographic information to include religion, age, race/ethnicity, military rank, and their spouse's respective military branch. Participants for this study will be comprised of male spouses of military veterans who faced deployment and combat during OEF, OIF, and/or OND. All participants previously completed the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling Report, and this archival data, which was initially collected by and belongs to Richard T. Elmore, Ph.D., will be analyzed in this present study.

Instruments/Measures

The participants of this study have completed the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling Report. Administration of the 16PF CCR was distributed either by computer testing or by the traditional paper version based on participant preferences.

Design/Plan of Analysis

A substantial aggregate of data will be required to be analyzed in this research. Therefore, this study is perceived as an exploratory analysis. The analyses that will be utilized in this present study will include analyses of variance, independent t-tests, multiple regression analyses, and Pearson correlation analyses.

Procedure

Participants completed the 16 Personality Factor Couples Counseling

Report individually at the onset of treatment, either through the traditional paper

format or through a computer program. Feedback of results was provided to the

participants by a trained mental health clinician regarding awareness of personality

factors and how they may impede certain areas of satisfaction and functioning.

Pertaining to the current research, additional exempt status IRB approval has been

obtained by the Florida Institute of Technology Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Chapter 6

Results

Descriptive Frequencies

Descriptive frequencies regarding sample demographic variables are displayed in Table 2. The sample analyzed included a total of 24 male spouses of combat-deployed female soldiers during OEF, OIF, or OND. All male participants completed the 16PF CCR. Regarding race, a majority of participants identified as Caucasian/White (66.7%), while 20.8% identified as African American/Black, 8.3% identified as Hispanic or Latino, and 4.2% identified as another race. Amongst the 24 participants, 20.8% reported obtaining a High School Diploma or GED as their Highest Education Level achieved, whereas 12.5% reported obtaining an Associate's or Technical Degree, 29.2% obtained a Bachelor's Degree, 8.3% completed some Graduate-Level Coursework but did not obtain a degree, and 29.2% obtained a Graduate Degree of some type. In reference to participant employment status, a majority either reported Working Full-Time (66.7%) or identified as a Homemaker/Househusband (4.2%). Additionally, 12.5% reported Working Part-Time, 8.3% reported they were Unemployed, 4.2% reported being retired, and 4.2% identified their current employment status as Other. In terms of current household income, 70.8% of participants reported annual combined earnings of $80,000 or more, 8.3% earned $60,000-$79,999 per year, 4.2% earned $40,000-$59,999 per year, and 16.7% earned $20,000-$39,000 per year.

In reference to participant relationships, most participants reported a relationship length of 8-14 years (62.5%), while 29.2% reported being in their current relationship for 3-7 years. Moreover, 4.2% of male participants reported their current relationship length falling within 15-25 years, and 4.2% of male participants reported their current relationship length falling within 0-2 years. Of these 24 men, 66.7% denied having children, and 33.3% reported having children. Regarding the participants' combat deployed female spouses, 75% served in the Army, 16.7% served in the Air Force, 4.2% served in the Navy, and 4.2% served in the Marine Corps. Of the 24 female spouses deployed in OEF, OIF, and/or OND, only 4.2% reported moderately high combat exposure.

Hypothesis 1

Within this study, it was hypothesized that a significant relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the nine Individual Item Satisfaction scores would be present. Descriptive statistics for the nine individual satisfaction areas can be found in Table 3. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis. Results indicated that the model was statistically significant as all nine individual satisfaction items, together, explained 89% of the variance in Overall Marital Satisfaction ($R^2 = .89$, $F(9, 23) = 12.34$, $p < .001$). Further analyses, utilizing a stepwise multiple regression, found that Caring and Affection explained 79% of the variance in Overall Marital Satisfaction ($R^2 = .79$, $F(1, 22) = 86.14$, $p < .001$) and Communication ($\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F(1,21) = 7.57$, $p <$

.05), explained an additional 5% above and beyond the variance explained in Overall Marital Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2

Regarding Hypothesis 2, it was hypothesized that a significant relationship would be found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. Means and standard deviations for each of the sixteen Primary and five Global Personality Factors can be found in Table 4. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis, and it was not supported, as the overall model was not significant ($F(16, 23) = 1.26$, p > .05). No significant relationships were found amongst the Sixteen Individual Personality Factors and Overall Marital Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3

Within this study, it was hypothesized that a significant relationship found between Personality Similarity scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis, and the hypothesis was not supported, as the overall model was not significant ($F(16, 23) = 1.10$, $p > .05$). However, it should be noted that a significant relationship was found between Personality Similarity scores and one of the sixteen Primary Personality Factors, such that Tension (Factor Q_4) ($b = 1.21$, $p < .05$), individually predicted Personality Similarity. No additional significant relationships were found amongst the Sixteen Individual Personality Factors and Personality Similarity scores.

Hypothesis 4

It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship found between Relationship Adjustment scores and the sixteen Primary Personality Factors. Through the use of a multiple regression analysis, this hypothesis was found to be supported as the overall model was significant and all sixteen Primary Personality Factors together explained a significant amount of variance in Relationship Adjustment (R^2 = .99, $F(16, 23)$ = 68.38, $p < .001$). Several individual factors also demonstrated significant positive relationships with Relationship Adjustment, including Emotional Stability (Factor C) (b = 1.07, $p < .001$), Rule Conscientiousness (Factor G) (b = .30, $p < .05$), Apprehension (Factor O) (b = .30, $p < .05$), and Openness to Change (Factor Q1) (b = .22, $p < .001$). Amongst the four aforementioned individual factors, Emotional Stability explained 83% of the variance in Relationship Adjustment (R^2 = .83, $F(1, 22)$ = 109.54, $p < .001$) and Rule Conscientiousness (ΔR^2 = .07, $\Delta F(1,21)$ = 15.03, p = .05), Openness to Change (ΔR^2 = .05, $\Delta F(1,20)$ = 18.08, $p < .001$), and Apprehension (ΔR^2 = .03, $\Delta F(1,19)$ = 26.42, $p < .001$), explained an additional 7%, 5%, and 3% of the variance in Relationship Adjustment, respectively.

Hypothesis 5

It was hypothesized that through conducting a Pearson correlation analysis, no significant relationship would be found between Overall Marital Satisfaction scores, Personality Similarity scores, and Relationship Adjustment scores. Descriptive statistics for these variables can be found in Table 5. This hypothesis

was not supported as a significant positive relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Relationship Adjustment ($r(24) = .49, p < .05, d = 0.85$). No significant relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Personality Similarity ($r(24) = .04, p > .05, d = 0.19$), or Personality Similarity and Relationship Adjustment ($r(24) = .26, p > .05, d = 0.49$).

Hypothesis 6

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

Relationship length. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Relationship Length. A significant effect was found ($F(3, 23) = 6.05, p < .01$), such that current relationship length was found to have an effect on marital satisfaction levels of male spouses of female combat veterans. Post hoc comparisons were unable to be conducted; however, as one group being compared had fewer than two cases (e.g., only one couple was married 25+ years). The means and standard deviations of each group can be found in Table 6.

Existence of children. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and whether participants had children or not. No significant effect was found ($F(1, 23)$ = 1.81, p = .19), such that having children or not was not found to impact marital satisfaction levels.

Branch of military service. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and the Brach of Military Service reported by combat-deployed female spouses. No significant effect was found ($F(3, 23)$ = 2.8, p = .067), such that the military branch of service was not found to have an effect on marital satisfaction levels of male spouses of female combat veterans.

Combat exposure. A One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Level of Combat Exposure reported by combat-deployed female spouses. No significant effect was found ($F(4, 23)$ = .80, p = .541), as the amount of deployment-related combat exposure reported by female spouses was not found to have an effect on marital satisfaction levels of male spouses.

Chapter 7

Discussion

This current research project analyzed several predictors of marital satisfaction, relationship adjustment, personality similarity, and a range of demographic variables amongst male spouses of combat-deployed female veterans. Research pertaining to military couples within the parameters that were examined in this study continues to be scarce despite the staggering amounts of marital dissatisfaction and divorce rates reported throughout all military branches. Moreover, there is a minimal amount of research pertaining to the male spouses of female service members and even less research when analyzed within the context of the female service members having faced deployment and combat exposure. The current study starts to provide further insight and information on the current gaps that exist in the literature. The results of this current study and examined and discussed as well as the limitations of the study and future directions for scholars to investigate.

The nine individual item satisfaction scores were found to be significantly correlated with overall marital satisfaction scores. Results indicated that the model was statistically significant as all nine individual satisfaction items, together, explained 89% of the variance in Overall Marital Satisfaction. Further analyses of the data revealed Caring and Affection to explain 79% of the overall variance in Overall Marital Satisfaction and Communication explained an additional 5% above and beyond the variance explained in Overall Marital Satisfaction. These findings

are in accord with the research conducted by Dungee (2019), which found Caring and Affection to be a significant predictor of overall marital satisfaction. The findings in this study confirm, from the position of both female and male spouses, the domain of Caring and Affection is vital in Overall Marital Satisfaction. The 16PF CCR describes Caring and Affection as "the ability to express caring and understanding; our ability to show each other respect; the way our partner makes us feel cared for overall." Bouchard et al. (1998) discussed men's pattern of coping as more problem-solving in nature than their female counterparts. These findings of the combination of Caring and Affection and Communication in male spouses are notable, especially within the military community, as it provides further direction and clarity on best practices in addressing the essential needs of a military couple navigating their marriage and the satisfaction thereof.

No statistically significant relationship was found regarding the relationship between overall marital satisfaction and the sixteen primary personality factors. Dungee (2019) came to a similar conclusion in her research with the caveat that Sensitivity (Factor I) significantly predicted partner satisfaction. As it pertains to a relationship between Overall Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment, no significant relationship was found between the three factors. It should be noted that a significant positive relationship was found between Overall Marital Satisfaction and Relationship Adjustment. This is consistent with findings produced by Field (2013) and Carpenter (2018). It has been displayed in the literature that an increase in the ability to navigate the

challenges of relationships over time successfully increases overall marital satisfaction.

When examining the relationship between personality similarity and the sixteen primary personality factors, there was no statistically significant relationship found between the two factors. However, one specific factor alone significantly and positively predicted male partner personality similarity: Tension (Factor Q_4). In this research project, it appears that increased Tension positively predicted relationship similarity, such that higher scores on the Tension scale suggested the male partners would be more similar to their female counterparts. This is particularly interesting as the results are suggesting, in accordance with the definition of Tension in the 16PF and 16 PF CCR, that men who may be more fidgety, restless, irritable, or even impatient are more similar to their female counterpart.

Regarding the relationship between Relationship Adjustment and the sixteen primary personality factors, a significant relationship was found, with four personality factors (Emotional Stability, Rule Conscientiousness, Apprehension, Openness to Change) explaining 99% of the variance in Relationship Adjustment. These findings are in accordance with research produced by Field (2013) and Dungee (2019), where similar findings were recorded in this domain. The results of this research further substantiate the claim the traits associated with Emotional Stability, Rule Conscientiousness, Apprehension, and Openness to Change are crucial to a couple's ability to adapt to changes in one's relationship over time.

Furthermore, within the military community, these results were found to be important in Relationship Adjustment from a Male and Female perspective as research on these domains has now been evaluated from both viewpoints. It can almost be taken as a given that Emotional Stability, Rule Conscientiousness, and Openness to change would be valuable traits to have mastery of in the context of conforming to military standards. What has not been revealed in the research is the role of Apprehension in Relationship Adjustment. Hart (2018) found Apprehension to be negatively predictive of Relationship Adjustment; however, a positive relationship exists just as it does in the Dungee (2019) study. Those who score high on Apprehension tend to worry about things, feel insecure, and be self-critical. However, worrying about things can be beneficial if it leads a person to anticipate dangers and take preventative steps to reduce risks as well as they can be better able to judge the consequences of actions. Risk-reducing behaviors and the ability to have foresight into the consequences of actions can be advantageous to the spouse that remains at home with the responsibilities of daily life while their service member counterpart is on deployment. These traits can serve as a protective barrier in many ways. These findings would benefit from further evaluation and investigation as to tease apart what factors regarding the Apprehension domain are positively correlated with Relationship Adjustment in military spouses.

The length of the relationship was found to influence overall marital satisfaction amongst male spouses of female combat veterans. However, due to the limited population size in the present study, we were unable to provide results

specifying whether greater time spent within a relationship lead to high levels of marital satisfaction. Moreover, no relationship was found between the existence of children, the branch of service, or the amount of combat exposure of female spouses and overall marital satisfaction of male partners. Previous literature has supported the notion that the existence of children and combat exposure play significant roles in overall marital satisfaction Andres (2014); however, the findings of this study are consistent with previous findings by Dungee (2019). Future researchers should explore at what point the length of a relationship influences overall marital satisfaction as it can help provide clinicians and researchers with a clearer picture of when the marital satisfaction within a couple's relationship begins to climb.

Study Limitation and Future Research Directions

Several limitations of note exist within the current study. As mentioned several times, there is an insignificant amount of research that exists in the literature regarding military spouses, particularly male spouses. The ever-growing population of civilian husbands continues to be on the rise, with little to no unique information on best practices for treatment or support services that have not come from established resources designed for their female counterparts. Men can have a particular style of learning and coping in opposition to their female counterparts, especially as it pertains to navigating marriage in the context of their female spouse being deployed. Further investigation regarding this topic is warranted to provide the best quality services for this population.

Another limitation to the present study is the number of participants used to analyze the various factors on the 16 PF CCR. This is a unique population, and not enough information has been gathered on the male spouses of female service members, let alone female service members that have been deployed and experienced combat. Nonetheless, the results produced in this sample size cannot be generalized to the overall military population at this time.

The information obtained from this research project will be beneficial for military personnel, especially for the spouses of Active Duty service members, as it will be useful for the development of resources for members of this population in the future. It will be especially valuable in the development of resources for coping, community involvement, and managing the intricacies of being married to a service member for the growing population of men who are fulfilling their duties while their spouses are deployed.

References

Aducci, C. J., Baptist, J. A., George, J., Barros, P. M., & Nelson Goff, B. S. (2011). The recipe for being a good military wife: How military wives managed OIF/OEF deployment. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 23,* 231–249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 08952833.2011.604526

Adjusting to Being A Male Civilian Spouse. (2018, December 12) Retrieved from https://www.militaryonesource.mil/family-relationships/spouse/military-life-for-spouses/life-as-a-male-military-spouse

Akhtar-Danesh, N., & Landeen, J. (2007). Relation between depression and sociodemographic factors. *International journal of mental health systems*, *1*(1), 4.

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

American Psychiatric Association: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental

    Disorders, Fifth Edition. Arlington, VA, American Psychiatric Association,

    2013.

American Psychological Association. (2019). *Marriage and divorce.* Retrieved

    from https://www.apa.org/topics/divorce/

Andres, M. (2014). Distress, support, and relationship satisfaction during military-

    induced separations: A longitudinal study among spouses of Dutch

    deployed military personnel. *Psychological Services, 11*(1), 22-30.

    doi:10.1037/a0033750

Antill, J. K. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married

    couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(1), 145.

Arnett, S. M. (2008). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital*

    Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment.

    (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology,

    Florida.

Balderrama-Durbin, C., Snyder, D. K., Cigrang, J., Talcott, G. W., Tatum, J.,

    Baker, M., Smith Slep, A. M. (2013). Combat disclosure in intimate

    relationships: Mediating the impact partner support on posttraumatic stress.

    Journal of Family Psychology, 27(4), 560-568. doi:10.1037/a0033412

Balderrama-Durbin, C., Stanton, K., Snyder, D. K., Cigrang, J. A., Talcott, G. W.,

    Smith Slep, A. M., Cassidy, D. G. (2017). The risk for marital infidelity

    across a year-long deployment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 31*(5), 629-

    634. doi:10.1037/fam0000281

Bergmann, J. S., Renshaw, K. D., Allen, E. S., Markman, H. J., & Stanley, S. M.

    (2014). Meaningfulness of service and marital satisfaction in army couples.

    Journal of Family Psychology, 28(5), 701-706. doi:10.1037/fam0000013

Bouchard, G., Sabourin, S., Lussier, Y., Wright, J., & Richer, C. (1998). Predictive

    validity of coping strategies on marital satisfaction: Cross-sectional and

    longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*(1), 112-131.

Campbell, S. B, & Renshaw, K. D. (2012). Distress in spouses of Vietnam

    veterans: Associations with communication about deployment experiences.

    Journal of Family Psychology, 26(1), 18-25. doi:10.1037/a0026680

Campbell, S. B., & Renshaw, K. D. (2018). Posttraumatic stress disorder and

    relationship functioning: A comprehensive review and organizational

    framework. *Clinical Psychology Review, 65*, 152–162.

    doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2018.08.003

Carpenter, D. (2018). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital*

    Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of Males

    in Marital Therapy. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of

    Technology, Florida.

Cavazos, R. (2013). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital*

    Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment among

    Males. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology,

    Florida.

Clarkwest, A. (2007). Spousal dissimilarity, race, and marital dissolution. *Journal*

    of Marriage and Family, *69*(3), 639-653.

Connor-Smith, J. K., & Flachsbart, C. (2007). Relations between personality and

    coping: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*

    93(6), 1080-1107. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.1080

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory: Manual*. Odessa, FL: PAR-Psychological Assessment Resources.

De Terte, I., & Stephens, C. (2014). Psychological resilience of workers in high-risk occupations.

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

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

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

Dungee, H.C. (2019). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment Among Spouses of Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

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

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

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

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

Gattis, K. S., Berns, S., Simpson, L. E., & Christensen, A. (2004). Birds of a

feather or strange birds? Ties among personality dimensions, similarity, and

marital quality. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*(4), 564-574.

doi:10.1037/0893-3200.18.4.564

Goff, B. S. N., Crow, J. R., Reisbig, A. M. J., & Hamilton, S. (2007). The impact of

individual trauma symptoms of deployed soldiers on relationship

satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 344–353. doi:10.1037/0893-

3200.21.3.344

Hart, M. (2018). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital*

Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment of

Females in Marital Therapy. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida

Institute of Technology, Florida.

Klaric, M., Franciskovic, T., Stevanovic, A., Petrov, B., Jonovska, S., & Nemcic

Moro, I. (2011). Marital quality and relationship satisfaction in war veterans

and their wives in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *European Journal of*

Psychotraumatology, 2, 8077. http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v2i0.8077

Lampis, J., Cataudella, S., Busonera, A., & Carta, S. (2018). Personality similarity

    and romantic relationship adjustment during the couple life cycle. *The*

    Family Journal, 26(1), 31-39.

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

Lester, D., Haig, C., & Monello, R. (1989). Spouses' personality and marital

    satisfaction. *Personality and individual differences*.

Military Demographics Profile. (2018, n.d.). Retrieved from

    https://www.militaryonesource.mil/data-research-and-statistics/military-

    community-demographics/2018-demographics-profile

Moore, K. M. (2015). *16PF Couples Counseling Report: Predictors of Marital*

    Satisfaction, Personality Similarity, and Relationship Adjustment among

    Male Combat Veterans Following Deployment. (Unpublished doctoral

    dissertation). Florida Institute of Technology, Florida.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Robertson, I. T., Cooper, C. L., Sarkar, M., & Curran, T. (2015). Resilience
training in the workplace from 2003 to 2014: A systematic review. *Journal
of occupational and organizational psychology*, *88*(3), 533-562.

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

Shiota, M. N., & Levenson, R. W. (2007). Birds of a feather don't always fly

    farthest: Similarity in big five personality predicts more negative marital

    satisfaction trajectories in long-term marriages. *Psychology and Aging,*

    22(4), 666-675. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.22.4.666

Whisman, M. A., Uebelacker, L. A., & Weinstock, L. M. (2004). Psychopathology

    and marital satisfaction: The importance of evaluating both partners.

    Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72, 830–838.

    doi:10.1037/0022-006X.72.5.830

Table 1

Personality Factor Scale Descriptors

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

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 1 continued

Primary Personality Factors Descriptors

Factor	Lower Scores (1-3)	Higher Scores (8-10)
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 Spouses of Combat-Deployed Female Veterans

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Race/Ethnicity		
African American	5	20.8%
Caucasian	16	66.7%
Hispanic or Latino	2	8.3%
Other	1	4.2%
Education Level		
High School/GED	5	20.8%
Associate Degree	3	12.5%
Bachelor's Degree	7	29.2%
Graduate Course work w/o Degree	2	9.3%
Graduate Degree	7	29.2%
Current Employment Status		
Full Time	16	66.7%
Part Time	3	12.5%
House Husband	1	4.2%
Unemployed	2	8.3%
Retired	1	4.2%
Other	1	4.2%

Table 2 continued

Descriptive Frequencies for Male Spouses of Combat-Deployed Female Veterans

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Current Household Income		
$20,000-$39,999	4	16.7%
$40,000-$59,999	1	4.2%
$60,000-$79,000	2	8.3%
$80,000+	17	70.8%
Relationship Length		
0-2 years	1	4.2%
3-7 years	7	29.2%
8-14 years	15	62.5%
15-25 years	1	4.2%
Existence of Children		
Yes	16	66.7%
No	8	33.3%
Wife's Branch of Service		
Army	18	75.0%
Navy	1	4.2%
Marine Corps	1	4.2%
Air Force	4	16.7%
Wife's Combat Exposure		
Unknown	6	25.0%
Little or no exposure	5	20.8%
Some Exposure	4	16.7%
Moderate Exposure	8	33.3%
Moderately High	1	4.2%

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Item Satisfaction Ratings

Variables	*M*	*SD*
Time Together	6.71	2.05
Problem-Solving Communication	6.42	2.48
Caring and Affection	6.62	2.26
Division of Roles	6.50	2.04
Finances	6.50	2.69
Sex	6.25	2.01
Extended Family	6.67	1.99
Children	6.83	1.79
Alcohol and Drug Use	7.58	1.69

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of 16PF Primary and Global Personality Factors

Variables	M	SD
Primary Factors		
Warmth (A)	4.00	1.29
Reasoning (B)	5.58	1.86
Emotional Stability (C)	5.46	1.67
Dominance (E)	5.33	1.09
Liveliness (F)	4.92	1.89
Rule-Conscientiousness (G)	5.46	2.02
Social Boldness (H)	5.79	1.98
Sensitivity (I)	4.92	1.61
Vigilance (L)	6.83	1.66
Abstractedness (M)	5.46	2.04
Privateness (N)	5.96	1.57
Apprehension (O)	5.42	1.79
Openness to Change (Q_1)	6.00	1.75
Self-Reliance (Q_2)	6.50	1.96
Perfectionism (Q_3)	6.00	2.11
Tension (Q_4)	6.04	1.60
Global Factors		
Extraversion (EX)	4.42	1.84
Anxiety (AX)	6.13	2.07
Tough-Mindedness (TM)	5.88	1.33
Independence (IN)	5.92	1.25
Self-Control (SC)	5.75	2.05

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Factors

Variables	M	SD
Overall Marital Satisfaction	7.12	1.96
Personality Similarity	6.67	2.73
Relationship Adjustment	5.54	1.74

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Relationship Length

Variables	M	SD
0-2 years	8.00	-
3-7 years	6.86	2.34
8-14 years	7.60	0.99
15-25 years	1.00	-

Tables for Hypothesis 1

Table 7

Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Nine Individual Satisfaction Areas

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.942	.888	.816	.847

a. Predictors: (Constant), Alcohol or Drug Use, Extended Family, Sex, Children, Division of Roles, Finances, Time Together, Communication, Caring and Affection

Table 8

Multiple Regression for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Nine Individual Satisfaction Areas

ANOVA[a]

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	78.720	9	8.747	12.362	.000[b]
Residual	9.905	14	.708		
Total	88.625	23			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Satisfaction Score
b. Predictors: (Constant), Alcohol or Drug Use, Extended Family, Sex, Children, Division of Roles, Finances, Time Together, Communication, Caring and Affection

Table 9

Coefficients for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Nine Individual Satisfaction Areas

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 Constant	1.066	1.184		.900	.383
Time Together	.256	.179	.269	1.431	.174
Communication	.199	.178	.251	1.116	.283
Caring And Affection	.223	.196	.256	1.137	.275
Division Of Roles	.042	.158	.043	.263	.796
Finances	.085	.138	.116	.614	.549
Sex	.087	.146	.089	.595	.561
Extended Family	.045	.104	.046	.436	.669
Children	.093	.137	.084	.676	.510
Alcohol or Drug Use	-.093	.116	-.080	-.803	.435

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Satisfaction Score

61

Table 10

Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and Caring and Affection and
Communication Satisfaction Area

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.893[a]	.797	.787	.905	.797	86.141	1	22	.000
2	.922[b]	.850	.836	.794	.054	7.571	1	21	.012

a. Predictors: (Constant), Caring and Affection
b. Predictors: (Constant), Caring and Affection, Communication

Tables for Hypothesis 2

Table 11

Model Summary for Overall Marital Satisfaction and 16 Primary Personality
Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.862[a]	.742	.816	1.806

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

Table 12

Multiple Regression for Overall Marital Satisfaction and 16 Primary Personality Factors

ANOVA[a]

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	65.795	16	4.112	1.261	.396[b]
Residual	22.830	7	3.261		
Total	88.625	23			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Marital Satisfaction Score
b. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Reasoning, Social Boldness, Openness to Change, Abstractedness, Sensitivity, Dominance, Perfectionism, Privateness, Self-Reliance, Apprehension, Warmth, Liveliness, Rule Consciousness, Vigilance, Emotional Stability

Table 13

Coefficients for Overall Marital Satisfaction and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Coefficients[a]

Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	Constant	13.490	11.627		1.160	.284
	Warmth	-.157	.483	-.103	-.324	.755
	Reasoning	-.420	.387	-.398	-1.083	.314
	Emotional Stability	1.005	.660	.854	1.524	.171
	Dominance	-.675	.623	-.375	-1.083	.315
	Liveliness	-.518	.381	-.498	-1.359	.216
	Rule Consciousness	-.386	.379	-.398	-1.019	.342
	Social Boldness	.108	.327	.109	.332	.750
	Sensitivity	.185	.341	.152	.542	.605
	Vigilance	.020	.571	.017	.035	.973
	Abstractedness	-.136	.415	-.141	-.327	.754
	Privateness	-.790	.349	-.633	-2.263	.058
	Apprehension	.625	.426	.570	1.466	.186
	Openness to Change	.072	.310	.064	.233	.822
	Self-Reliance	-.042	.435	-.042	-.096	.926
	Perfectionism	-.006	.327	-.006	-.018	.986
	Tension	-.060	.550	-.049	-.109	.916

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Marital Satisfaction Score

Tables for Hypothesis 3

Table 14

Model Summary for Personality Similarity and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.846[a]	.716	.066	2.637

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

b.

Table 15

Multiple Regression for Personality Similarity and 16 Primary Personality Factors

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	122.643	16	7.665	1.102	.475[b]
	Residual	48.690	7	6.956		
	Total	171.333	23			

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

Table 16

Coefficients for Personality Similarity and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Constant	-12.109	16.980		-.713	.499
	Warmth	.657	.706	.309	.931	.383
	Reasoning	-.274	.565	-.187	-.485	.642
	Emotional Stability	2.023	.964	1.236	2.099	.074
	Dominance	-1.048	.911	-.419	-1.151	.288
	Liveliness	-.639	.557	-.441	-1.147	.289
	Rule Consciousness	-.433	.553	-.321	-.783	.459
	Social Boldness	.396	.477	.287	.831	.433
	Sensitivity	1.102	.498	.651	2.211	.063
	Vigilance	1.193	.834	.726	1.431	.196
	Abstractedness	-.591	.606	-.443	-.975	.362
	Privateness	.450	.510	.259	.883	.407
	Apprehension	.343	.622	.225	.552	.598
	Openness to Change	-.349	.452	-.223	-.771	.466
	Self-Reliance	-1.415	.635	-1.014	-2.227	.061
	Perfectionism	-.112	.478	-.086	-.234	.821
	Tension	2.071	.803	1.215	2.578	.037

a. Dependent Variable: Similarity Score

Tables for Hypothesis 4

Table 17

Model Summary for Relationship Adjustment and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.997[a]	.994	.979	.252

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

Table 18

Multiple Regression for Relationship Adjustment and 16 Primary Personality Factors

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	69.514	16	4.345	68.384	.000[b]
	Residual	.445	7	.064		
	Total	69.958	23			

   a. Dependent Variable: Relationship Adjustment Score
   b. Predictors: (Constant), Tension, Reasoning, Social Boldness, Openness to Change, Abstractedness, Sensitivity, Dominance, Perfectionism, Privateness, Self-Reliance, Apprehension, Warmth, Liveliness, Rule Consciousness, Vigilance, Emotional Stability

Table 19

Coefficients for Relationship Adjustment and 16 Primary Personality Factors

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Constant	-5.347	1.623		-3.295	.013
	Warmth	.021	.067	.015	.305	.769
	Reasoning	-.085	.054	-.091	-1.569	.161
	Emotional Stability	1.118	.092	1.069	12.144	.000
	Dominance	.024	.087	.015	.272	.793
	Liveliness	-.023	.053	-.025	-.428	.682
	Rule Consciousness	.263	.053	.305	4.977	.002
	Social Boldness	.098	.046	.111	2.145	.069
	Sensitivity	.041	.048	.038	.867	.415
	Vigilance	-.025	.080	-.024	-.317	.761
	Abstractedness	-.035	.058	-.041	-.601	.567
	Privateness	-.016	.049	-.041	-.323	.756
	Apprehension	.288	.059	.296	4.841	.002
	Openness to Change	.223	.043	.223	5.162	.001
	Self-Reliance	-.008	.061	-.009	-.134	.897
	Perfectionism	-.050	.046	-.060	-1.086	.314
	Tension	.143	.077	.131	1.865	.104

a. Dependent Variable: Relationship Adjustment Score

Table 20

Model Summary for Relationship Adjustment and 4 Primary Personality Factors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.913[a]	.833	.825	.729	.833	109.542	1	22	.000
2	.950[b]	.903	.893	.570	.070	15.039	1	21	.001
3	.974[c]	.949	.941	.423	.046	18.076	1	20	.000
4	.989[d]	.979	.974	.281	.030	26.423	1	19	.000

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

Table for Hypothesis 5

Table 21

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

Correlations

		Overall Satisfaction	Personality Similarity	Relationship Adjustment
Overall Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	.041	.487[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.851	.016
	N	24	24	24
Personality Similarity	Pearson Correlation	.041	1	.259
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.851		.222
	N	24	24	24
Relationship Adjustment	Pearson Correlation	.487[*]	.259	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.222	
	N	24	24	24

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

Tables for Hypothesis 6

Table 22

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

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	42.168	3	14.056	6.051	.004
Within Groups	46.457	20	2.323		
Total	88.625	23			

Table 23

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

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.750	1	6.750	1.814	.192
Within Groups	81.875	22	3.722		
Total	88.625	23			

Table 24

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

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	26.181	3	8.727	2.795	.067
Within Groups	62.444	20	3.122		
Total	88.625	23			

Table 25

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

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.750	4	3.188	.798	.541
Within Groups	75.875	19	3.993		
Total	88.625	23			