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ABSTRACT

SACRIFICE IN MARRIAGE: MOTIVES, BEHAVIORS, AND OUTCOMES

Kevin Shitamoto Figuerres
Marriage and Family Therapy Program
School of Family Life
Master of Science

Today’s society appears to have become focused on the individual and his/her exclusive needs in relationships. Self-sacrifice has seemingly become a forgotten value and behavior. The motives for sacrificing for another can widely vary for each individual. This study examined the effects of couples’ sacrificing behaviors and the motives for sacrificing on the couples’ marital quality. In this research, a random sample of 138 couples from Oakland, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Ogden, UT; and Atlanta, GA were assessed on these variables using the Self Perception of Sacrifice, Partner Perception of Sacrifice, Motives for Sacrifice, Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships measures.

Analyzing the data with structural equation modeling showed that approach and avoidance motives for sacrifice were related to the individual’s marital quality. The approach motives were also related to the individual’s actual frequency of sacrificing, but only wives’ avoidance motives were a predictor of her frequency in sacrificing. Husband’s sacrificing frequency was a strong predictor of his own marital quality and also his wife’s. The wife’s frequency of sacrificing was also connected with her and his marital quality, but was not as
strong of a predictor as his frequency of sacrificing. In examining the partner effects, only wives’
approach and avoidance motives had an effect upon their husband’s marital quality. Husband’s
approach and avoidance motives were not related to his wife’s marital quality; rather, the
husband’s actual frequency of sacrifice and the wife’s perception of his sacrificing influenced
her marital quality. Husbands’ and wives’ approach motives were associated with their partner’s
frequency of sacrifice, but their avoidance motives were not significant predictors of their
partner’s frequency of sacrifice. Clinical implications and directions for future research are
discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In today’s competitive, individual-focused society, self-sacrifice in marital relationships is often viewed as outdated. A firm focus on what one wants and needs in life seems to take a much higher priority over sacrificing for another. Many authors believe that individualism is at the foundations of marital confusion and problems today (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, Tipton, 1985; Fowers, 2000; Furstenberg & Cherlin, 1991; Popone & Whitehead, 2001; Richardson, Fowers, & Guignon, 1999; Whitehead, 1997). Hawkins, Fowers, Carroll, and Yang (2007) hypothesize that social scientists have largely been guilty in seeing marriage through the lens of individualism. The authors state that individualism may define marriage as a choice founded on present satisfaction and anticipated future gratification and rewards in the relationship. This viewpoint focuses on benefits individuals receive and the rewards that individuals obtain from their partner’s investments for the relationship that in return produce satisfaction, intimacy, support, and rewards. Fowers, Bucker, Calbeck, and Harrigan (2003) analyzed 10 years of marital research looking at 2,200 quantitative studies and found that the most measured constructs was satisfaction. Commitment came in ninth place. Content analysis found that relationship satisfaction was mentioned and measured between 12 and 26 times more than relationship commitment. Bahr and Bahr (2001) state that, “Self-sacrifice is under a cloud these days. There is not much place for it in an era dominated by rational choice theory, market models of human relationships, and ‘having it all’ individualism” (pg. 1231).

Recent empirical literature suggests the fact that sacrifice increases marital success (Stanley, Whitton, Sadberry, Clements, & Markman, 2006). Noller (1996) discovered that people’s conception of “love” was connected with sacrifice as well as caring, trust, respect, and
loyalty. Fincham, Stanley, and Beach (2007) believe that much of marital research has focused on the study of conflict, but research needs to move into the study of transformative processes. Transformative processes look beyond the deficits and conflict in marriages, but focus on the broader picture by including strengths, methods of coping, and deeper systems of meaning to more clearly see the full picture of a marriage. Some scholars suggest that conflict may not be so capable at predicting outcomes that our theories, research, and interventions suggest (Bradbury, Rogge, & Lawrence, 2001; Fincham, 2003). Stanley (2007) asserts that marital research is moving in a new stage where the research will explore larger meanings and deeper motivations about relationships with a focus on more positive constructs. Fincham et. al (2007) makes the point that researchers should observe fully what they measure, not just a singular focus on part of what they measure. They suggest that the limiting knowledge that we have has been largely a part of these conceptual limitations.

What is sacrifice and how is it expressed? Van Lange, Rusbult, Drigotas, Arriaga, Witcher, and Cox (1997) say that, “Sacrifice may entail the forfeiting of behaviors that might otherwise be desirable (i.e., passive sacrifice), enacting of behaviors that might otherwise be undesirable (i.e. active sacrifice), or both” (pg. 1374). For some it may mean giving up further education to follow the career path or dream of their spouse, working multiple jobs to support an afflicted spouse, or forsaking a long-held habit in order to please one’s partner. Or it could be as easy as doing a simple favor for the other. Impett, Gable, and Peplau (2005) found in their study on a sample of 45 male and 77 female dating undergraduates from the University of California whose ages ranged from 18 to 37 years (4% African American, 39% Asian or Pacific Islander, 10% Hispanic, 34% White, and 13% multiethnic or “other”) that these subjects sacrificed the most for their partner in friends by sacrificing time with personal friends or spending time with
significant other’s friends (mentioned by 87% of participants); recreation (86%); errands, chores, and favors (65%); school and work (59%); family (56%); communication and interaction (49%); gifts and money (33%); and other-sex interactions such as talking to others of the opposite sex or dating other people (25%).

Feminist authors have proposed that sacrifice creates codependency, relationship dissatisfaction, and depression (Jack, 1991; Jordan, 1991; Lerner, 1988). There seems to be a contradiction between conceptualizations and empirical findings about sacrifice in marriage. Some research points out the fact that increased psychological distress and decreased relationship satisfaction is a result of forgoing one’s wishes and desires for another’s (Cramer, 2002; Fritz & Helgeson, 1998; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989). Other studies found that sacrifice increases satisfaction and the likelihood of the relationship enduring over time (Van Lange, Agnew, Harinck, & Steemers, 1997; Van Lange et al., 1997; Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster, & Agnew, 1999). Part of the discrepancy in the findings may be due to the lack of research on the context, dimensions, and other variables that are related to sacrifice. Little is known as to what constitutes healthy sacrificing or different patterns of sacrificing.

Clearly, some degree of sacrifice occurs and is necessary in any marital relationship. However, it appears important to know the motivation for sacrificing in the marital relationship. Kelley (1979) notes that when a sacrifice is made by one’s partner, his or her partner may be motivated to find the reason behind it. There can be a wide array of motives for sacrificing for one’s partner. Gable and Reis (2001) postulated that in close relationships there are approach motives and avoidance motives. Approach motivations are about obtaining positive outcomes, including the other’s happiness or a greater intimacy. Avoidance motives are about seeking to
evade negative outcomes including conflict, disapproval, or the other’s loss of interest in the relationship.

While relatively little is known about the association of motives and self-sacrifice in relationships, it is important to assess their relationship with relationship outcomes. If healthy motives and self-sacrifice increase marital satisfaction, it is important to understand how this process happens. The purpose of this study is to examine how self-sacrifice motives and behavior are related to marital quality. This study will examine the husband’s frequency of self-sacrifice and his motives for sacrificing and the wife’s frequency of self-sacrifice and her motives for sacrificing and how they are related to both the husband and wife’s marital quality.
Sacrifice

The interdependence theoretical framework (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, Rusbult, & Van Lange, 2003) has been the major guiding force in much of the research that has been done on sacrifice in relationships. This theory states that the very structure of relationships sometimes requires individuals to forgo their immediate preferences for the sake of the relationship. If the couple’s interests are the same, the outcomes correspond. In such a case, sacrifice is unnecessary. On the other hand, when the husband’s and wife’s interests are not aligning or do not correspond, individuals are compelled to choose between their own self-interest or to sacrifice for their partner. In cases when individuals sacrifice their own preferences, their self-interests are replaced by a deeper concern for their partner or the relationship. However, an individual’s self-interests can also be replaced by a fear of reprisal. This phenomenon is referred to as a transformation of motivation.

Anderson and Sabatelli (2007) believe that in close personal relationships a high degree of interdependence is needed. In these relationships, the goal is to obtain and maintain a high level of intimacy; therefore, it is critically important that individuals not act out of self-interest alone. This type of self-interested behavior deters from a deep level of intimacy. Feelings of resentment, mistrust, and complaints about the lack of reciprocity and fairness in the relationships accompany such selfish behavior. On the other hand, an interdependent relationship in which both partners see that acting in the best interests of one’s partner becomes a way of attaining benefits for oneself. In this type of relationship, trust and commitment that is
continually sustained and developed has the capacity to lead to the belief that the relationship is one of special and unique qualities that define a lifetime relationship.

How often are sacrifices made in intimate relationships? In the Impett et al. (2005) study, one hundred sixty three (69 men and 84 women) undergraduates of the University of California ranging in age from 18 to 34 years, completed a study of the sacrifices made for their dating partners. The sample was 4% African American, 40% Asian or Pacific Islander, 13% Hispanic, 35% White, and 8% self-identified as multiethnic or “other.” It was found that couples made sacrifices on 48% of the days. On average, there were 8.7 sacrifices made over the course of the 2-week study as reported by the participants.

Sacrifice has often been associated with relationship commitment. As couples increase their commitment to one another, they seem to develop a couple identity which centers on the couple unit and less on the focus to maximize their own needs. Furthermore, when couples have commitment, they forsake their immediate self-interests, and act in the interest of the couple’s relationship; they find their relationships fulfilling and satisfying (Stanley & Markman, 1992). In addition, higher levels of commitment were correlated with perceiving sacrificing behaviors as less difficult. This was found to be the case particularly with men (Stanley et al., 2006). Commitment is connected with the quality of relationships over time in men. Husband’s commitment led to healthy relationship behaviors that maintained and improved the relationship quality over time (Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro, & Hannon, 2002; Johnson & Rusbult, 1989; Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik, & Lipkus, 1991; Van Lange et al., 1997). Whitton, Stanley, and Markman (2002) suggests that the gender discrepancy may lie in the fact that women are more socialized to sacrifice, no matter the level of commitment.
Sacrifice seems to carry a cost with it. Sacrificing can have later psychological costs in feelings of resentment, guilt, dependence, or other psychological costs (Rusbult & Van Lange, 1996). Sacrificing by avoiding conflict in the form of keeping one’s “true” feelings bottled up was related with decreased relationship satisfaction (Canary & Cupach, 1988; Cramer, 2002; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; Heavey, Layne, & Christensen, 1993; Noller, Feeney, Bonnell, & Callan, 1994).

Van Lange et al. (1997) rejects this notion of sacrifice as a cost in the relationship because in exchange theory cost would be an exchange that one saw as a net personal loss. For those individuals that want to sacrifice for their partner, the sacrifice could be seen as a cost that is reappraised to an emphasis on the couple’s future and therefore a source of satisfaction rather than a cost.

Sacrifice has many associated benefits. Impett et al. (2005) reports that individuals who typically sacrificed their own needs in conflicts out of a genuine concern for their partner’s welfare found personal and interpersonal benefits such as personal fulfillment and a strengthened relationship. Stanley, Markman, and Whitton (2002) hypothesized that a greater willingness to sacrifice facilitates the growth of relationships and the reinforcement of a sense of security and safety which is fundamental to marital success.

The perception of one’s partner as making a sacrifice on the partner’s behalf increased trust in that partner which thereby increased the commitment to the relationship. They also come to develop a trust in their partner as a caring and responsive person (Wieselquist et al., 1999). Whitton et al. (2002) add that an individual’s commitment is likely to be connected with a greater willingness to sacrifice, greater satisfaction in making sacrifices, and the perception that the sacrifices made are not harmful to one’s self.
Motives in Sacrificing

According to the helping-orientation model developed by Ribal (1963), individuals can typically have two motives in interpersonal behavior. The first is the desire to help others in need which is called nurturance. The second is the desire to have others help oneself when they are in need of succorance. Romer, Gruder, and Lizzadro (1986) builds upon this model and says that there are “altruists” who are nurturant, but not succorant. They help others but do not give help to receive help from others. “Receptive givers” are those who are nurturant and succorant in that they are motivated to help others, but they become more likely to help if that help is contingent on receiving help back. The “selfish” are those who are succorant but not nurturant. Their motives are to receive help but not give it. “Inner-sustaining individuals” are not nurturant or succorant and have no motive to help others or receive help from others. Altruists and receptive givers seem to be more empathic than the latter two. When compensation was not available to all parties, altruists were the most likely to help. However, when compensation was available, receptive givers were the most likely to help. Altruists were also high on social responsibility in comparison to the other groups.

Mehrabian (1976) studies closely parallel the findings found in the previously mentioned studies. There appear to be two social motives in interactions: the need for affiliation and the fear of rejection. Those people who have a greater fear of rejection in relationships generally expect to receive punishment in their relationships. However, those with a greater need for affiliation usually expect to be positively reinforced in their interpersonal relationships (Mehrabian & Ksionzky, 1974). The higher in need for affiliation the more likely the partner was to sacrifice for approach motives, while the higher in fear of rejection the more likely to sacrifice for avoidance motives. The outcomes of both social motives are polarized. Those high in the need
for affiliation self-report that they feel self-confident and show more positive affect, while those who are high in fear of rejection feel low in self-confidence and perceive themselves being judged negatively by others (Mehrabian, 1976; Russell & Mehrabian, 1978). In addition Impett et al. (2005) mentions that those that sacrifice for avoidance motives experienced more negative emotions, lower satisfaction with life, less positive relationship well-being, and more relationship conflict. As would be expected, those that sacrificed for approach motives experienced more positive emotions, greater satisfaction with life, more positive relationship quality, and less relationship conflict. In the Impett et al. (2005) study, dating couples who sacrificed for approach motives were more likely to remain together, while those couples who sacrificed for avoidance motives were particularly detrimental to the relationship. The more the couples sacrificed for avoidance motives, the more they were found to be less satisfied and more likely they were to have broken up a month later, no matter their initial relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio, & Piliavin (1995) examined motivations in caregiving for one’s partner. In the learning approach, individuals are motivated to help the other because of past reinforcement when helping them. However, some may be motivated to not aid another because of negative reinforcement when such aid was offered.

Caregiving motives are also found in emotions and arousal. Emotions such as feelings of sympathy, guilt, and sadness may increase the desire and motive to help another. Conversely, feelings of anger may decrease the motivation to care for another (Schroeder et al., 1995). The acts of service that are motivated by desires to meet another’s need in itself will typically bring about feelings of happiness and satisfaction in the giver (Batson, Bolen, Cross, & Neuringer-Benefiel, 1986). Other emotional experiences are dependent on the motive with the sacrifice. An approach motive of satisfying a spouse’s wishes to make him or her happy can lead to a higher
level of pleasure and positive emotions through the process of empathic identification (Blau, 1964; Lerner, Miller, & Holmes, 1976). On the other hand, an avoidance motive of sacrificing to avoid conflict may result in relief but may also bring about anxiety and tension around the very conflict that was sought to be avoided (Downey, Freitas, Michaelis, & Khouri, 1998).

Sacrifice, Relationship Functioning, and Marital Quality

Research shows that there is a connection with sacrifice and good relationship functioning (Stanley & Markman, 1992). Van Lange et al. (1997) discovered that “willingness to sacrifice partially mediated the relationship between commitment levels and overall relationship adjustment.” Whitton, Stanley, and Markman (2007) found that when perceptions of sacrifice were less harmful to the self, this partially mediated the relationship between commitment levels and relationship quality. Higher satisfaction with sacrifice in the early marriage was correlated with the couple being nondistressed over time and individuals maintaining marital adjustment 1 and 2 years down the line (Stanley, Amato, Johnson, & Markman, 2006). Anderson and Sabatelli (2007) note that in couple’s close personal relationships an individual’s satisfactions tend to generally depend upon the extent to which one’s own partner is satisfied. Therefore, it is in each partner’s best interest to obtain benefits for oneself.

Relationship quality is in fact positively related to positive attitudes on sacrifice (Stanley & Markman, 1992; Van Lange et al., 1997). The perception that sacrifices were harmful to the self was associated negatively with relationship satisfaction and positively with depressive symptomatology (Whitton et al., 2002).

Lin and Huddleston-Casas (2005) surveyed a sample of 333 participants (41% were male and 59% were female) to examine agape (altruistic) love in couples’ relationships. The sample was composed of mainly Caucasian (94%), ages between 19 and 91 years of age, 84% married,
10% never married, and 6% were either divorced, separated, or widowed. Thirty-five percent of the participants had full or partial high school education, 33% some college, and another 32% achieved a Bachelor’s degree or higher. The religious denomination of the sample was 64% Protestant, 25% Catholic, and 11% were non-Christian, agnostic or of some other religion. Sixteen percent had an annual income of less than $25,000, 36% had $25,000-$49,999, 34% had $50,000-$100,000, 8% had $100,000 or more, and 6% reported that they did not know or did not answer. Participants were given the Love Attitudes Scale which assess the individual’s report of his/her love style from the six love styles. A Relationship Assessment Scale was also administered which tested whether their needs and expectations were being met. This study found a high correlation between relationship satisfaction and Agape or selfless, altruistic love. The higher the individual’s relationship satisfaction, the higher the reported scores of Agape were.

The current investigation seeks to build upon the previous research that has touched upon both dating and married couples’ sacrifice in their relationships by investigating in depth at the approach and avoidance motives and sacrificial behavior in marriages. The Impett et al. (2005) findings in social motives and Kelley’s (1979) interdependence theory will provide the theoretical framework for this study. Impett’s study has taken a college dating sample and measured their motives for sacrifice, sacrifice, partner’s well-being, and relationship satisfaction. Specifically, this study will examine in more detail how married couples’ motives in sacrificing for their partner directly and indirectly affects actual sacrifices that appear to lead to marital quality.
Key Concepts and Operational Definitions

The operational definitions of concepts were as follows:

1. Motives for sacrifice are the causes that move an individual to sacrifice for his or her partner. We treated motives for sacrifice as the self-reported 8 approach and 7 avoidance motives identified in the Motives for Sacrifice Measure by Impett et.al (2005).

2. Frequency of sacrifice is to surrender or give something for the sake of the other partner as measured by sacrifice frequency in the Sacrifice Measure by Impett et.al (2005).

3. Marital quality is the degree to which an individual self-reports his/her consensus, satisfaction, cohesion, and intimacy in the marital relationship. Marital quality was the overall score of the individual on the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Busby, Christensen, Crane, & Larson, 1995) which measures consensus, satisfaction, and cohesion. The current perception of the relationship of the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships instrument (Schaefer and Olson, 1981) measures several dimensions of intimacy. It examines the emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy. The combination of the RDAS and PAIR measure gives a fuller perspective and better measure of marital quality.

Research Question

How are motives for sacrificing and frequency of self-sacrificing behaviors related to a couple’s marital quality as a function of self and partner perceptions?
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of couples where both the husband and wife were older than 18 years old. The participating couples were randomly selected from four metropolis areas in the United States (Oakland, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Ogden, UT; and Atlanta, GA) using Polk City Directories. These four metropolitan areas were chosen because of their possibility of producing racial diversity.

A total of 138 couples participated in this study. The sample was comprised of 32 couples from Oakland, CA; 43 couples from Phoenix, AZ; 19 couples from Ogden, UT; and 44 couples from Atlanta, GA. As shown in Table 1, the average husbands’ age was 48.82 years ranging from 23 to 86 years with a standard deviation of 14.87. The average wives’ age was 47.02 years ranging from 23 to 82 years with a standard deviation of 14. There were a total of 85 Caucasian (61.6%), 28 African American (20.3%), 8 Hispanic (5.8%), 4 Asian (2.9%), and 1 Multiracial (0.7%) husbands. In addition, the sample consisted of 83 Caucasian (60.1%), 24 African American (17.4%), 9 Hispanic (6.5%), 4 Asian (2.9%), 2 Multiracial (1.4%), and 2 Other (1.4%) wives. The average years in marriage for husbands was 18.64 years ranging from 1 to 56 years with a standard deviation of 15.07 years. For the wives, the average years in marriage was 17.95 years ranging from 1 to 52 years with a standard deviation of 14.33 years. Husbands reported their average annual household income as 87,767 dollars with a range from 0 to 250,000 dollars and a standard deviation of 46,213 dollars. Wives reported an average annual household income of 83,255 dollars with a range from 0 to 250,000 dollars and a standard deviation of 46,896 dollars.
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample (N=138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Mean (S.D.)</td>
<td>Mean (S.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>48.82</td>
<td>(14.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>(15.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income</td>
<td>$87,767</td>
<td>($46,213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0-250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden, UT</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures

The addresses of 1050 couples were purchased from infoUSA, a sales and marketing agency. The addresses were guaranteed to be randomly selected from four metropolitan areas (Oakland, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Ogden, UT; and Atlanta, GA) and were guaranteed to be married couples over the age of 18. The manner in which surveys were mailed out followed the Total Design Method (TDM) procedures as outlined by Dillman (2000). Selected couples were mailed packets that include two envelopes, one for the wife and one for the husband, which included surveys, an instruction form, one consent form, and a two dollar bill place in the envelope. Couples who completed their surveys were informed in the instruction form that they would be rewarded with a $40.00 visa card in appreciation for their time and participation.

The measures included in the packet were the Self Perception of Sacrifice, Partner Perception of Sacrifice, Motives for Sacrifice, Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships measures. The instructions asked that each of the
partners complete their surveys independently. Upon completion of the surveys, the instructions informed the couple to enclose their consent and survey forms in a pre-addressed and pre-paid envelope to be sent back. The couples received separate envelopes that they put their survey forms in and then enclosed in the pre-paid envelope. Couples that had not completed their surveys in a two week period were sent postcards periodically as a token of appreciation for their consideration in their participation with the study and as a reminder to complete and return their surveys. After a four week period following the sending out of the packets, the couples or spouses who had not filled out their responses were frequently called by a team of research assistants. Of the 1050 couples that were sent surveys, a total of 138 couples responded producing a 13% response rate. While it is uncertain as to the cause of the low response rate, it is suspected that it may be due to the questionnaires being barely glanced over and treated as junk mail, using a marketing company was a poor source for finding willing research participants, and/or some couples being deterred in their experience of discomfort in assessing their marriage. Little is known about what is considered an adequate response rate when both partners are required to return questionnaires.

Measures

Sacrifice Measure

The Perception of Sacrifice Measure (Harper and Figuerres, 2008) is comprised of both the perception of one’s and one’s partner’s sacrificing behaviors. The Self-Perception of Sacrifice portion measures the individual’s perception of both the frequency of a given sacrifice and the degree of sacrifice for each sacrifice item in the past 6 months. The questionnaire was created using some of Impett, et al.’s (2005) results from an open ended questionnaire asking what dating couples actually sacrificed. The categorical results of sacrificing behavior were
made into questions that assessed the frequency of that particular sacrifice. Other additional sacrificing categories that were more common to marital couples were added as well. Participants are first asked to identify how often they perform a particular sacrifice such as sacrificing “occupational/house work to be with your partner,” “spending time with your partner’s family when he/she wants you to,” or “show affection to your partner to please him/her.” The participant rates the frequency of the sacrifice using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Frequently, 5 = Always). A follow-up question asks about the perceived degree of sacrifice using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = No Sacrifice, 2 = Slight Sacrifice, 3 = Medium Sacrifice, 4 = High Sacrifice, and 5 = Extremely High Sacrifice). Total possible scores range from 25-125 for the frequency and level of sacrifice scales. Higher scores indicate an individual’s perception of their higher frequencies of sacrifice. The Chronbach’s alphas in this study were .84 for husbands and .81 for wives.

The Partner Perception of Sacrifice portion examines the perception of an individual on how frequently their partner sacrificed in the past 6 months. Possible scores range from 25-125. Higher scores indicate an individual’s perception of their partner’s higher frequencies of sacrifice. The Chronbach’s alphas for this study were .86 for husband’s perception of wife’s sacrifice and .87 for wife’s perception of husband’s sacrifice. (See Appendix C for a copy of this measure).

*Motivations for Sacrifice*

This measure was adopted from by Impett, Gable, and Peplau (2005) from Feeney and Collins’ Motivations for Caregiving (2003) measure. The instrument is designed to determine the individual’s motives in sacrificing for their partner in the past 6 months. Eight items address using approach motives while seven items address motives of avoiding negative outcomes. The
stem for an item reads, “On occasions when I sacrifice for my current partner, I generally do so because…” followed by the associated 15 approach and avoidance motives items. The participant then rates each motive on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (all the time). The eight approach questions were, “I love my partner and am concerned about his or her well-being,” “I want my partner to be happy,” “I get a great deal of pleasure out of making my partner happy,” “Just knowing that I have done a nice thing for my partner makes me feel good,” “I want to develop a closer relationship with my partner,” “I want my partner to appreciate me,” “I feel good about myself when I sacrifice for my partner,” and “I truly enjoy sacrificing for my partner.” The avoidance questions were, “I do not want my partner to think negatively about me,” “I want to avoid negative consequences from my partner,” “I feel guilty if I do not sacrifice,” “I feel less anxious when I sacrifice for my partner,” “I feel obligated to sacrifice for my partner,” “I sometimes feel that I do not desire my partner, so I sacrifice to make up for it,” and “I have to sacrifice or my partner will not love me.” The approach and avoidance variables had high internal reliability (α = .72 and .68, respectively).

To test validity, Impett et al. (2005) had approach and avoidance motives regressed simultaneously with relationship satisfaction. Approach motives were positively associated with satisfaction (β = .40, p < .001) and avoidance motives were negatively associated with satisfaction (β = -.20, p < .05). Higher scores on the approach items will suggest higher levels of approach motives for sacrificing and higher avoidance scores will suggest higher avoidance motives for sacrificing. The Cronbach Alphas for this study were .78 and .79 for wife’s approach and avoidance motives respectively and .86 and .79 for husband’s approach and avoidance motives. (See Appendix D for a copy of the measure).
Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS)

The Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Busby et al., 1995) was one of the measures used to indicate marital quality. It has three subscales: the Dyadic Consensus Subscale ($\alpha = .81$), the Dyadic Satisfaction Subscale ($\alpha = .85$), and the Dyadic Cohesion Subscale ($\alpha = .80$). The consensus subscale is composed of questions 1-6 which looks at decision making, values, and affection. The satisfaction subscale covers stability and conflict items on questions 7-10. Finally, the cohesion subscale touches upon the activities and discussion in the relationship in questions 11-14. Examples of the items that participants rate in the RDAS are: “Religious matters,” “Demonstration of affection,” “How often do you and your partner quarrel,” and “Work together on a project.” Using a 6 point Likert scale, the measure has 14 items which assesses marital satisfaction and adjustment. Possible scores range of 0-69 and total score of 69 ($\alpha = .90$). Only the total scale was used in this study. The Cronbach’s alphas for this study were .86 for husbands and .88 for wives. (See Appendix E for a copy of the measure).

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR)

The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (Schaefer and Olson, 1981) was the other indicator of marital quality in this study. While the RDAS measures the couples’ consensus, satisfaction, and cohesion, the PAIR assesses the intimacy levels of the couple. It is composed of thirty six items divided into six questions under six subscales: the Emotional Intimacy subscale ($\alpha = .75$), Social Intimacy subscale ($\alpha = .71$), Sexual Intimacy ($\alpha = .77$) subscale, Intellectual Intimacy subscale ($\alpha = .70$), Recreational Intimacy subscale ($\alpha = .70$), and Conventionality subscale. A total score is calculated by adding all the scales except the conventionality subscale. This total score was used in this study.
Schaefer and Olson report all six scales have coefficients of at least .70. PAIR looks at the degree to which each partner perceives to feel intimate in the above mentioned areas of relations (six subscales) and the degree to which each partner would expect to be intimate. Each partner responds to each of the thirty six questions rating their level of agreement or disagreement (on a 5-point Likert Scale) to the intimacy in the relationship on two items: “as it is now” (perceived) and “how he/she would like it to be” (expected). For the purposes of this study the “as it is now” (perceived) scores were only used and the research participants can receive possible scores ranging from 0 to 480. Higher scores are indicative of satisfaction while lower scores suggest a lack of fulfillment. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for this sample were .84 for husbands and .86 for wives. (See Appendix F for a copy of the measure).

Conceptual Model

Figure 1 illustrates the variables and pathways that were analyzed in this research. Approach and avoidance motives stand alone as independent, observed variables for husband and wives. The latent variable of both husbands’ and wives’ frequency of sacrifice is comprised of both their own individual perception of sacrifice frequency and perception of their partner’s sacrifice frequency. Finally, the latent variable of both husbands’ and wives’ marital quality are products of their own RDAS and PAIR scores.

The model proposes both direct and indirect associations between latent variables. It was proposed that husband’s and wife’s approach motives would have a direct, positive relationship with both their own individual and partner’s frequency of sacrifice and marital quality. There was assumed to be a positive relationship between both husband’s and wife’s frequency of sacrifice and their individual and partner’s marital quality. We proposed there would be an indirect positive association of both husband’s and wife’s approach motives to the
individual’s/partner’s frequency of sacrifice also positively relating to the individual’s/partner’s marital quality. Avoidance motives of husbands and wives were proposed to have a direct, negative relationship with their own individual and partner’s frequency of sacrifice and marital quality. Both husband’s and wife’s avoidance motives were also expected to have a negative, indirect relationship with both their own/partner’s frequency of sacrifice which thereby would have a negative association with marital quality.

Data Analysis Design

As shown in Figure 1, Structural Equation Modeling (Kline, 2005) was used to analyze the data. The data analysis model was a recursive full latent variable model (Byrne, 2001). First, the full latent variable model uses the measurement model which uses factor analysis to determine the strength of the loadings of each measure on their respective latent variable. Four latent variables were created: husband frequency of sacrifice, wife frequency of sacrifice, husband marital quality, and wife marital quality. Both husband and wife frequency of sacrifice had two indicators, self report and partner report. The factor loadings on the latent variable, husband frequency of sacrifice were .84 for self report and .89 for wife’s report and on wife frequency of sacrifice were .81 for self report and .89 for wife’s report and on wife frequency of sacrifice were .81 for self report and .86 for husband’s report about his wife. Both the latent variables, husband marital quality and wife marital quality had the respective spouse’s report on the RDAS and the PAIR. Factor loadings on the husband marital quality were .84 for PAIR and .86 for the RDAS. Factor loadings on the wife marital quality were .86 for the PAIR and .88 for the RDAS.

Structural equation modeling next estimates the strengths of both the direct and indirect paths among variables in the model and determines goodness of fit indexes that indicate how
well the hypothesized model fits the data. Following Kenny, Kashy, and Cook’s (2006) suggestions, both actor (paths from husband’s to husband’s variables and paths from wife’s to wife’s variables) and partner effects (paths from husband’s to wife’s variables and vice versa) were examined in the same analysis.

Figure 1. Actor Partner Effects Conceptual Model with husband’s approach motives, avoidance motives, wife’s approach motives, avoidance motives, husband’s frequency of sacrifice, and wife’s frequency of sacrifice predicting husband and wife marital quality
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The means, standard deviations, and ranges for all measure variables are shown in Table 2. The mean RDAS score for husbands was 50.60 with a standard deviation of 8.14 (range 23-68), and the mean RDAS score for wives was 49.43 with a standard deviation of 8.99 (range 17-66) indicating that wives scored slightly lower on average than husbands and had slightly greater variability in scores. The cutoff score for the RDAS is 48. The average PAIR score of 320.76 (S.D. = 73.31) for husbands was very similar to the mean score of 321.44 (S.D. = 80.75) for wives. Both of the PAIR scores were in the moderate range, and the range of scores on both the RDAS and the PAIR scores were in the moderate range, and the range of scores on both the RDAS and the PAIR for both husbands and wives indicate that some couples in the sample were severely distressed. Both husbands and wives reported a medium level of frequency of sacrifice with the mean scores of 84.52 and 84.31 respectively. The mean scores for husband’s view of wife’s sacrifice and vice versa were both lower than self reports for frequency of sacrifice. The mean scores for both husbands’ and wives’ approach motives (mean = 34.16, SD = 4.98; mean = 33.69, SD = 4.67) were significantly higher than both husbands and wives avoidance motives (mean = 19.33, SD = 5.41; mean = 17.99, SD = 5.68). These scores seem to represent a sample with moderate levels of marital quality, moderate levels of sacrifice from both husbands and wives, and motives leaning toward pleasing partners rather than avoiding some negative consequence.
Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Range for All Measured Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDAS (Husband)</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>23-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAS (Wife)</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>17-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIR (Husband)</td>
<td>320.76</td>
<td>73.31</td>
<td>152-452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIR (Wife)</td>
<td>321.44</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td>92-456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives for Sacrifice - Approach (Husband)</td>
<td>34.16</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>18-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives for Sacrifice - Avoid (Husband)</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives for Sacrifice - Approach (Wife)</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>17-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives for Sacrifice - Avoid (Wife)</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>7-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Perception Sacrifice (Husband)</td>
<td>84.52</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>39-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Perception Sacrifice (Wife)</td>
<td>84.31</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>57-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband’s Perception of Wife’s Sacrifice</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>25-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife’s Perception of Husband’s Sacrifice</td>
<td>53.05</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>25-104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 contains the correlations for all measured independent and dependent variables in the study. As can be seen in the table, there are high correlations between measures that would load on the same latent variable, but there were no correlating relationships among independent variables that would foreshadow problems with multicollinearity. The high correlations between husband and wife RDAS and PAIR scores suggest a high degree of similarity in the perception of their relationship quality. Husbands and wives’ scores on approach motives were also highly correlated. There were also significant positive correlations for both the husbands’ and wives’ sacrifice frequency and the perception of the sacrifice frequency by their partner. In other words, it seems as though these couples see pretty similarly the frequency with which they each sacrifice for their marriage.
Table 3. Correlations for all Measured Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at p < .05 level  
** = significant at p < .01 level  
*** = significant at p < .001 level
The standardized betas for each of the actor effects in the structural equation model are shown in Figure 2a, and the standardized betas for each of the partner effects are shown in Figure 2b. While both actor and partner effect paths were included in one analysis, the actor and partner effects are reported separately so that the reader can clearly see the various paths and their respective betas. Reporting them together involves too many paths and betas making it difficult to see all the relationships. The Goodness of Fit statistics are reported with each figure, but they are the same because only one analysis was performed.

Figure 2a. Results for Actor Effects (Analysis was done with both actor and partner effects combined into one model (Figure 1), but the results are split out for clarity and ease of reading)

As shown in Figure 2a, all but one of the pathways was statistically significant. The goodness of fit statistics (chi square = 32.62, df = 24, p = .112, CFI=.989, RMSEA=.049) all indicated that the model was a good fit with the actual data. The $R^2$ value for wives’ marital quality was .57 and husbands’ marital quality was .72.
There were statistically significant relationships between both husband and wife approach and avoidance motives and their respective reports of marital quality. The betas of .29 (p < .001) for the path from husband approach motives to husband marital quality and .32 (p < .001) for the path from wife approach motives to wife marital quality indicate a positive relationship, meaning as approach motives increase so does their respective marital quality increase. The paths from both husband and wife frequency of sacrifice to their respective reports of marital quality were statistically significant (β = .34, p < .001 and β = .20, p < .05) and positive related meaning that increases in frequency of sacrifice are positively related to self perceptions of marital quality. Both husband and wife paths from approach motives were significantly related to frequency of sacrifice for both (β = .21, p < .05 and β = .27, p < .01) indicating that higher approach motives are related to higher frequency of sacrifice for both husbands and wives. It appears from the model that approach motives not only affect marital quality directly but indirectly as well through frequency of sacrifice, and this is true for both husband and wives. The results also showed that avoidance motives for both husbands and wives are statistically, negatively related to marital quality for both (β = -.27, p < .01 and β = -.46, p < .001), but only wife avoidance motives were significantly related to her frequency of sacrifice. While it appears that her avoidance motives may be related to higher frequency of sacrifice which in turn is related to marital quality, the fact that a strong negative direct relationship exists between her avoidance motives and her marital quality seems to indicate that avoidance motives are harmful to marital quality for both wives and husbands.

The results for partner effects are reported in Figure 2b.
Figure 2b. Results for Partner Effects (Analysis was done with both actor and partner effects combined into one model (Figure 1), but the results are split out for clarity and ease of reading)

Figure 2b shows the standardized betas for partner effects in the model. The fact that these partner effects exist even when controlling for all actor effects is interesting. Husband approach motives were positively related to wife frequency of sacrifice ($\beta = .20, p < .05$) which in turn was positively related to husband’s marital quality ($\beta = .21, p < .05$). Likewise, wife approach motives were positively related to husband frequency of sacrifice ($\beta = .44, p < .001$) which in turn was positively related to wife marital quality ($\beta = .34, p < .001$). Neither the husband approach or avoidance motives were related to wife marital quality. However, both wife approach motives ($\beta = .19, p < .05$) and avoidance motives ($\beta = -.32, p < .001$) were significantly related to husband marital quality. As her avoidance motives rise, his marital quality goes down, but as her approach motives increase, his marital quality goes up.
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion and Limitations

The purpose of this research study was to understand the effects of motives for sacrificing and self-sacrificing behaviors in connection to a couple’s marital quality. Analyzing the data with structural equation modeling showed that approach and avoidance motives for sacrifice did in fact affect the individual’s marital quality. The approach motives were also related to husbands’ and wives’ actual frequency of sacrificing, but only wives’ avoidance motives were an indicator of her frequency in sacrificing. Husband’s sacrificing frequency was a strong predictor of his own marital quality and also his wife’s. The wife’s frequency of sacrifice was also related to her and his marital quality, but was not as strong of a predictor as his sacrificing frequency.

In examining the partner effects, only wives’ motives had an effect upon their partner’s marital quality. Husband’s motives were found to be a non-factor in a wife’s marital quality; rather, the husband’s actual frequency of sacrifice and the wife’s perception of his sacrificing influenced her marital quality. Husband and wives’ approach motives were related to their partner’s frequency of sacrifice, but their avoidance motives appeared to be a non-factor in affecting their partner’s frequency of sacrifice.

The findings of this research support the idea that sacrifice frequency does enhance both the individual’s and partner’s perception of marital quality. Some previous research has shown that sacrifice is related to decreased relationship satisfaction (Cramer, 2002; Fritz & Helgeson, 1998; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989) while other researchers have shown that sacrifice can be viewed as relationship commitment and is related to increased marital quality (Stanley & Markman, 1992).
Past research (Finkel et al., 2002; Johnson & Rusbult, 1989; Rusbult et al., 1991; Van Lange et al., 1997) highlighted the fact that husband’s commitment (or sacrifice) led to healthy relationship behaviors that maintained and improved relationship quality over time. The results from our research support the notion that sacrificing frequency of husbands is a strong predictor for a perception of good marital quality for both him and her (in the past 6 months). It is reasonable to speculate that his continued sacrifice would maintain and improve relationship quality over time. Whitton et al. (2002) believed that women were more socialized to sacrifice. Our findings show that both husband and wives reported about an equal amount of perceived personal sacrifice (84.52 and 84.31 by husbands and wives respectively) and partner’s sacrifice (55.33 and 53.05 by husbands and wives respectively).

Impett, et al. (2005) concluded that dating individuals who sacrifice for approach motives experienced more positive relationship quality and less relationship conflict. Other researchers (Stanley & Markman, 1992; Van Lange et al., 1997) reinforce these findings reporting that positive attitudes on sacrifice are positively related to relationship quality. Results from the research conducted confirms the finding that individually speaking husband and wives approach motives do enhance their perception of marital quality while their avoidance motives decrease their perception of marital quality. Impett et al. (2005) reports that individuals who sacrifice for avoidance motives experienced less positive relationship well-being and more relationship conflict. Whitton et al. (2002) shares similar findings in that perceptions that sacrifices are harmful to self were negatively related to relationship satisfaction.

The Perception of Sacrifice measure (Harper and Figuerres, 2008) with self and partner report was created specifically for this study. Previous research has not always used good measures of sacrifice. The differences in finding may be related to measurement differences. It is
also possible that the relationship between frequency of sacrifice and marital quality is curvilinear. In other words, as frequency of sacrifice increases to a point, it is good for marriage, but as it gets too high, it leads to lower marital quality. The analysis in the current study did not look at this possibility, but future research should take into account that this relationship may be curvilinear.

The findings related to partner effects showed that husbands’ approach and avoidance motives were not significant predictors of their wives’ marital quality. On the other hand, wives’ approach and avoidance motives affected their husbands’ marital quality even when controlling for her own actor effects. In particular, her avoidance motives were a very significant predictor of his reported marital quality. This is a surprising finding in light of the common notion that women are more concerned with the motives behind actions while men are not as concerned.

This raises questions as to why the actor effects are strong predictors of their own individual perception of marital quality, but the partner effects are only significant in wife’s motives relation to husband’s marital quality. Perhaps, there may be a certain individual self-prophesying effect in that partners who are genuinely concerned about their partners and sacrifice altruistically create a lens of perception or reality that they possess a good marriage. Individuals who feel obligated and guilty may in turn create a lens of perception or reality that they possess a poor marriage. It may be speculated that husbands and wives may have more of a major role in their actual perception of the marriage than their partners have the role of affecting. Another possibility may be that there are certain motives that the individual already brings to the relationship.

In regards to the partner effects, the data shows that wives’ marital quality is in relation to her husband’s frequency of sacrifice and is not in relation to his motives for sacrificing. The
strong predictor is the husband’s frequency of sacrifice. This gives the impression that for wives it is his actions that speak louder than his words or thoughts in his motivations. It can also be speculated that given the average years in marriage in the sample is about 18 years, perhaps at this stage in the marriage the practical actions mean much more in enhancing the marriage for her than his motives. The data shows that it is only his approach motives that have a significant relationship with her frequency of sacrificing. A possible interpretation of this data may be that husbands with approach motives influence their wives to sacrifice more and possibly perceive that he is sacrificing more, while his avoidance motives would decrease her sacrificing frequency and possibly influence her to believe that he is sacrificing less.

For husbands the data suggests that his wife’s avoidance motives have a strong influence on his perception of marital quality. It is interesting to note that it is the negative motives of his wife and not his wife’s approach motives or frequency of sacrifice (although significant) that is the stronger predictor of his perception of marital quality. Husbands may have a strong perception that their marriage is poor when their wives out of fear or compulsion sacrifice for them. It is probable that such motivations instill distance, fear, anger, resentment, and hostility which husbands see as indicative of a poorer marriage. It appears as though the wife’s approach motives and frequency of sacrifice have a positive relationship with his marital quality perception, however, not as strong of a predictor. These data findings may propose that while her approach motives and frequency of sacrifice tend to influence him to perceive his marital quality in a good light, her avoidance motives will have a significant devastating impact in influencing his perception of the marriage quality as poor.

One of the more interesting findings from this research is the concept that approach and avoidance motives can mutually exist in an individual and couple. Initially it was assumed that
both motives are present on opposite sides of the spectrum, but the findings showed that they are not strongly negatively correlated. It may be that there are particular contexts or situations in the marriage where an individual is prone to sacrifice for their partner for separate motives. Even in the same context, an individual may have both an approach and avoidance motive in sacrificing. For example, an individual may sacrifice for the motivation that they want their partner to be happy knowing that the sacrifice will make them happy, but at the same time knowing that if he/she does not do the particular sacrifice the partner will be angry with them.

Even though changes were made in this study to variables, measures, and different analysis models, the findings of this study are similar to Impett et al.’s (2005) study of dating couples. For example, Impett’s (2005) study found that approach and avoidance motives were significant predictors of dating couple’s relationship quality. In addition, they also found that on days when participants reported increases in approach, they also reported higher positive relationship quality. On days when participants reported increases in avoidance, they also reported lower positive relationship quality. The finding in the study reported here were similar results in that married couples approach and avoidance motives were significant predictors of marital quality in the actor effects as approach motives raised marital quality scores and avoidance motives lowered marital quality scores. However, wives’ motives were the only significant predictors of marital quality in the partner effects as approach motives raised marital quality scores and avoidance motives lowered marital quality scores for husbands. Husbands’ motives showed no significance in relation to wives’ marital quality. It is unclear as to why male dating partners would influence female dating partners’ relationship quality, but husbands would not influence wives’ relationship quality. Perhaps as before mentioned wives are more concerned
with the actual practical sacrificing than the motives behind them, while female dating partners are equally concerned about the motives for sacrificing.

Interdependence theory (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Kelley et al., 2003) helps explain the findings. The data would appear to support the fact that the very structure of relationships sometimes requires a sacrifice of needs and wants for the sake of the relationship. It indeed looks as if relationship functioning is dependent upon a dynamic process of individuals giving and taking. While the research did not assess the degree of similarity or difference in interests, generally speaking the data did show that the marital quality and processes (overall intimacy, cohesion, consensus, and satisfaction) were positively related to sacrificing. This research did not look specifically at the transformative processes over time, but it is highly probable that approach motives for sacrificing would increase sacrificing behavior which reinforces their approach motives to sacrifice over time. It may be assumed that through continual repetition of these processes, it would become a habit for the partners. The finding from this research suggest that there may be a more strong effect on individual transformation rather than partner transformation through sacrificing and the motives associated with them.

This study’s findings bring about a multitude of research questions that may be asked. While this research examined the frequency of sacrificing behaviors, future research would do well to look at the duration, meaningfulness of, and expectations for sacrificing. Qualitative research could further clarify questions such as “how do couples experience sacrificing motives and behaviors?” or “how do husbands experience sacrificing motives and behaviors in comparison to their wives?” Are there generational differences in sacrificing motives and behaviors? Other questions might be, “what are the antecedents that lead to motives for sacrifice and sacrifice behaviors?” or “what are the consequences that result from them?” It may be of
interest to researchers to explore the different husband-wife dyads and their differing marital quality. For example, how do high sacrificing husbands or wives compare with low sacrificing husbands or wives? Are there generalizations in differing levels of sacrificing dyads? Are there particular patterns and paths that would be similar and/or different to the findings of this study that are found in differing lengths of marriage, ethnic groups, level of husband-wife similarity, or clinical/non-clinical populations?

Clinical Implications

Marriage and family therapists can make application of these findings with their couple cases. Fowers (2000) suggested that marriage and family therapists might more thoroughly investigate values of generosity, sacrifice, and fairness in working with distressed couples as opposed to teaching problem solving and communication skills. The findings in this study support such a principle based approach in that partners’ intent or motives and sacrificial behavior seems to be a strong predictor of both husband and wife marital quality. A clinical intervention of exploring ways husbands and wives might sacrifice for each other and an examination and possible change of their motives may be fruitful. Interventions aimed at changing a wife’s motives from avoidance to more approach motives may also increase marital quality.

The Perception of Sacrifice (Harper & Figuerres, 2008) instrument may also prove to be a valuable instrument to use in both the assessment and self-exploration dimensions of therapy. Couples may find it helpful to both find out both their own and partner’s reported frequency and level of sacrificing. A clinician may guide a discussion about their findings and use interventions to develop approach motives and sacrificing behavior to enhance the marital quality and process.
A possible application of the clinical application of the findings in the current research might be in connection with a behavioral intervention. The research has found that for both husbands and wives, the increased sacrificing frequency has a positive relationship with an individual’s and partner’s perception of marital quality. Perhaps, an intervention like that of Gottman’s (1999) “love gifts” would prove helpful for couples in developing behavioral sacrificing interactions that would enhance the marriage. A cognitive intervention reinforcing approach motives may also enforce positive marital quality outcomes. Individual actor effects in this research showed that both husband and wives have greater individual sacrifice frequencies and higher individual marital quality scores. Indirectly, approach motives of individuals increases their partner’s sacrificing frequency which comes back and increases the individual’s marital quality. Other psychoeducational approaches such as the instilling of virtues (Fowers, 2000) would likely be beneficial in developing and deepening approach motive sacrifice virtues.

Limitations

One of the major limitations in this study was the low response rate for the sample. The 138 couples represented a response rate of 13%. This makes it difficult to generalize because how these 138 couples differ from the thousands who didn’t respond is not known. It may be that the length and time required to complete the questionnaire favored a more literate and educated population. Less literate populations may have not completed the questionnaire due to the perception of completing a lengthy questionnaire being outweighed by their literacy and time limitations.

Another limitation of the study is that the sampling strategy did not produce as much racial diversity as the researchers hoped. Consequently, the lack of ethnic diversity may not
generate reliable generalizations across ethnic cultures. The language barrier may have had some part in the low participation rates as all of the questionnaires were in English.

The research did not control for the couple’s similarity or differences in interests. Couples who are more similar in nature and interests may not require as much sacrificing in frequency or level. On the other side, couples who differ more in this area may need to sacrifice much more for one another for the sake of the relationship. Therefore, it is difficult to measure and compare the sacrifice for varying couples of differing levels of similarities. It may be helpful to add another instrument to examine the different types of couples sacrificing.

Finally, the complex and difficult nature of reporting on the sacrificing behaviors and motivations behind them in their relationships may have not clearly and effectively been explored in enough detail. It may be that a qualitative study would further clarify the nature of these sacrificing behaviors and motivations.

Conclusion

The findings in this study provide new insights into the effects of marital sacrifice and motives for sacrificing in relation to marital quality. Types of motives and frequency of sacrifice are not oft studied variables in marital quality research. The results shed some light on the importance and the nature of sacrificing and the motives behind them in relation to marital quality. Sacrificing may be a fundamental process in marriage that is not as negatively valenced as some theorists have tried to portray.
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Informed Consent to Participate as a Research Subject

Introduction
Kevin Figuerres, a graduate student and Professor James Harper of Brigham Young University’s School of Family Life are conducting research focused on understanding the role of motives and sacrifice in marital satisfaction.

You have been invited as a couple who may be willing to participate in this research. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may discontinue in your participation at any time. If you decide not to participate in the research, please accept the 2 dollars enclosed in the packet as a token of appreciation for your time and consideration.

Procedures
Participation involves completing the questionnaires independent of your spouse. Questions will include details about your perception of your/your partner’s sacrificing in your relationship, motives for sacrifice, and thoughts on the intimacy and relationship satisfaction and stability of your relationship. The combined measures will have a total of 115 questions which is estimated to take about 15-25 minutes. Upon completion, please put each of your completed forms back in separate pre-paid envelopes to be mailed.

Risks
There are minimal risks for participation in this study. There is the potential for discomfort associated with providing information about your experiences in marriage. Participant’s risks can be mitigated by the participant’s option to discontinue their participation with the study by not filling out the questionnaires or by referring to the AAMFT website (www.aamft.org) to locate a couple therapist in your respective areas.

Benefits
The academic field of Marriage and Family Therapy will be largely benefit from your participation in this study as we are able to increase our knowledge and understanding on these marital issues that are being researched. In addition, the data that is collected and analyzed could potentially guide and strengthen marital therapy in the future. The results of this research may specifically help other couples who come to therapy with motive and sacrifice related issues. As this study is completed, the conclusions and benefits will be released to the public in hopes of educating the general population and providing assistance for all therapists who work with couples.

Confidentiality
Although the surveys used will become the property of Brigham Young University’s School of Family Life, reasonable and appropriate actions will be taken to keep your information confidential. Confidentiality will be maintained as the participants’ questionnaires will be given an identification number which will be used in the data entry in place of the participants’ names.
Participants will write in an address on the back of the questionnaires to which they would like their visa card to be mailed to. The questionnaires will be stored in a secure, locked file cabinet in room 273 in the Comprehensive Clinic at Brigham Young University. Only a data entry team will be allowed access to these questionnaires. Upon completion of the data entry, the questionnaires with the written address will be destroyed. The electronic data form with no identifying information will be kept for 3 years and then destroyed.

Compensation
Upon our receiving of both partners forms, we will send you a 30 dollar visa card for your participation in our study. It is important to our study that both partners return questionnaires. We will send your gift card to the address that you write on the back of your questionnaires. If after 6 weeks, we have only received one partner’s form, we will send a 15 dollar Visa card to the participating partner.

Participation
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to participate entirely.

Questions about the Research
For questions about this research study, please contact Dr. James Harper or Kevin Figuerres.

James Harper, Ph.D
Professor, School of Family Life
Marriage and Family Therapy Graduate Programs
Brigham Young University
273 TLRB, P.O. Box 28601
Provo, UT 84602-8601
(801) 422-6509

Kevin Figuerres
Graduate Student, School of Family Life
Marriage and Family Therapy Program
Brigham Young University
273 TLRB, P.O. Box 28601
Provo, UT 84602-8601
(801) 422-6509

Questions about your Rights as Research Participants
If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in a research project, you may contact IRB Chair, Christopher Dromey, (801) 422-6461, dromey@byu.edu, 133 TLRB, Provo, UT 84602.

By signing this form, you acknowledge that your participation in this research study is voluntary.

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent, and desire of my own free will and volition to participate in this study.

Research Participant ___________________________ Date ________________

Research Participant ___________________________ Date ________________
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic Questionnaire

ID# _____
Age: _____
Number of Years in Current Marriage: ______
Ethnicity (check one): □ Caucasian □ African-American □ Hispanic □ Asian □ Pacific Islander □ Multiracial □ Other: Specify __________________
Annual Household Income: ____________
Appendix C: Perception of Sacrifice

Perception of Sacrifice

J. M. Harper and K. S. Figuerres

Instructions: Circle two responses for each item. **First, indicate how often you did the action (in the past 6 months) the item describes, and second, indicate how much of a sacrifice this was for you.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Circle how often <strong>you</strong> do this in your relationship</th>
<th>Indicate the level of sacrifice this is for <strong>you</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I go along when my partner wants me to go to a social event or family gathering.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I cancel or change my plans to be with my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I attend events that my partner is interested in – even if I am not personally interested in going.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I pass up personally enjoyable activities to be with my partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do favors for my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I run errands/perform chores to help my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I sacrifice occupational/house work to be with my partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I help my partner with his/her occupational/house work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I give up time to care for my partner when he/she is sick or disabled.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I sacrifice to maintain/improve my partner’s health</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I spend time with my partner’s extended family when he/she wants me to.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I limit time with my extended family to be with my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I listen and pay attention to my partner even when he/she is talking about something that I am not interested in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do things my partner’s way rather</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I buy gifts for my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I change my spending/earning habits to benefit my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I change how I interact with someone of the opposite sex to please my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I change my appearance to satisfy my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I have sex to please my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am willing not to push for sex when my partner does not want to have sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I show affection to my partner to please him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I meet my partner’s requests even when it is difficult for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I do something for others (children, extended family, neighbors, etc.) because my partner wants me to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. When making decisions, I give in to what my partner wants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I give up control and let my partner be in charge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: Circle two responses for each item. **First**, indicate how often you perceive your partner did the action (in the past 6 months) the item describes, and second, indicate how much of a sacrifice this was for him/her in your perception.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circle how often <strong>you</strong> do this in your relationship</td>
<td>Indicate the level of sacrifice this is for <strong>you</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>No Sacrifice</td>
<td>Slight Sacrifice</td>
<td>Medium Sacrifice</td>
<td>High Sacrifice</td>
<td>Extremely High Sacrifice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. My partner goes along to a social event or family gathering when I want him/her to go. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
27. My partner cancels plans to be with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
28. My partner attends an event I am interested in – even if she/he is not interested in going. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
29. My partner passes up personally enjoyable activities to be with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. My partner does favors for me.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. My partner runs errands/perform chores to help me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My partner sacrifices occupational/house work to be with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My partner helps me with my occupational/house work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My partner gives up time to care for me when I am sick or disabled.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My partner sacrifices to maintain/improve my health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My partner spends time with my family when I want her/him to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My partner limits time with her/his extended family to be with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My partner listens and pays attention when I talk about something that she/he is not interested in.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. My partner does things my way rather than her/his own way to please me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My partner buys gifts for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My partner changes her/his spending/earning habits to benefit me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My partner changes how she/he interacts with someone of the opposite sex to please me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My partner changes her/his appearance to satisfy me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. My partner has sex to please me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. My partner is willing not to push for sex when I don’t want to have sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. My partner shows affection to me to please me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. My partner meets my request even when it is difficult for her/him.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. My partner does something for others (children, extended family, neighbors, etc.) because I want her/him to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. When making decisions, my partner gives in to what I want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My partner gives up control and let me be in charge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Motives for Sacrifice

Motives for Sacrifice

B.C. Feeney and N.L. Collins adapted by E.A. Impett, S.L. Gable, and L.A. Peplau

(Below are fifteen statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1-5 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding. The 5-point scale is as follows: )

1 = never
2 = rarely
3 = sometimes
4 = frequently
5 = all the time

On occasions when I sacrifice for my current partner, I generally do so because:

1. I love my partner and am concerned about his or her well-being __
2. I want my partner to be happy __
3. I get a great deal of pleasure out of making my partner happy __
4. Just knowing that I have done a nice thing for my partner makes me feel good __
5. I want to develop a closer relationship with my partner __
6. I want my partner to appreciate me __
7. I feel good about myself when I sacrifice for my partner __
8. I truly enjoy sacrificing for my partner __
9. I do not want my partner to think negatively about me __
10. I want to avoid negative consequences from my partner (e.g. anger) __
11. I feel guilty if I do not sacrifice __
12. I feel less anxious when I sacrifice for my partner __
13. I feel obligated to sacrifice for my partner __
14. I sometimes feel that I do not deserve my partner, so I sacrifice to make up for it __
15. I have to sacrifice or my partner will not love me __
Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>Occasional Agree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Always Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Religious matters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstration of affection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Making major decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating of your relationship?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How often do you and your partner quarrel?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How often do you and your mate “get on each other’s nerves”?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Work together on a project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Calmly discuss something</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

M. T. Schaefer and D. H. Olson

INSTRUCTIONS: This inventory is used to measure different kinds of intimacy in your relationship. You should indicate your response to each statement by using the following five point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How it is NOW</th>
<th>How I would LIKE IT TO BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two steps in answering each item. In the "How it is NOW" column, you should respond in the way you feel about the item in the present. In the "How I would LIKE IT TO BE" column, if you could have your relationship to be any way you might want it to be, you would answer accordingly in that column. So you should have a number written in both columns for every item.

1. My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to.
2. We enjoy spending time with other couples.
3. I am satisfied with our sex life.
4. My partner helps me clarify my thoughts.
5. We enjoy the same recreational activities.
6. My partner has all of the qualities I've always wanted in a mate.
7. I can state my feelings without him/her getting defensive.
8. We usually "keep to ourselves".
9. I feel our sexual activity is just routine.
10. When it comes to having a serious discussion, it seems we have little in common.
11. I share in few of my partner's interests.
12. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my partner.
13. I often feel distant from my partner.
14. We have few friends in common.
15. I am able to tell my partner when I want sexual intercourse.
16. I feel "put-down" in a serious conversation with my partner.
17. We like playing together.
18. Every new thing I have learned about my partner has pleased me.
19. My partner can really understand my hurts and joys.
20. Having time together with friends is an important part of our shared activities.
21. I "hold back" my sexual interest because my partner makes me feel uncomfortable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>22. I feel it is useless to discuss some things with my partner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>23. We enjoy the out-of-doors together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>25. I feel neglected at times by my partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>26. Many of my partner's closest friends are also my closest friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>27. Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>28. My partner frequently tries to change my ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>29. We seldom find time to do fun things together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>30. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my partner and I when we are with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>31. I sometimes feel lonely when we're together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>32. My partner disapproves of some of my friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>33. My partner seems disinterested in sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>34. We have an endless number of things to talk about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35. I feel we share some of the same interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36. I have some needs that are not being met by my relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>