

2015

Infidelity, Trust, Commitment, and Marital Satisfaction Among Military Wives During Husbands' Deployment

Myriam Levesque McCray
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Military and Veterans Studies Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Myriam McCray

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Kimberley Cox, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Frederica Hendricks-Noble, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Susan Rarick, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2015

Abstract

Infidelity, Trust, Commitment, and Marital Satisfaction Among Military Wives During

Husbands' Deployment

Myriam Levesque McCray

MA, American Intercontinental University, 2007

BS, University of Quebec, 2003

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

May 2015

Abstract

Over 1.5 million U.S. soldiers have deployed overseas since the beginning of the War on Terror in 2001; consequently, spouses are faced with new physical, emotional, and psychological challenges. Many researchers have documented the effects of deployment on marriages and families. However, few researchers have explored the correlates of trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for wives during deployment. This quantitative study, grounded in risk and resilience theory and interdependence theory, used a web-based survey to investigate the relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction in a sample of 127 military wives whose husbands were deployed overseas. The “Events with Others” questionnaire, Dyadic Trust Scale, Commitment Inventory Revised, Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale, and Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale were used. Results indicated that length of deployment did not have a statistically significant impact on marital satisfaction. Bivariate correlation analysis indicated statistically significant relationships among wives’ perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction. After controlling for wives’ attachment style, marital commitment and trust were significant explanatory variables of marital satisfaction. The findings from this study can inform establishing effective programs to support military marriages during deployment. Such programs will promote social change by improving satisfaction, decreasing relationship conflicts, and reducing the rate of divorce. The Armed Forces may benefit from the results of this study by addressing marital commitment and trust issues prior to deployment, thereby supporting wives, husbands, and children during deployment.

Infidelity, Trust, Commitment, and Marital Satisfaction Among Military Wives During
Husbands' Deployment

by

Myriam Levesque McCray

MA, American Intercontinental University, 2007

BS, University of Quebec, 2003

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

May 2015

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to all spouses of service members whose commitment to the service members and our country is greatly appreciated. You are often forgotten despite the fact that you are the backbone of our armed forces. A military spouse is often left caring for children, worrying about a spouse in the line of danger, and all the while feeling emotionally and intimately deprived. A military spouse needs some encouragement to get through the tough times. A military spouse needs recognition for the countless hours of increased household duties in the absence of a mate. I am grateful for your sacrifice and commitment, and I admire your resilience. You and your children are heroes that are often forgotten. Elizabeth Edwards demonstrated resilience throughout her challenging life, and she hoped that her grandchildren would once be able to say, “She stood in the storm, and when the wind did not blow her way (and it surely has not), she adjusted her sails.” This saying applies to all military spouses who had to cope with the realities of deployment.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my family and faculty for the support offered throughout my doctoral program. Their encouragement and support helped me remain dedicated throughout this long journey. My husband, Alfredrick McCray, has endured long hours of loneliness while I stayed up or went away to clear my mind and brainstorm new ideas. My children, Alex, Ashley, Isaac, and Angelina, never gave up on me, but rather believed in me and my ability to complete this research project. Their words of encouragement and prayers kept me motivated and believing that there would be a light at the end of the tunnel. Dr. Kimberley Cox, my dissertation chairperson and mentor, provided invaluable guidance and assistance throughout the entire research process. Personal faith in God has kept me hopeful and believing that through Him who strengthens me, nothing is impossible.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Nature of This Study.....	5
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	7
Purpose of the Study	8
Theoretical Framework.....	9
Definitions of Terms	12
Assumptions.....	13
Scope and Delimitations	14
Limitations	15
Significance.....	17
Summary	18
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	20
Military Marriages	21
Domestic Violence.....	22
Suicide	23
Divorce.....	25
Isolation.....	28
Work Related Issues	29

Support Programs for Military Wives.....	29
Duty Overseas.....	34
Effect on Couples	34
Stages of Deployment	38
Separation and Trust	43
Trust	44
Infidelity	47
Marital Commitment.....	49
Theoretical Framework of the Study	52
Overview of Interdependence Theory	52
Overview of Risk and Resilience Theory	53
Interdependence and Risk and Resilience Approaches	54
Attachment Theory	54
Review of the Literature on Methods.. ..	56
Summary.. ..	58
Chapter 3: Research Methods	61
Research Design and Approach.....	61
Population and Sample.. ..	63
Instrumentation and Materials.	64
Sociodemographic Questionnaire	65
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	65
Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale.....	67

Dyadic Trust Scale	68
Events With Others.....	69
Revised Commitment Inventory	70
Experience in Close Relationship-Revised Questionnaire	71
Data Collection Procedures.....	72
Validity	74
Data Analysis.....	75
Measures for the Protection of Participants Rights.....	76
Summary.....	76
Chapter 4: Results	79
Data Collection.....	81
Descriptive and Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Sample	84
Scale Reliability	88
Results.....	92
Bivariate Correlation.....	93
Hypothesis 1.....	93
Hypothesis 2.....	94
Hypothesis 3.....	95
Hypothesis 4.....	95
Summary of Findings.....	97
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations	98
Study Overview.....	99

Interpretation of Findings.	101
Length of Deployment and Marital Satisfaction.....	101
Percieved Likelihood of Spousal Infidelity and Trust	102
Trust and Marital Commitment	103
Controlling for Attachment Styles	104
Theoretical Framework.....	106
Limitations of the Study.....	108
Implications for Social Change.....	110
Recommendations for Future Research.	112
Conclusion.	113
References.....	116
Appendix A: Sociodemographic Questionnaire	132
Appendix B: Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale	134
Appendix C: Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale	136
Appendix D: Dyadic Trust Scale	138
Appendix E:Events with Others.....	140
Appendix F: Commitment Inventory Revised.....	144
Appendix G: Experience in Close Relationships-Revised.....	146

List of Tables

Table 1. Central Tendency, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis	83
Table 2. Decriptive Statistics	86
Table 3. Pearson Correlation Between DTS, CI, KMSS, and RDAS.....	93
Table 4. Regression Summary <i>ECR-R, DTS, CI, and KMSS</i>	96
Table 5. Regression Summary <i>ECR-R, DTS, CI, and RDAS</i>	97

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Background

By the end of 2010, there were over 1,471,570 active duty military personnel employed by the U.S. Armed Forces (Department of Defense, 2010b). The Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (2014) reported 2.25 million military personnel were employed by the Department of Defense (DOD) in 2013, and there were more family members (57.8%) than Active Duty members (42.2%) reported by the Department of Defense. As a result of the War on Terror (WOT), more than 1.5 million soldiers have been deployed since 2001, and consequently, military marriages have been faced with new challenges (Johnson et al., 2007). For the purpose of this study, deployed service members were identified as husbands, while spouses were identified as wives. According to the National Healthy Marriage Resource Center (NHMRC; 2006), the definition of deployment is when a service member must report to duty somewhere other than a permanent duty station without family members. Deployment length is variable and depends on factors such as branch of service, career field, and time period needed to complete the mission. Currently, deployment related to the War on Terror ranges from 6 to 15 months. Numerous researchers agree that challenges in military families, such as frequent relocations, deployments, difficult work conditions, financial struggles, and living away from family and friends are unique to this population (Allen, Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2010; Basham, 2008; Eaton et al., 2008; Gambardella, 2008; Huebner, Mancini, Bowen, & Orthner, 2009; Kotrla & Dyer, 2008; Sherwood, 2009; SteelFisher, Zaslavsky, & Blendon, 2008). According to McNulty (2005), military wives'

needs for health care have increased as a result of deployments. Furthermore, military couples tend to experience higher levels of stress, depression, and anxiety during deployment (Bagley, Munjas, & Shekelle, 2010; McNulty, 2005; Olmstead, Blick, & Mills, 2009; Orthner & Rose, 2009).

Divorce (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010; Lundquist, 2007), domestic violence (DV; McCarroll et al., 2008; Somerville, 2009), and suicidal behaviors (Bagley, et al., 2010; Bell, Harford, Amoroso, Hollander, & Kay, 2010; Martin, Ghahramanlou-Holloway, Lou, & Tucciarone, 2009; Selby et al., 2010) are other serious consequences of deployment that are often encountered by military couples. Deployment can also increase some marital conflicts leading to financial disagreement, infidelity and mistrust, parental disagreement as well as legal separation and marital dissolution (Lincoln, Swift, & Shorteno-Fraser, 2008).

Trust is a core component affecting marital functioning (Campbell, Simpson, Boldry, & Rubin, 2010; Lazelere & Huston, 1980; van de Rijt & Buskens, 2006). Trust is the extent to which an individual is willing to risk getting close to an intimate partner (Lazelere & Huston, 1980). According to Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster, and Agnew (1999), trust is the reflection of commitment and prorelationship behaviors from one partner toward the other, such as a desire to meet a partner's needs and interests. Betrayal of one's trust can lead a partner to withdraw emotionally (Brimhall, Wampler, & Kimball, 2008; Campbell et al., 2010). In turn, withdrawal can lead to avoidance and decreased positive and healthy communications. Factors affecting trust include lack of prorelationship behaviors, past betrayal, and lack of communication. In addition,

according to Hertlein, Wetchler, and Piercy (2005), trust can be greatly affected by a partner's infidelity. Hertlein et al. defined infidelity as cyber, sexual, or emotional involvement with someone other than the intimate partner. According to Amato and Rogers (1997), sexual infidelity was a significant predictor of future divorce. In a study conducted by Alt (2006), as many as 69% of military wives believed that infidelity is a reoccurring behavior during deployment. Past or current betrayal can lead to emotional withdrawal, consequently affecting communication and trust between partners (Brimhall et al., 2008). Couples separated due to deployment often do not have the necessary time to address trust issues and to communicate emotions related to betrayal prior to deployment. While wives often feel isolated during deployment and may not be able to cope with these emotional challenges, military personnel tend to form a strong and deep bond with fellow deployed soldiers (Sherwood, 2009).

Marital commitment is an individual's willingness to put the marital relationship before other commitments such as friends, family, and work (Stanley & Markman, 1992). According to Stanley and Markman (1992), there are two types of commitment: constraint commitment and personal dedication. These two aspects of commitment will be explored in more detail in Chapter 2. For the purpose of the present study, the focus remained on personal dedication rather than constraint commitment. According to Stanley and Markman, personal dedication is often related to marital satisfaction. Personal dedication can be demonstrated by prorelationship behaviors and attitudes demonstrating an individual's devotion to the relationship. Wives married to military personnel who are deployed can feel a sense of abandonment (Allen et al., 2010).

Consequently, wives who believe that their husbands may be unfaithful to the marriage during a military deployment may have lower level of trust. Lower trust level could potentially affect wives' marital commitment, which could then impact marital satisfaction of both partners.

There is a large body of research supporting the challenges faced by military couples and the effect of deployment on marital functioning. There is also research demonstrating the relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction in nonmilitary marriages (Kelley & Thibault, 1978; Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998; Wieselquist et al, 1999). However, there is a lack of research concerning the effect of deployment on military marriages, more specifically exploring the level to which wives perceive their husbands' likelihood of infidelity to the marriage. A perception of high likelihood of marital infidelity could negatively impact wives' trust towards their husbands, consequently affecting marital commitment of wives and overall marital satisfaction during deployment. The purpose of the present study was to explore possible issues faced by military couples during deployment, which could impact the job performance and retention of military personnel, divorce rate, domestic violence rate, psychological needs of military personnel and spouses, and suicide rate in the military. More specifically, in the study I expanded on the knowledge and understanding of the relationship between perceived likelihood of marital infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives whose husbands are deployed. In addition, sociodemographic variables were added as new elements to current understanding. To control for external factors, wives' attachment styles were assessed in relation to trust and

marital commitment. Chapter 2 addresses in more detail the current literature regarding the Armed Forces and the impact of deployment on marital functioning.

Statement of the Problem

Over 1.5 million soldiers have been deployed since the beginning of War on Terror in 2001 and consequently, spouses are faced with new challenges (Johnson et al., 2007). Challenges include anxiety, infidelity, mistrust, domestic violence, poor job performance, and divorce (Lincoln et al., 2008). As a result, there has been an increased need for physical and psychological healthcare for military wives (McNulty, 2005). Furthermore, the divorce rate in the Army has increased in the last decade (Adler-Baeder et al., 2005; Renshaw, Rodrigues, & Jones, 2008), but the causes remain unclear. An initial review of the literature revealed that marital satisfaction impacts partners' wellbeing (Avellar & Smock, 2005; Grinstein-Weiss & Sherraden, 2006; Waite & Gallagher, 2000), and that the nature of the relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during deployment is unclear. The research problem addressed in this study concerned whether or not there were significant relationships between perceived likelihood of infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for wives during deployment. Wives' attachment styles were also explored in relation to trust level to control for this external factor.

Nature of This Study

In this quantitative study, I employed the survey method to examine whether or not there is a relationship between perceived likelihood of infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction among military wives during their husbands'

deployment. To control for attachment styles, wives' attachment styles were assessed. I also assessed the influence of sociodemographic variables such as age group, military affiliation (Army, Air Force, Marine, Navy, Reserve, or National Guard), ethnicity, husbands' military rank, years married, frequency of deployments, expected length of current deployment, and number of children, as they relate to trust and marital satisfaction during deployment.

I employed bivariate correlational and multiple regression analyses. Correlations were conducted to evaluate relationships between perceived likelihood of infidelity and trust, between trust and marital commitment, as well as between marital commitment and marital satisfaction of wives. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictive strength that the predictor variables of trust and marital commitment had on the criterion variable of marital satisfaction after controlling for wives' attachment styles.

A convenience sample of 127 wives whose husbands are deployed were asked to provide sociodemographic information and complete six scales: the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS; Busby, Crane, Larson, & Christiansen, 1995) and the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMSS; Schumm, Paff-Bergen, Hatch, & Obiorah, 1986) measured marital satisfaction, the Dyadic Trust Scale (DTS; Larzelere & Huston, 1980) measured trust level, the Events with Others instrument (Shackelford & Buss, 2000) measured the likelihood of husbands to commit adultery based on wives' perceptions, four items from the Commitment Inventory (CI; Stanley & Markman (1992) assessed wives' marital commitment, and the Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised questionnaire (ECR-R; Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) assessed wives' attachment

styles. In Chapter 3, I provide a more detailed explanation of these scales and the research methodology of the present study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions and hypotheses were derived from a review of the literature in the areas of military marriages, commitment, trust, and marital satisfaction. A more detailed explanation of the methods used to answer each question is provided in Chapter 3. Four research questions and hypotheses were used in the present study:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between military wives' marital satisfaction and length of husbands' deployment?

H₀1: Longer length of husbands' deployment will predict lower levels of wives' marital satisfaction.

H_a1: Shorter length of husbands' deployment will predict higher levels of wives' marital satisfaction.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between military wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment?

H₀2: There is no relationship between wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment.

H_a2: There is a negative relationship between wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between trust and marital commitment of military wives during husbands' deployment?

H₀₃: There is no relationship between trust and marital commitment of married military wives during husbands' deployment.

H_{a3}: There is a positive relationship between trust and marital commitment for married military wives during husbands' deployment.

Research Question 4: After controlling for attachment styles of wives, is there a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment?

H₀₄: After controlling for wives' attachment styles, there is no relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for married military wives during husbands' deployment.

H_{a4}: After controlling for wives' attachment styles, there is a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to expand on the understanding of the relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives whose husbands are deployed. Sociodemographic variables were added as new factors to current knowledge in this area. Lastly, to control for attachment styles, wives' attachment styles were assessed in relation to trust, commitment, and marital satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

According to Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro, and Hannon (2002), observation of prorelationship behaviors of one's partner, often demonstrated by marital commitment and fidelity, can significantly impact the level of trust for the receiving partner. Trust is a critical component of relationships, which can assist couples in coping with marital conflicts and compromising situations, consequently increasing marital satisfaction (Finkel et al., 2002; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004). According to a study conducted by Kurdek (2002), over time, a decrease in love, liking, and trust was a significant predictor of low level of marital satisfaction as well as separation and divorce. Prorelationship behaviors and the perceived sacrifice of one's partner for the wellbeing of the other are also significant predictors of marital satisfaction (Allen et al., 2010). During deployment, wives could feel a sense of neglect and abandonment and may even perceive the husbands' behaviors as being promilitary rather than prorelationship, thereby affecting marital functioning. According to the risk and resilience theoretical perspective, wives who are separated from their husbands due to work demands tend to feel a sense of confusion but also a deeper sense of resilience (Orthner & Rose, 2009). As applied to this study, the risk and resilience theory (Orthner & Rose, 2009) held expectations that wives of deployed military personnel would perceive their husbands' marital commitment as low, in part because of the husbands' dedication to the military. In turn, wives' personal dedication would be impacted by this perception, consequently leading to increased resilience and independence and decreased marital commitment for wives.

Interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibault, 1978) demonstrates the relationship between commitment, prorelationship behaviors, trust, and marital satisfaction (Rusbult et al., 1998; Wieselquist et al., 1999). This theory stipulates that trust develops largely from prior experiences and not solely from personality traits as presented in attachment theory (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). As applied to the present study, interdependence theory held expectations that levels of trust would impact marital commitment and marital satisfaction for military wives. Furthermore, wives' attachment styles would not be the sole factor impacting the level of trust for military wives.

According to Kelly and Thibaut (1978), individuals are willing to remain in relationships that are perceived as equitable and able to meet their needs. As a marriage progresses, individuals invest themselves and expect their partner to do the same, consequently reaching a form of interdependence, in terms of setting goals for the future and demonstrating prorelationship behaviors (Kelly & Thibaut, 1978). According to interdependence theory, prorelationship behaviors and marital commitment prompt individuals to maintain the relationship (Kelly & Thibaut, 1978). Stafford and Canary (1991) examined perceptions of relational maintenance strategies in different relationship types and genders. Relationship types for the purpose of the study referred to married, engaged, seriously dating, and dating. Furthermore, Stafford and Canary explored the manner in which perceptions of partner's behaviors can affect commitment, liking, and satisfaction. Infidelity, for example, has been found to have negative consequences on marital relationships, such as leading to anger, disappointment, low self-image, and self-doubt (Buunk, 1995). Spousal infidelity ultimately leads to loss of trust and feelings of

abandonment (Charny & Parnass, 1995). As such, wives' perception of their husband's ability to remain faithful during deployment would affect their level of trust.

According to Stafford and Canary (1991) commitment and satisfaction are crucial components of intimate relationships. Furthermore, perception rather than the actual behavior of one's partner reflects an individual's experiences with interactions (Stafford & Canary, 1991). Wives' perceptions of their husbands' marital commitment will therefore likely reflect their interaction with the behavior (perceived rather than actual). Kelley and Thibaut (1978) mentioned that a satisfying relationship is one where the rewards exceed the costs. Thus, within the tenets of interdependence theory, higher marital satisfaction and poor alternatives increase the dependence of partners in a relationship (Rusbult et al., 1998). According to Wieselquist et al. (1999), commitment and trust are critical components of a relationship, impacting the ability of one to be satisfied with their relationship as presented in interdependence theory. A more recent study conducted by Campbell et al. (2010) using the interdependence model, found that trust significantly impacted marital quality.

In summary, as applied to the present study, risk and resilience theoretical perspective (Orthner & Rose, 2009) as well as interdependence based theory (Kelly & Thibaut, 1978) helped predict marital commitment, trust level, and marital satisfaction for military wives whose husbands are deployed. However, to control for other variables, the wives' attachment styles were measured in relation to trust level. It was critical to study the preservation of military marriages, particularly since high marital functioning is often associated with physical and psychological health as well as life satisfaction (McNulty,

2005; Orthner & Rose, 2009). Risk and resilience theory and interdependence-based theory are further addressed in Chapter 2.

Definition of Terms

Army Community Service (ACS): A team of individuals providing advocacy, prevention, resources, financial assistance, employment assistance, relocation assistance to Army soldiers and their families (Albano, 1994).

Family Readiness Group (FRG): A group providing support, outreach, and resources to military families. The FRG also serves as a liaison between family members and military personnel's unit through websites, rosters, and e-mail distribution (Albano, 1994).

Infidelity: Cyber, sexual, or emotional involvement with someone other than one's spouse (Hertlein et al., 2005).

Marital commitment: Recognizing the rewards and values of the current marriage while ignoring or devaluating the possible alternatives. The marriage is the most valued priority in the heart of the individual (Stanley & Markman, 1992).

Marital satisfaction: A state of contentment and happiness with the functioning of one's marriage (Rusbult et al., 1998).

Military personnel: Individuals serving in any of the major branches of the U.S. military, including the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corp, and Coast Guard.

Military wives: Women married to military personnel.

Military chaplain: A chaplain who attempts to serve the spiritual needs of military personnel and their family members. Chaplains tend to have access to most military wives during deployment.

Military deployment: Military personnel going away for military duty. Deployments can be war-related or related to other missions in many different countries.

Relocation: A required move to a new state or country, in order to meet the needs of the military's mission.

Trust: The extent to which an individual is willing to risk getting close to their partner (Lazelere & Huston, 1980)

War on Terror or Overseas Contingency Operation: Includes the missions Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan beginning in 2001 and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) in Iraq, beginning in 2003 (Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (2014).

Assumptions

It was assumed that the participants in the study were honest and accurate when answering the demographic and survey questions. It was also assumed that participants would possess enough knowledge about their marriage to be able to provide accurate information. It was assumed that the KMSS and the RDAS questionnaires were psychometrically effective assessment tools for identifying marital satisfaction. Furthermore, it was assumed that participants were residents of the United States over the age of 18 years old and wives of deployed military personnel. Moreover, it was assumed that wives' attachment styles did not play a mediator role in wives' marital satisfaction.

To control for this external factor, wives' attachment styles were assessed in relation to trust and marital commitment.

Scope and Delimitations

In this study, 127 wives of deployment service members voluntarily completed an online demographic questionnaire and survey. All wives over the age of 18 years old who reported that their husbands were deployed at the time of the study were included in the study. The participants were asked to read and understand the informed consent form, outlining the purpose of the study and any ethical considerations. The participants provided basic demographic information and completed the KMSS, RDAS, and DTS, four items of the CI, ECR-R, and the "Events with Others" Questionnaire. Participants were not asked to provide any identifying information.

The present study could have been extended to other populations in which spouses are obligated to travel for work demands, such as executive members of organizations, truck drivers, firefighters, and pilots. According to Atkins, Baucom, and Jacobson (2001), infidelity is more likely to occur with frequent work-related travels. It is suggested that spouses of employees who travel frequently for work purposes are faced similar challenges as military wives, such as increased likelihood of infidelity and lower level of trust and marital satisfaction. It is not implied that military marriages are the only marriages that are challenged by frequent relocations and time away from home. Infidelity, trust, and lack of commitment to the marriage can be generalized beyond the military population. Attachment styles, parental experiences, past experiences within the marriage as well as experiences in previous relationships can all have an impact on an

individual to trust and feel committed to the marriage. Women who chose to marry members of the Armed Forces likely had an idea of the challenges that would be associated with their husbands' employment. They may have some characteristics in common such as high level of self-efficacy, independence, and resilience prior to the marriage. In the same sense, military personnel are taught early on in their career to be dependent on one another and committed to the military mission first and foremost. In this respect, it could be the nature of the wives' characters and husbands' engagement to the military, not necessarily deployment that led to marital challenges. Participants in the present study were military wives over the age of 18 years old. Wives were located in different bases or posts throughout the United States, and the study did not extend to wives who were stationed in other countries such as Japan, Germany, and Korea. The sample only comprised wives whose husbands were deployed at the time of the study, and thus, omitted data from wives whose husbands had recently returned from deployment.

Limitations

There were several potential limitations of the present study. Limitations include, but are not limited to, incomplete data due to inconsistent responding to survey items or dishonest responses.

Self-administered online surveys are convenient as they can reach a wide range of the population in numerous geographical areas. On the other hand, there are some limitations to online surveys. Self-administered surveys can permit participants to answer in a way that is quick and convenient rather than accurate, consequently affecting the

results. Participants can also opt to answer based on what makes them look good rather than what is true of their situation (Allen et al., 2010; Kurdek, 2002; Lawrence et al., 2008; Wright, 2005). Similarly, according to Dillman (2000), participants completing online or web-based surveys may opt to skip questions more expediently than would participants who are completing paper surveys. No time constraints were given for participants to complete surveys, and the data collection span could have affected the participants' answers depending on their mood or relationship challenges at the time of completion of certain items. Fluctuations in wives' mood could impact responses. In addition, it is possible that other factors within the home could have impacted wives' response patterns during certain periods of deployment, such as children's needs, household chores, and other family activities that may feel overwhelming at times. The aforementioned factors could possibly impact response rate, bias, and overall validity of findings.

In the present study, perceived probability of infidelity was measured using the "Events with Others" questionnaire. Wives' perceptions can be affected by multiple other factors from current as well as past experiences. In addition, only subjective perceptions are measured, not concrete quantifiable measures of absolute outcomes. It is therefore advised to proceed with caution when considering the multitude of factors that could potentially impact wives' perceptions.

Significance

The purpose of the study was to expand understanding of the possible relationships between perceived likelihood of infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives whose husbands were deployed.

Since the beginning of the Global War on Terrorism, over 1.5 million military personnel have deployed (Johnson et al., 2007). Consequently, there has been an increase in the divorce rate, domestic violence cases, and psychological health care needs for military wives (McNulty, 2005). A large body of research has demonstrated the relationship between deployment and low marital satisfaction of military couples, but the cause remains unclear. By gaining new understanding of this relationship, the military organization may be able to explore new avenues in prevention and treatment of commitment and trust issues in the predeployment phase, rather than following deployment. Military wives often experience challenges due to lengthy and frequent deployments. Some couples are not prepared for long-term separation, which can create stress and concerns during deployment, consequently affecting communication between partners (McNulty, 2005). Marital functioning could be especially impacted during deployment if the couples were dealing with trust issues prior to deployment. As a result of this study, military couples may be better educated on how to deal with trust issues at all three phases of deployment (predeployment, deployment, and postdeployment). As the divorce rate continues to increase in the military, it would be advantageous to obtain a better understanding of the impact of trust on marital satisfaction and to potentially offer new marital educational program, particularly addressing marital commitment and trust

issues. It is hypothesized that long-term positive marital commitment and higher trust level during deployment could increase marital functioning of military couples at all phases of deployment. This could consequently increase military personnel's job performance, military retention, life satisfaction for husbands and wives, and decrease psychological health issues, suicide rate, separation, and marriage dissolution.

Summary

Military wives experience challenges that are unique to this population. Separation due to deployment can increase the stress and anxiety level of military couples, especially when conflicts are unresolved (Olmstead, et al., 2009). Consequently, suicide and divorce rates have increased among the military population, which can greatly impact the work performance and life satisfaction of many military personnel and their family members (Bagley et al., 2010; McNulty, 2005; Orthner & Rose, 2009). Poor marital satisfaction can impact more than the partners and their children; it can also affect the military mission and consequently the nation's wellbeing (Albano, 1994; Department of the Army, 2008). High divorce rates affect partners, children, friends, families, the military, and the community at different levels. Exploring the issues of perceived likelihood of infidelity, trust, and marital commitment in relation to marital satisfaction can increase knowledge in this area and perhaps help create more appropriate marriage education curriculums, addressing these issues for couples prior to deployment as a prevention method. In Chapter 2, I present a review of the literature integrating a wide range of scholarly work on the theory of risk and resilience and interdependence theory to establish their significance and need for current research. Military marriages,

deployment, wives' marital commitment, trust, likelihood of infidelity, and marital satisfaction are also addressed in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 addresses methodology, including the study's design, procedures, sample, data collection, and data analysis. In Chapter 4, I provide the descriptive statistics, instruments used, and statistical analyses. In Chapter 5, I provide an overall summary of the current study, including interpretation of findings, and overviews of the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and an explanation of how the current study could have social change implications for military wives and couples faced with deployment.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The literature review begins with a brief overview of military marriages and some common challenges faced by military couples. Information on commitment, satisfaction, and trust are discussed in relation to military marriages. The theoretical concepts of interdependence and risk and resilience are also presented. More specifically, interdependent and risk and resilience theoretical approaches are examined in relation to perceived likelihood of infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during their husbands' deployment. Research related to the role that commitment and trust play in marital satisfaction is discussed. The review of related research and literature also includes comparisons and complementary characteristics of interdependence theory and attachment theory. Literature supporting the use of the measures and the methodology chosen for the present study was reviewed. Finally, the need for further research in the presented area is discussed.

An online, digital search of the literature was performed using psychological, social science, human science, and military research databases. The strategy used for reviewing the literature consisted of an intense scan of literature using the following key terms: *military marriages*, *military deployment*, *marital commitment*, *trust*, *infidelity*, and *marital satisfaction* whether individually or in combination with one another. A comprehensive literature search strategy was employed, choosing filters that exclusively selected peer-reviewed journals, books, and government documents derived from multiple databases. The primary databases used for this literature review were Academic

Search Premier, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, Military and Government Collection, and SocINDEX with Full Text. A date range of 2003 to 2013 was selected, with preference for research published within the last 5 years.

Military Marriages

As of December 2010, there were over 1,471,570 active duty military personnel employed by the U.S. Armed Forces (Department of Defense, 2010b). Of these military personnel, there were (a) 564,926 serving in the Army, (b) 327,447 serving in the Navy, (c) 202,433 serving in the Marine Corps, (d) 334,561 serving in the Air Force, and (e) 42,202 serving in the Coast Guard (Department of Defense, 2010b). According to the Department of Defense (2009), 86% of these military personnel were men, and according to the Department of Defense (2010a) approximately 20% were serving overseas in September 2010. Because of the constant movement and relocation and the importance of secrecy, it is difficult to give an exact account of the number of deployed military personnel. Active duty service members tend to be younger than that of the civilian work force (Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, 2006). In 2006, almost 50% of active component enlisted members were between the ages of 17 to 24 years old compared to nearly 14% of the comparable civilian work force. Officers in both, the active duty and reserve components also tend to be younger in age when compared to similar civilian workers. Enlisted and officers male service members, from both active and reserve components are more likely to be married than female service members, and service members are more likely to be married than their civilian counterparts (Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, 2006). In 2013, there were 391,383 Selected Reserve

spouses, in which the majority (87.5%) were female, and 689,344 active duty spouses, in which 92.7% were female. In the Marine Corps active component, 97.5% of spouses are wives, whereas the Air Force only has 89.7% spouses who are female. According to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (2014), 35% of wives of active duty service members were not in the labor force and not interested in working.

Based on a report from the National Healthy Marriage Resource Center (2006), half of military personnel were married, while approximately 90% of military spouses were wives. For the purpose of the present study, the focus will remain on military personnel's wives, rather than husbands. The wives in the present study are themselves nonmilitary and, will be referred to as spouses, partners, or wives, while military husbands will be referred to as soldiers, military personnel, partners, or husbands.

A large number of researchers agree that military couples are faced with challenges that are unique to this population (Allen et al. , 2010; Basham, 2008; Eaton et al., 2008; Gambardella, 2008; Huebner et al., 2009; Kotrla & Dyer, 2008; Sherwood, 2009; SteelFisher et al., 2008). Challenges include but are not limited to (a) frequent moves, (b) multiple deployments, (c) frequent travels, (d) long work hours, (e) difficult work conditions, (f) loss of friends, (g) loss of job for the nonmilitary spouses, and (h) shift in life priorities. Consequently, serious issues can arise within the military community such as domestic violence, isolation, suicide, divorce, or work-related issues.

Domestic Violence

Research has shown that DV is a prominent and serious issue faced by military couples (Marshall, Panuzio, & Taft, 2005; McCarroll et al., 2008; Somerville, 2009).

McCarroll et al. (2008) explored the issues of DV within the military community at a U.S. Army installation from 1997 to 2005. The authors reported the need to assist “1,417 clients in 1,380 physical and 301 verbal abuse incidents” (McCarroll et al., 2008, p. 865). The leading arguments or triggers for these abusive behaviors in this particular study were primarily associated with “marital discord, jealousy, and infidelity” (McCarroll et al., 2008, p. 868). It can be challenging for military couples to experience marital discords in the mist of relocations or work-related demands. They must learn to approach marital issues with loving emotions rather than physical forces, which is contrary to military training.

Suicide

Many researchers have reported high risk of suicidal behavior in soldiers serving in the U.S. military (Bagley et al., 2010; Bell et al., 2010; Martin et al., 2009; Scoville, Gubata, Potter, White, & Pearse, 2007; Seal et al., 2008; Selby et al., 2010). Researchers have also suggested that the rate of suicide tends to be lower in the military population during peace time, but higher when involving deployment to the war zone (Bagley et al., 2010; Lopez, 2009; Martin et al., 2009; Selby et al., 2010). Suicide is a complex behavior involving multiple injury factors. Researchers have demonstrated common risk factors affecting the military population such as (a) affective disorder, (b) mood disorders (i.e., major depressive disorder), (c) substance abuse, (d) psychiatric disorders, (e) mental injury (i.e., traumatic brain injury), (f) recent traumatic life event such as exposure to war zone, and (g) male gender (Bagley et al., 2010; Bell et al., 2010; Martin et al., 2009). According to Scoville et al. (2007), risk factors include being male or being single. Other

researchers have mentioned the skills and accessibility to firearms as well as relationship problems as risk factors for soldiers (Bagley et al., 2010; Selby et al., 2010).

Military personnel have access to firearms because it is necessary for their training to the fulfillment of the mission. According to Scoville et al. (2007), Army and Marine personnel are given a firearm during Basic Military Training, while Navy and Air Force personnel have a more limited access. In their research, Scoville et al. were unable to find suicides by firearms among Air Force and Navy personnel. On the other hand, suicides by gunshot were prevalent (about one half of suicide) among Army and Marine personnel. The accessibility to the weapons could therefore have accounted for the use of firearms when suicides were committed (Scoville et al., 2007).

Bagley et al. (2010) conducted an extensive review of literature on suicide prevention methods. The authors reviewed 261 articles and identified seven studies exploring suicide intervention methods with military personnel (Bagley et al., 2010). Of the seven studies examined by Bagley et al., six suicide interventions were multifaceted programs. According to the findings in their study, Bagley et al. found that “all the suicides involved marital or relationship discord or alleged infidelity” (p. 259). It is critical to have a basic knowledge and awareness of the impact deployment and relationship discord can have on members of the Armed Forces. By increasing marital satisfaction and positive communication skills, risk factors for suicidal behavior could be reduced.

Divorce

The risk factors discussed in the previous section can have a great impact on the health of military marriages as well. Military spouses can also encounter challenges when witnessing their husbands' struggles with reintegration. According to SteelFisher et al. (2008), mental health issues affecting soldiers following deployment have a great impact on the mental health of their marital partner as well. Sayer et al. (2010) surveyed 1,226 Iraq-Afghanistan combat veterans, of which 62% responded ($N = 745$). Participants were veterans receiving Veterans Affairs (VA) medical care. The purpose of their study was to explore different issues related to community reintegration and readjustment of veterans returning from deployment. Results demonstrated that more than 30% of the participants reported divorce, increased substance use, and increased anger issues since deployment. Furthermore, approximately 25% to 56% of all participants reported difficulty in social functioning, and community involvement.

Adler-Baeder, Pittman, and Taylor (2005) examined Department of Defense surveys from three datasets from the Defense Manpower Data Center to explore the demographic of military families, primarily focusing on divorce and remarriage. The first dataset from 1992 included surveys with a population of 18,370 matched military couples in the Army, Air Force, Marine, and Navy (Adler-Baeder et al., 2005). The second dataset from 1999 included 30,384 military personnel (Army, Air Force, Marine, Navy, and Coast Guard) of whom 36% were single and 64% were married (Adler-Baeder et al., 2005). The third dataset, also from 1999, included 18,043 military spouses (Adler-Baeder et al., 2005). From the datasets, Adler-Baeder et al. constructed codes regarding marital

and family type, using information about the participants' marital status. According to Adler-Baeder et al., there were many risk factors that were present in military couples, such as job demands, deployments, frequent moves, work-related separation, long work hours, and stressful and dangerous work task. Furthermore, according to the authors, the number of military personnel who marry is much higher than their civilian counterparts, while the number of never married military personnel is lower than the civilian U.S. population across all ages. Adler-Baeder et al. also mentioned that it is extremely common to encounter a high proportion of military personnel who have divorced and remarried.

Hogan and Furst Seifert (2010) explored the possibility that the U.S. Armed Forces' compensation policies could induce military personnel to marry earlier. Such compensations include a 25% higher Basic Allowance for Housing and better housing quality and opportunity for married military personnel compared to single personnel. Hogan and Furst Seifert used a logistic regression model to examine the possibility that military benefits induce earlier marriage in comparison to the general population. The authors used data from a 2005 nationwide survey from the U.S. Census Bureau, looking at incidence of marriage for active-duty military personnel in comparison to individuals who have never served on active-duty (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010). Participants needed to be active-duty service members, be at least high school graduates, and at a maximum have a bachelor's degree. The authors selected participants between the age of 23 and 25 years old (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010). Hogan and Furst Seifert believed that the benefits offered to married military members could increase their desire to marry early.

These early marriages of “convenience” may not be as solid and meaningful in comparison to marriages not encouraged by compensations (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010). Thus, the authors explored the effect of these early marriages on the divorce rate of military couples (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010). The results demonstrated that for individuals who graduated from either high school or college and who were between the age of 23 and 25-years-old, the ones who served in the military for over 2 years were more likely to marry than their civilian counterparts. Furthermore, there seems to be a relationship between the early marriages of military couples and early divorce.

Lundquist (2007) examined divorce rate of military personnel in comparison to the general population between 1979 and 1983. According to Lundquist, in comparison to their civilian counterparts, enlisted military personnel were more likely to divorce. Factors affecting military marriages included, according to Lundquist, lower education, financial instability, and age at time of marriage. Lundquist also mentioned that monetary incentives and better living conditions could be factors leading military personnel to marry earlier than their civilian counterparts. On the other hand, Karney and Crown (2011) explored military marriages and deployment. The authors analyzed a longitudinal data set from the year 2002 to the year 2005 for all military personnel (Karney & Crown, 2011). In the study conducted by Karney and Crown, the variables were time deployed and marital status (married, annulled, interlocutory, legally separated, never married, and widowed), while controlled variables were gender, age when married, presence of children, and race. Results demonstrated that from 2002 to 2005, the time deployed did not increase the risk of marital dissolution for most of military personnel (Karney &

Crown, 2011). Although the study conducted by Karney and Crown gave very concrete information about time deployed and marriage status, it did not explore the effect of deployment from the wives perspective.

Isolation

Orthner and Rose (2009) mentioned that social isolation can impact the mental health of individuals, even when formal support is provided. Sherwood (2009) used a case example to demonstrate the value and treatment outcomes of military couples' therapy using different assessment methods: the strengths perspective, systems theory, and attachment theory. The ultimate goals of that study were to explore the impact of isolation and to explore the value of different theories when assessing military couples. The sample was represented by Canadian military couples. Military life requires soldiers and their family to relocate every 2 or 3 years, often times taking them away from their families of origin (Sherwood, 2009). The relocation process can be demanding and quite often leading families to unknown and remote locations. Relocation could therefore make it difficult for military couples to visit friends and families. Kotrla and Dyer (2008) also mentioned the challenges of being away from home church. As the military wives move to a new location, they remain aware of the possibility to be relocated sooner or later. Sherwood (2009) stated, "The most unique quality of military life therefore is this perpetual feeling of being physically, socially and psychologically separated" (p. 333). This feeling of isolation can therefore trigger emotions such as anger, loneliness, sadness, stress, and depressive mood. Eaton et al. (2008) found that 19.5% of 940 military wives

who had been surveyed met the criteria for either Major Depressive Disorder or Anxiety Disorders during the work-related separation.

Work-Related Issues

In clinical and social work, it is critical to understand the complexity of life in the military and military marriages in order to employ the appropriate assessment approach and consequently to produce appropriate treatment plan. Furthermore, the attitudes and satisfaction of military spouses play an important role on the recruitment and retention of soldiers in the military (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010). Similarly, researchers have demonstrated over the years that the retention and career motivation of married soldiers, especially those with high marital satisfaction, was higher than the career motivation and retention of single soldiers (Grace & Steiner, 1978; Huffman, Culbertson, & Castro, 2008; NHMRC, 2006; Raiha, 1986; Schumm et al., 1996; Shorcs & Scott, 2005; Thoresen & Goldsmith, 1987). According to the NHMRC (2006), soldiers who are married tend to have stronger work performance and get promoted faster than their single counterparts. Therefore, the support offered by the work organization can increase the quality of life and satisfaction of spouses and consequently increase the motivation, job performance, and retention of the Armed Forces personnel. The following section presents some of the current support available to military wives.

Support Programs for Military Wives

According to Hogan and Furst Seifert (2010), all branches of the military have support programs available to members and their families, especially around deployment. The Department of the Army, for instance, is considering families as important entities

within their organization. According to the Department of the Army (2008), the wellbeing of the Army is

The personal, physical, material, mental, and spiritual-state of the Army Family, including Soldiers (active, reserve, and guard), retirees, veterans, DA civilians, and all their Families, that contributes to their preparedness to perform and support the Army's mission. The focus of Army Well-being is to take care of our Army Family before, during, and after deployments. (p. 20)

According to Albano (1994), families were once considered to be a hindrance to the military mission accomplishments. The very first acknowledgment to family members happened in 1794, when monetary payments were offered to widows and orphans of fallen officers, followed by the extension of payments to noncommissioned officers' widows and children in 1802, and enlisted family members in 1898 (Albano, 1994). Until World War II (WWII), the law prohibited married men from enlisting, consequently reducing the amount of military family members. In 1940, the government began to offer housing to soldiers and their families as long as they were E-4s or above (Albano, 1994). In the Army, the enlisted soldiers are ranked from E-1 to E-9, Warrant officers are ranked from W-1 to W-5, while officers are ranked from O-1 to O-10. Wives were very involved in volunteer activities during and after the WWII era, bringing the army to provide a more formal support to families. According to Albano, on February 5, 1942 the Army Emergency Relief (AER) was created to help families in financial needs. In 1965, the Army Community Service (ACS) was created to offer support and resources to families. In 1969 a group of wives formed the National Military Wives Association

(currently called the National Military Family Association), which had a great influence on the development of policies regarding the needs of military families. Albano reported that in the 1970s the amount of married soldiers increased, and reached 60% by 1978, and the military began to invest on scientific research regarding family demographics and factors affecting retention. In the late 1970, the Air Force began to recognize the impact of families on the mission accomplishment, and all branches began to have military family conferences in the 1980s (Albano, 1994). The goal of these conferences was to address issues encountered by military families. According to Albano, in 1983 there was a major shift in the army's viewpoint of families, due to the publication of "The White-Paper, The Army Family" (p. 292). Following this shift, the army Family Action Plan (FAP) was created. The FAP was a policy framework having for goal to address family issues and to find and evaluate solutions (Albano, 1994).

The progress of support offered to military families was rather slow, but also critical to the soldiers' work performance and retention rate. In their study, Orthner and Rose (2009) presented two types of support systems: the primary support system, and the secondary support system. The primary support system includes friends, family, and community, while the secondary system involves support from the husbands' work organization. According to Orthner and Rose, these support systems can offer intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to the wives during challenging and difficult times. The primary support system incorporates a more social network such as friends, family members, neighbors, and most importantly, the marital partner (Orthner & Rose, 2009). Research has demonstrated that the marital relationship can greatly impact the ability of

partners to cope during stressful or challenging situations, such as during deployments (Basham, 2008; Orthner & Rose, 2009).

Although Orthner and Rose (2009) mentioned that the primary support system plays an important role for military wives' psychological wellbeing, military families tend to be relocated every 2 to 3 years. Consequently, it can be difficult for military wives to develop trusting relationships with friends, family members, and neighbors. As part of the secondary support system, the Family Readiness Group (FRG) was implemented by the U.S. Army to help address the needs and concerns of family members (Di Nola, 2008). The FRG, once called the Association, was first created by 39 military wives in 1780 (Di Nola, 2008). During WWII, the Association became the Waiting Wives club prior to becoming the FRG following the Persian Gulf War (Di Nola, 2008). One of the purposes of the FRG is to act as a connection between soldiers' units and their significant others. This support group is especially critical during deployment, or when families undergo challenging times. According to a study conducted in 2007 with 100 family members of deployed soldiers, 54 % of the 74 % of spouses who remained closed to the military post attended the FRG meetings (Di Nola, 2008). Westhus (2006) identified reasons behind the unwillingness of some wives to attend FRG meetings such as (a) leaders not communicating with family members, (b) gossip within the group, (c) cliques formed by a few members, (d) lack of time, and (e) not wanting to expose personal life. Alongside the FRG, the Army also offers support from their Rear Detachment Command. According to Adams (2005), the Rear Detachment Command consists of an Officer in Charge (OIC) and a Non-Commissioned officer in charge (NCOIC). These army

personnel have been trained to assist family members in need of added emotional and moral support, or sometimes physical and financial support.

Another form of support available to military couples is marriage education. Marriage education programs are offered throughout most branches of the military. They include the Active Military Life Skills (AMLS), the army's Building Strong and Ready Families program, the Marine Corp's Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP), and the Navy's Chaplains Religious Enrichment Development Operation (CREDO). According to Kotrla and Dyer (2008), these educational programs serve as a tool to enhance communication and problem resolution skills, as well as improve stress and emotional management. According to McFayden (2005), more research is needed to confirm the effectiveness of these educational programs. According to a study conducted by Orthner and Rose (2009), the relationship between the use of an informal support group and the wives' adjustment was not significant.

Finally, during deployment, couples are given tools and instruments to communicate with each other. According to an interview conducted by Rotter and Boveja (1999) with two military personnel, available communication tools, such as e-mails, telephone, videoconferencing, and internet access, were helpful during the adjustment period of deployment. On the other hand, according to Basham (2008), it can sometimes be challenging for partners to share personal emotions via e-mails or telephone conversations. Spiritual groups were also an important outlet for some military personnel's during deployment. It enabled them to find comfort and reliance on others

who shared similar beliefs and values. In the following section, an explanation of duty overseas in relation to military marriages will be presented.

Duty Overseas

Over 1.5 million soldiers have been deployed as a result of the War on Terror beginning in 2001, and consequently, spouses are faced with new challenges (Johnson et al., 2007). According to the NHMRC (2006), deployment can be defined as a soldier going away overseas or activated for military duty. In addition to war-related deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan, military personnel are often called to serve overseas in many different countries. For instance, from 2008 to 2010, military personnel were called to serve at over 800 installations in approximately 135 countries (Department of Defense, 2010a).

Effect of Overseas Deployment on Couples

According to Nelson Goff, Crow, Reisbig, and Hamilton (2007), there is a lack of research on the impact of depression, anxiety, and similar symptoms on the soldiers, wives, and their marital relationships. Nelson Goff et al. (2007) mentioned that most researchers have focused on the service members or the wives' symptoms, rather than focusing on the couples' relationship satisfaction and functioning. When husbands deploy, wives can feel a sense of emotional loss, increased responsibilities, and a significant need for role adjustment (NHMRC, 2006). According to McNulty (2005), the needs for physical and psychological health care for spouses have increased as a result of more frequent deployments. Challenges experienced by military couples during deployment include anxiety, financial struggles, infidelity and mistrust, parental

disagreements, as well as legal separation and divorce (Lincoln, et al., 2008). The findings of a study conducted by Orthner and Rose (2009), with U.S. Army wives ($n = 8,056$) suggested that long periods or frequent work-related separations have a significant negative impact on the psychological wellbeing of many wives. Sahlstein, Maguire, and Timmerman (2009) explored the contradictions experienced by military wives prior to, during, and following deployments. Fifty military wives whose husbands were currently deployed or recently returned from deployment, were interviewed (Sahlstein et al., 2009). According to the authors, wives tended to describe the deployment phase rather negatively, although they recognized the importance of their husbands' work. Wives experienced stress, anxieties, and a certain level of uncertainty, but tried to remain focused on the purpose of their husbands' mission. Sahlstein et al. stated that "the women privileged their husband's certainty over their own uncertainty" (p. 428.). According to Sahlstein et al., although wives wanted to be supportive, most felt a sense of emotional drain during the predeployment period. Some wives even began to demonstrate a sense of independency prior to deployment, by fighting with their husbands or avoiding communication.

Stafford, Merolla, and Castle (2006) explored the effect of long distance on relationships. Participants in this qualitative study were undergraduate students ($n = 335$) from a large Midwestern University and needed to have either currently or recently been in a serious long distance dating relationship (Stafford, Merolla, & Castle, 2006). Of the participants 58.3% were female and 87.5% were Caucasian, with an average age of 19.91 years old (Stafford, Merolla, & Castle, 2006). Surveys consisted of open-ended questions

asking participants about the status of their long distance relationship upon reunion (Stafford, Merolla, & Castle, 2006). Stafford, Merolla, and Castle found that one-third of the participants terminated their relationship within three months of reunion. According to Stafford, Merolla, and Castle, primary reasons for terminating relationship included loss of autonomy, issues with time management, and jealousy. Couples, who are often physically separated and therefore become used to their independence, are less likely to maintain the relationship (Stafford, Merolla, & Castle, 2006). The authors reported that partners learn to make choices on their own while separated, and therefore may have found it challenging when the other's thoughts and opinions came back into play after the reunion (Stafford, Merolla, & Castle, 2006). This pattern of independency versus dependency can often be seen in military couples. According to Orthner and Rose (2009), wives whose husbands are deployed must make constant readjustments while the husbands are away, going from an intimate relationship to an independent one. During the deployment period, husbands are unable to carry on with some roles and responsibilities to the marriage and family (Orthner & Rose, 2009).

In a broader spectrum, military couples experiencing work-related separations could encounter challenges leading to deeper personal and marital issues. Arlitt (1943) explored the effect of separation on the family left behind during WWII. Although older, the study mentioned an important point about the cause-and-effect of separation that can lead to a partner's withdrawal. During WWII, soldiers were limited in their ability to communicate with their family members, but in our current era, exchanges between husbands and wives may happen more frequently, especially since the birth of the

internet and cellular phones. McNulty (2005) mentioned the accessibility of such interaction tools even in combat zones. Interactions between soldiers and spouses can therefore be synchronous and can bring either positive or negative outcomes. It is usually the negative exchanges occurring during separations that could lead a partner to experience a sense of withdrawal. This sense of withdrawal could in turn negatively influence the desire of the partner who is away to return home (Arlitt, 1943; Basham, 2008). According to Basham (2008), it is not uncommon for military personnel to desire returning to combat after returning home. Furthermore, soldiers who feel a sense of withdrawal may decide not to initiate or to avoid contact with their wives. Wives could then perceive their husbands' behavior as being antirelationship (contrary to prorelationship) and may feel as though the military commitment supersedes the marital commitment of the husbands. In such instance, wives may in turn become less committed to the marital relationship. Kline and Stafford (2004) looked at the impact interactions can have on marital satisfaction of partners. According to the authors, interaction is highly related to higher marital quality if the interaction between partners is affectively affirmed, pleasant, and friendly rather than conflict ridden. When military couples are frequently separated or for long periods, interactions should therefore be geared toward positive, reinforcing, and productive talks. Although it is critical to avoid negative interactions, it may be challenging to interact positively for couples who experienced conflicts prior to deployment or during deployment. Research has demonstrated over the years that marital conflicts or low marital satisfaction prior to deployment could be an important predictor of further conflicts during and after the deployment period (Iverson et

al., 2007; Kotrla & Dyer, 2008; Schumm, Silliman, & Bell, 2000). Some couples may therefore feel the need to bring about conflicts during the verbal or written interactions with their partners while separated, consequently increasing the withdrawal period of one or both partners.

Stages of Deployment

Basham (2008) explored the emotions experienced by couples at different stages of deployment. During the predeployment stage, service members are said to be physically present and psychologically absent (Faber, Willerton, Clymer, MacDermid, & Weiss, 2008). During that phase, couples may feel worried, angry, sad, and lacking control over their own lives. Predeployment stressors include clarification of changes in family dynamics, anticipation of threats to service member, lack of information, striving for intimacy, and value that service members put on deployments and military mission (Faber et al., 2008). During the deployment stage, service members are typically psychologically present and physically absent (Faber et al., 2008). During that stage, couples may feel stressed, exhausted, and depressed. Deployment stressors include adjusting to new responsibilities, mixed emotions about the service member's absence, and disrupted routines. According to Logan (1987), during the penultimate month, resiliency and a newfound independence develop, confidence increases, and new routines are established. Rotter and Boveja (1999) explored issues faced by military families who experience different stages of deployment. According to the authors, during the anticipation stage, couples can experience fear, anger, sadness, confusion, resentment, and emotional withdrawal (Rotter & Boveja, 1999). During the first part of the stage of

separation, couples can experience confusion, feelings of abandonment, sense of loss, disorganization, sadness, lack of sleep. During the adjustment period of the separation stage, couples begin to feel more hope, confidence, organization, and less anger.

According to Rotter and Boveja (1999), about 2 months before service members return home, couples begin to feel conflicting emotions such as high expectations, apprehension, excitement, and worry. During the last stage of deployment, the reunion stage, couples must reestablish intimacy, face-to-face relationship, and roles within the family. Faber et al (2008) reported that when returning from deployment, service members are physically present and psychologically absent. Couples can experience somewhat of a honeymoon phase until conflicts begin to arise (U.S. Navy as cited in Rotter & Boveja, 1999). According to Allen, et al. (2010), certain Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms can lead military personnel returning home to avoid their wives, which can in turn result in intimacy issues, feelings of rejection, isolation, and increased marital conflicts. Nelson Goff et al. (2007) showed that service members' trauma symptoms significantly predicted lower marital satisfaction for the couples.

Milliken, Auchterlonie, and Hoge (2007) conducted a longitudinal study with veterans ($n = 88\ 235$) returning from Iraq. The researchers reported that mental health symptoms present during the first 6 months postdeployment were more often related to relationship conflicts rather than PTSD. Allen, et al. came to a different conclusion when they found that there was not a significant difference in the relationship functioning of couples who were not separated and couples who were separated due to deployment. According to the authors the main factor affecting relationship functioning was the husbands' PTSD

symptoms. However, there were some limitations to the study that should be considered. For instance, couples who agreed to participate in the study were not experiencing marital conflicts at the time, and were most likely committed to their relationship. Thus, they may not have been an accurate representation of all military husbands (Allen et al., 2010).

Pincus, House, Christenson, and Adler (2007) are all military psychiatrists who have narratively described the process and the impact of deployment on military families, with assistance from military leaders. The primary purpose of the study was to describe psychological elements to consider when dealing with military families exposed to deployment (Pincus et al., 2007). The authors presented five phases of deployment which are the following: predeployment, deployment, sustainment, redeployment, and postdeployment (Pincus et al., 2007). According to Pincus et al. (2007) there are variances in the time-span of each phase depending on individuals and situations. McNulty (2005) identified three phases of deployment: predeployment, middeployment, and postdeployment. In the predeployment phase, soldiers and wives may, as a coping strategy, unconsciously become detached and withdrawn from one another. During deployment, couples may experience an array of emotions beginning with feelings of disorganization, followed by “recovery,” and eventually stabilization. In the postdeployment phase, couples usually anticipate the homecoming of the soldiers with an array of emotions and anxiety. Once the soldiers have returned home, couples must embark in a journey to rediscover one another in order to regain stability and role specific organization within the family. According to Kotrla and Dyer (2008), stress and guilt can

sometimes lead soldiers to be unable to reintegrate their family life, even after they have returned home. Wives can find it challenging when husbands return home expecting to resume the “family business” as they left it prior to deployment (Gambardella, 2008). The author reported that returning to a changed home environment and relationships with family members can impact the status and balance of the marriage (Gambardella, 2008). In the qualitative case-study, Gambardella explored the effectiveness of role-exit theory with 10 military couples following deployment. According to the results, 60% of the couples reported improvement in their marriages following role-exit therapy.

According to McNulty (2005), stressors experienced at three different phases of deployment can cause serious health risks for the soldiers. Gambardella (2008) also reported that marital discords and marital dissatisfaction could increase the level of stress and anxiety experienced by family members. McNulty mentioned that in the deployment phase, wives tend to experience anger, lack of tolerance toward children, fear for physical wellbeing of deployed husband, and fear of husband’s infidelity. Wives can also feel depressed, fatigue, anxious, and stressed. According to McNulty and Kline and Stafford (2004), these challenges and emotions can be “transmitted” to the deployed soldiers through different forms of interactions.

Schumm, Knott, Bell, and Rice (1996), explored the perceived effect of stressors of civilian wives on marital satisfaction during their husbands’ deployment to Somalia. The participants were military wives ($N = 478$) whose husbands had recently returned from a short deployment (in average 3 to 4 months) to Somalia. Stressors explored by the authors included pregnancy, loneliness, and communication problems, which were all

assessed by mean of straight-forward questions (Schumm et al., 1996),. A three-item scale was used to measure marital stability in the predeployment phase (control variable), and the marital satisfaction was assessed using a 7-point scale with levels ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied (Schumm et al., 1996). Results demonstrated that marital stability was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction. Furthermore, loneliness level seemed to have a significant relationship to marital satisfaction. In relevance to the proposed study, the findings from the study conducted by Schumm et al. (1996) confirmed the idea that marital instability and loneliness, which are emotions often felt by military wives, could impact marital satisfaction. Marital instability and loneliness are also emotions that have been associated with trust level and lack of prorelationship behavior, as mentioned by Wieselquist, et al.(1999).

According to the NMF A (2005), wives experience different stress levels at different stages of deployment. According to the study, 15% experienced higher level of stress when first notified of the upcoming deployment, 18% when the husband departed, and 62% felt the highest level of stress during deployment (NMFA, 2005). During deployment, the stress encountered by family members can be transferred to the soldiers (McNulty, 2005). According to McNulty (2005), the synchronous communication methods can bring about either positive or negative outcomes for the soldiers. For instance, wives' stress can be conveyed to the soldiers, which consequently could affect their willingness and ability to perform at work. McNulty mentioned the importance of emphasizing positive communication with family members during the predeployment briefs prior to deployment. Marital conflicts and negative communications can lead

soldiers to perform poorly at work, to withdraw from the relationship, and to be unhappy returning home.

Separation and Trust

Another prevalent element affecting military couples during separation is trust. Many aspects of a relationship can impact trust, such as previous betrayal, attachment styles, presenting situations, and environment. During military separations, couples could be faced with situations in which the trust level could be affected either positively or negatively. Wives are often left behind to care for the household and family members. They experience a change in household activities and increased chores and responsibilities (Gambardella, 2008). And while the wives are busy with their “new family life”, they are also aware of the possibility of their deployed husbands to develop intimate relationships with female coworkers. For instance, Alt (2006), found that as many as 69% of wives whose husbands deployed, believed that infidelity occurs frequently during deployment. According to McNulty (2005), it was in the mid-1990s that female personnel were added to the military, and by 2005 they represented 20 to 25 % of the work force. Wives suspecting that their husbands are in a withdrawal state could be aware of the possibility of other women fulfilling the emptiness and loneliness felt by their husbands. In turn soldiers may also be aware of the possibilities of their spouses’ infidelity. However, for the purpose of this study, the focus remained on wives’ emotional and psychological states. In the next section, I explore trust in relation to military marriages.

Trust

According to Lazelere and Huston (1980), trust is a core component of healthy relationships, and represents the ability of one to feel a sense of comfort with taking a risk to become close in an intimate relationship. Brimhall, Wampler, and Kimball (2008) conducted a qualitative study with 8 couples who were married for the second time as a result of previous divorce. According to Brimhall et al., betrayal leading to losing trust in relationships can bring partners to emotional withdrawal. Furthermore, lack of trust greatly impacted the way in which divorce was experienced by the participants. Brimhall et al. found that approximately 37% of the participants who had been betrayed in their first marriage thought that divorce was really difficult, while approximately 37% felt a sense of relief after the divorce was final. Brimhall et al. reported that men and women tend to react emotionally differently when faced with relationship withdrawal. The authors demonstrated that 83% of women felt a sense of relief after the divorce, while 83% of men thought that divorce was difficult. The authors also demonstrated that almost 19% of all participants had mixed feelings about the divorce, feeling a sense of relief although the process had been difficult. Interestingly, 100% of the remarried participants mentioned a time when trust was threatened in their current relationship. The emotional and physical reactions of all participants toward this threat were linked to the previous marriage (Brimhall et al., 2008). Results of the study conducted by Brimhall et al. (2008) clearly demonstrate the impact of past experiences and relationship history on the emotional and psychological state of individuals and their current relationship. Campbell et al. (2010) came to a different conclusion and mentioned that trust level within the

current marriage depends primarily on the characteristics of the current partner and current marriage relationship. Brimhall et al. (2008) stressed the importance of being open with one's partner, as well as avoiding some behaviors that could trigger the memory of past experiences. Although this avoidance of triggering emotions and behavior could have positive impacts on the level of trust one may have towards the partner, it is important to realize that military couples do not always have the opportunity to avoid triggering behaviors or even to remain open towards one another. For example, if an affair occurred while the soldier was serving in Iraq, redeployment of the soldier could trigger a sense of anxiety for the wife who has no control over the situation at hand. Furthermore, openness in the relationship can be especially challenging when couples have lack of communications due to physical separation.

Another factor affecting trust for military wives is the bond shared between military personnel. This close bond can sometimes lead to the inability of some military personnel to share information with their wives. A clinical assessment of Canadian military marriages conducted by Sherwood (2009) found that soldiers may not be able to share important aspects of their deployment, especially when peers' extra-marital affairs could be exposed. Although not directly related to their own marriage, these issues could impact couples' trust and attachment (Sherwood, 2009).

Wieselquist et al., (1999) described trust as "a reflection of the partner's commitment and benevolent intentions," (p. 942.) which can be associated with the reliability of a partner's prorelationship motivations. There are many aspects of a relationship that can impact trust such as financial disagreement, differing parenting

styles, physical unfaithfulness, emotional unfaithfulness, and sexual unfaithfulness.

Depending on the relationship, aspects such as those mentioned above can greatly impact the trust level and the willingness of a spouse to remain married. Amato and Rogers (1997) conducted a study with 2,000 married couples, in which they found that sexual infidelity was the most significant predictor of later divorce. The results of Amato and Rogers's study are consistent with findings from Hertlein, Wetchler, and Piercy (2005) who mentioned that infidelity can negatively impact trust, and connection between husbands and wives, finding it challenging to recover from the betrayal.

Van de Rijt and Buskens (2006) defined trust as “the extent to which a trustor dares to place trust in a trustee” (p.129). According to Van de Rijt and Buskens, the recent rise in the popularity of short-term relationships has impacted the popularity of long-term relationships. Furthermore, the rise in the economic opportunities for women has modified traditional relationships for the general population. The military with its frequent relocations, has influenced many couples to opt for more traditional relationships, with wives remaining at home. Van de Rijt and Buskens mentioned the idea that wives at home tend to depend more on the husbands, than the latter on the wives. Husbands are more independent of the relationship and would not lose as much financially if the couple divorced (Van de Rijt & Buskens, 2006). On the other hand, wives at home become less attractive to future employers, and would potentially hurt more financially if the couple divorced. Thus, it may be more likely that the working husbands would take a chance in an extramarital affair than would the wives. On the other hand, the contract of marriage bonds partners to remain faithful and accountable for

one another. If couples divorce, men are often obligated to pay child support (if children are involved) and spousal support for the wives, which could impact the decision of partners to be faithful. Infidelity is a real factor affecting trust in couples in the general population as well as the military population.

Infidelity

Hertlein, Wetchler, and Piercy (2005) defined infidelity as either “participation in sexual intercourse with a person other than one’s partner” (p.6.), cybersex, looking at pornography, physical intimacy, or emotional intimacy with someone other than one’s partner. Once infidelity has affected trust, it can be difficult for the betrayed individual to feel comfortable enough to communicate with their partner (Hertlein et al., 2005). Lack of communication can in turn make it more difficult to address and resolve the issues at stake. Mao and Raguram (2009) explored the issues surrounding infidelity, primarily online infidelity. According to the authors, there are three main types of infidelity, which are sexual, emotional, and more recently cyber infidelity (Mao & Raguram, 2009). Infidelity, regardless of the type, can bring important conflicts in intimate relationships. According to Mao and Raguram, infidelity is highly unacceptable in the institution of marriage, and can negatively impact the level of trust between partners. Infidelity is usually conducted in secrecy and therefore leads one partner to feel not only hurt, but also betrayed by the other. When military couples are separated for long periods of time, and have access to the internet, it may not be uncommon for them to become emotionally involved with cyber partners.

Olson, Russell, Higgins-Kessler, and Miller (2002) explored the three stages of healing following an extramarital affair, which are: emotional roller coaster, moratorium, and trust rebuilding. The results demonstrated the importance of the healing process in order for couples to regain trust and marital satisfaction. This process can take time and be challenging for both parties involved. Olmstead, et al., (2009) also addressed the importance of the forgiveness process following an extramarital affair, beginning with reconciliation (interpersonal process). Thus, one may wonder how this trust can be rebuilt in situations where one partner is called to leave the family dwelling, such as soldiers having to leave their family for up to 12 months. If conflicts were not addressed prior to work-related separations, further marital challenges could continue to develop. According to Olmstead et al., extramarital affairs can seriously damage relationships and it can be challenging to find an appropriate treatment plan for couples who are trying to remain together. Once trust is impaired, it could be difficult to recover from the betrayal, the hurt, and the loss.

The history of the current relationship as well as past relationships should also be considered when addressing issues of infidelity. Olmstead et al. (2009), mentioned the importance of addressing history such as the etiology of infidelity and the extramarital affair status (first time or pattern) when exploring marital infidelity. Olmstead et al. found that one of the most important themes that remained considerable during the interviews was time (such as the long-term process of forgiveness). The relationship history of military couples can be quite lengthy, but the actual time spent together can be minimal as a result of service members' duty away from home base or post. Frequent moves

across states or across country, as well as lengthy and frequent duty overseas can add challenges to these military couples trying to recover from extramarital affairs.

Other challenges faced by military couples in regards to trust include disagreement between husbands and wives regarding financial decisions, parental decisions, and choice of lifestyle during work-related separations. Service members serving overseas may be dissatisfied with the financial choices made by wives, which can create conflicts that may lead to withdrawal from one or both partners. In the same sense, deployed service members could be unhappy with the parenting style of the wives, which could also lead to lack of trust, further conflicts, negative communications, and possible withdrawal. Finally, during the work-related separations, partners find themselves in a state of independency, and could make decisions that could impact the trust level of the other. While trust can be extremely important, the perception of partners' marital commitment can also have a great impact on marriages. In the following section I explore wives' marital commitment.

Marital Commitment

Marital commitment, for the purpose of this study, is described as the wives' willingness to sacrifice personal needs and wants and prioritizing the marriage during the husbands' deployment, which can in turn promote prorelationship behavior and lead to higher levels of security and stability for the couple (Allen et al., 2010).

Stanley and Markman (1992) presented two aspects to commitment. The first one represents the constraint side of commitment, which incorporates the obligation to fulfill a commitment, and the other represents the sense of dedication to someone. Stanley and

Markman named these two types of commitment: constrain commitment and personal dedication. Personal dedication usually influences individuals to desire to improve their relationship by sacrificing for it, investing in it, and prioritizing the partner's welfare and happiness (Stanley & Markman, 1992). Often times, in marriage, both types of commitment exist. Personal dedication would be the desire to get married and to sacrifice one's independence, while constraint commitment may come later when the marriage encounters conflicts and partners are faced with challenges that could lead to separation if no legal commitment (i.e. marriage, children, assets, etc.) had been made. According to Stanley and Markman, the commitment most often associated with marital satisfaction is personal dedication. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the term commitment referred primarily to personal dedication rather than constraint commitment.

Many factors affecting military couples have been explored in the previous sections. Most researches on deployment and military marriages thus far, have focused on divorce, marital satisfaction, and domestic violence (Allen et al., 2010). According to the authors, there are other more positive factors that are often associated with deployment, including confidence in the survival of the marriage, parental unity, bonding experiences, and partners' dedication to the marital relationship (Allen et al. 2010). The work load of soldiers in the Army can be demanding and time-consuming. Spouses, specifically wives at home, can experience a sense of loneliness, abandonment, and depression when they feel that the military commitment exceeds the commitment towards the marriage. According to Allen et al. (2010) the perception of military demands by military couples can often be seen as a threat to marital satisfaction.

Allen et al. (2010) mentioned that personal commitment to the marriage is an important aspect of relationship functioning, along with the confidence that there is a future for the relationship. According to the authors, marital commitment demonstrates the intention to remain in the relationship with the partner, which consequently facilitate some prorelationship behaviors, and leads to a certain level of security and stability in the future of the marriage (Allen et al., 2010). Prorelationship behaviors and the perceived sacrifice of one's partner for the wellbeing of the other have been important predictors of marital satisfaction (Allen et al., 2010). On the other hand, when husbands are called to defend the country and to leave their family behind, spouses could feel a sense of neglect and abandon. They could perceived the behavior has being promilitary rather than prorelationship, which could create conflicts and challenges for military couples.

A lack of confidence in the military organization could also impact the emotions of wives towards their husbands' mission, thus impacting overall marital commitment. For instance, SteelFisher, et al. (2008) explored wives' well-being related to extensions of deployment timeframe of military personnel. Wives ($n = 798$) were asked questions related to mental well-being, household strains, and other work issues. The authors found a significant negative perception of the Army by wives whose husbands had been extended to stay deployed longer than previously agreed upon (SteelFisher et al., 2008). In other words, wives whose husbands had been extended felt more frustration and anger towards the Army. More specifically, over 48% of the wives reported that the army had done a poor job at explaining the duration of deployments, and over 37% reported that the available support during deployment was fair or poor. Chapin (2009) also found in his

study that several spouses were unsatisfied with the Army lifestyle. According to the study, the main factor influencing this dissatisfaction with the Army lifestyle was the length of deployment. Huebner, et al. (2009) put into perspective military couples' lives during high deployment times, when mentioning that "soldiers often spend more time overseas than at home" (p.217).

Wives in a military marriage may feel abandoned, left alone, and uncared for when duty becomes the priority of the husbands. Consequently, marital commitment would likely be lower for wives whose husbands have been deployed frequently and for long periods of time.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

Overview of Interdependence Theory

Interdependence theorists believe in the interdependence of partners rather than simply the dispositions of each partner. (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). According to interdependence theory, there are two primary processes in the growth of dependence, which are marital satisfaction and quality of alternatives (Rusbult, et al., 1998). Quality of alternatives represents the degree to which an individual may need to find alternative involvement to fulfill unmet needs. Thus, according to interdependence theory, higher marital satisfaction and poor alternatives would lead to greater dependence in a relationship (Rusbult et al., 1998). Wieselquist et al. (1999) proposed that many aspects of intimate relationships depend primarily on two constructs, which are commitment and trust, as presented in interdependence theory.

Overview of Risk and Resilience Theory

According to the risk and resilience theoretical perspective, spouses experiencing separation caused by their husbands' work tend to feel a sense of resilience and confusion (Orthner & Rose, 2009). Spouses can, according to this theoretical approach, perceive the work commitment as exceeding commitment to the marriage. As applied to the present study, this theory holds expectations that spouses perceived their husbands' military commitment as a priority over marital commitment. In the same sense, interdependence-based theory developed by Kelley and Thibault (1978) confirmed the relationships between commitment, prorelationship behavior, and trust (Rusbult, et al., 1998; Wieselquist, et al., 1999). According to the authors, a partner's commitment to the relationship enhances the other partner's trust and commitment levels, which in turn increase marital satisfaction. According to Rusbult et al., marital satisfaction is the positive versus negative affect experienced by partners. Marital satisfaction tends to be influenced by the extent to which one meets the needs of the other. According to Rusbult et al., commitment is positively associated with marital satisfaction and negatively associated with attractiveness of alternatives. Thus, According to interdependence theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), individuals' perception of prorelationship behaviors in a given time influences marital satisfaction. During deployment, it may be more difficult for husbands and wives to demonstrate prorelationship behavior or marital commitment, consequently affecting overall level of trust and marital satisfaction for both spouses. In a study conducted by Campbell et al. (2010), using the actor-partner interdependence model, the authors found that trust significantly impacted relationship quality. The

authors also found that trust from one's partner impacted relationship quality, regardless of the other's personal trust level (Campbell, et al., 2010).

Interdependence and Risk and Resilience Approaches

According to interdependence theory, trust develops largely from past experiences and not solely from personality traits or attachment styles as it was presented in attachment theory (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). As applied to the present study, the risk and resilience theoretical perspective as well as interdependence-based theory helped to predict marital commitment, trust level, and marital satisfaction for military wives whose husbands were deployed at the time. To control for personal attachment styles as presented by attachment theory, the wives attachment styles were determined and explored in relation to trust level.

Thus, prior research focused primarily on marital discord during the postdeployment phase. As mentioned by the NHMRC (2006), the status of the couples' relationship during the predeployment phase seems to have a significant impact on the couples' adjustment during the postdeployment phase. Therefore, the present study explored trust issues that were occurring during deployment, to obtain a better understanding of wives perspectives.

Attachment Theory

The theoretic frameworks presented in the present study were not meant as competing alternatives to attachment theory. On the contrary, the intention was to add a new dimension to attachment theory in regards to trust.

Attachment theory has its roots in Bowlby's work (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). The theory stipulates that individuals' internal model significantly impacts their reactions to bonding and social relations. The two main areas of bonding, according to Sherwood (2009), are between infant and caregiver, or adult partners. According to attachment theory, infants are born with a need for attachment. The caregiver's response to that need has an impact on the infant's internal working model. As individuals grow into adulthood, the internalized working model will influence their intimate relationships. Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) discovered patterns of attachment: secure, insecure-ambivalent, and insecure-avoidant. Individuals with a secure attachment style tend to feel more confident in themselves and their significant others. Thus, they are more likely to be satisfied in their marriage. Individuals with insecure-ambivalent attachment style tend to crave social acceptance, while they doubt their own worthiness. Thus, they are more likely to be unsatisfied in their marriage and lack trust in their partner. Individuals with an insecure-avoidant attachment style tend to have lack of trust in others and would rather remain distant in intimate relationships. Thus, attachment styles of the wives in the present study could influence the level of trust they are willing to give their husbands.

Basham (2008) explored the impact of deployment-related stress on military couples' marital relationships. Although support is most often present, many military couples experience elevated stress level and mental health issues. According to Basham, there is a lack of research on the effect of deployment stress on military relationships. Basham looked deeper into the effect of deployment stress on the relationship, and

explored the effect of attachment styles on the relationships. The author mentioned that secure partners tend to have the ability to be more flexible, depending on their emotional needs, while preoccupied partners may be needier and regularly seeking comfort in their partner (Basham, 2008). On the other hand, partners with unresolved attachment style, may opt for avoidance, volatility, and violence. According to Basham, couples with only one partner with a secure attachment style often face marital challenges.

When soldiers are deployed and faced with traumatic events, it is very possible that their experiences eventually lead them to lose their sense of security, which could in turn affect their styles of attachment (Basham, 2008). On the other hand, the training inflicted by the military can give soldiers new strengths and abilities that are useful at work, but not necessarily in their relationships (Basham, 2008). In other words, military training is designed to teach military personnel to be good soldiers, not good husbands. Soldiers learn to keep their emotions inside, to be limited in their communication, to be ready to deceive, and to prepare for battle, rather than to learn good communication skills with partners. Consequently, wives can be faced with personal challenges as well as challenges faced by their husbands returning from deployment, which could ultimately affect their attachment patterns.

Review of the Literature on Methods

Studies exploring marriage and physical separations have employed both qualitative and quantitative methods, with some differing results. More specifically, numerous studies exploring military marriages and deployment used data set analysis (Hogan & Furst Seifert, 2010; Karney & Crown, 2011; Orthner & Rose, 2009;

SteelFisher, et al., 2008). Others opted for quantitative survey method. Kurdek (2002) conducted a longitudinal quantitative study using the survey method to explore timing of separation and marital satisfaction. Participants completed surveys and mailed them back to the author (Kurdek, 2002). Completed surveys were returned by 538 interested couples, but only 130 couples provided complete data after 8 years of participation. Wieselquist, et al. (1999) also conducted a quantitative longitudinal study. Wieselquist et al. tested the interdependence model looking at the relationships between commitment, prorelationship behavior, and trust. The quantitative study obtained data from self-report questionnaires and laboratory tasks (Wieselquist, et al., 1999). Allen, et al. (2010) conducted a quantitative study using self-report surveys completed by 434 married couples of whom the husbands were Active Duty soldiers, while the wives were not. Lastly, some studies explored the effect of separation on marriages utilizing qualitative methods. Stafford, et al. (2006) used the survey method with their 335 participants. The authors utilized open-ended questions in their qualitative study exploring long distance dating and the impact of reunion on couples (Stafford et al., 2006). A qualitative study conducted by Sahlstein et al. (2009) explored struggles of military spouses left behind during deployment. The authors travelled near military installations to meet with chaplains and leaders of military family support groups. Participants ($n = 50$) were introduced to the study via chaplains, leaders, other participants, or flyers seen at local military stores. The interviews with participants were recorded and then analyzed using a qualitative method. Researchers using qualitative approach are able to gather in-depth,

open-ended information, but the time consumption and cost associated with the qualitative method makes it often impractical.

In the present quantitative study, to ensure that the sample were an accurate representation of the military population, I used online surveys. This enabled me to reach wives from different geographical locations, ethnicity, age groups, and military affiliations. Furthermore this method enabled participants to complete surveys and sociodemographic questionnaires from the comfort of their homes.

Summary

Over 1.5 million soldiers deployed since the beginning of War on Freedom in 2003, and consequently, spouses are faced with new challenges (Johnson et al., 2007). Challenges include anxiety, infidelity, mistrust, and divorce (Lincoln, et al., 2008), and increased needs for psychological healthcare (McNulty, 2005). Furthermore, the divorce rate in the Armed Forces has increased in the last decade (Adler-Baeder, et a;., 2005; Renshaw, et al.,2008), but the causes remain unclear. An initial review of the literature revealed that marital satisfaction impacts wellbeing (Avellar & Smock, 2005; Grinstein-Weiss & Sherraden, 2006; Waite & Gallagher, 2000), and that the nature of the relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction of military wives during deployment is unclear.

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between military wives' perceived spousal likelihood of infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction during their husbands' deployment. Social change implications included new understanding leading to development of appropriate programs helping

military couples with trust and commitment issues, especially prior to deployment, by understanding conflicts that occur during deployment.

According to Finkel et al. (2002), partners' marital trust can increase marital commitment. According to Wieselquist et al. (1999) and Rusbult et al. (1998), trust develops largely from experiences and not solely from personality traits or attachment style. Evidence shows that prorelationship behavior, cooperation, and trust help couples cope during crisis which in turn increases marital satisfaction (Finkel et al., 2002; Kurdek, 2002; Rusbult et al., 1998; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004; Wieselquist et al., 1999). As applied to the present study, resilience theory (Orthner & Rose, 2009) held expectations that marital commitment during deployment would be low. Interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibault, 1978) held expectations that affirmative perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity would decrease trust level and marital commitment, and consequently the marital satisfaction level would decrease also.

This chapter reviewed literature addressing military marriages during deployment, focusing primarily on wives' marital commitment and trust. The review of the literature also examined challenges unique to military marriages, support available to wives, and issues related to deployment, including marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction, for the purpose of this study referred to the happiness of a partner in the marriage relationship. Lastly, literature related to risk and resilience as well as interdependence theoretical frameworks was reviewed. It is clear that there is a large body of research addressing issues related to military deployment. However, there is a gap in the literature covering military wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, and marital commitment

and their impact on marital satisfaction during husbands' overseas deployment. The present study attempted to fill this gap.

In Chapter 3 the study's methodology and research design are addressed. The setting and the sample population are described. The instruments used, data collection and analysis procedures, and data security, are also discussed. Lastly, I present the measures used to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

Chapter 3: Research Method

As the need for military deployment increases, military couples and military families continue to require attention from behavioral health professionals. The purpose of the current study was to investigate wives' perception of likelihood of husbands' infidelity as it relates to trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction during deployment. This chapter addresses the methodology of the present study, including the study's design, overview of the sample, procedures used for sampling, participation, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis plan. Protection of participants' rights, methodological limitations, external, internal, and construct validity are also addressed.

Research Design and Approach

This quantitative study employed a survey design to investigate relationships between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction of wives during husbands' deployment. Participants accessed six standardized instruments online through SurveyMonkey, a commercial web-host survey provider: the RDAS (Spanier, 1976), the KMSS (Schumm et al., 1986), the DTS (Larzelere & Huston, 1980), the "Events with Others" questionnaire (Shackelford & Buss, 2000), four items from the CI (Stanley & Markman, 1992), and the ECR-R questionnaire (Fraley et al., 2000). A sociodemographic questionnaire was also administered to collect data such as age group, military affiliation, ethnicity, husbands' military status, years married, frequency of deployments including past and current deployments, expected length of current deployment, and number of children.

According to Wright (2005), surveys are an efficient data collection method to conduct correlation analysis. Wright also mentioned the ability of online surveys to reach a wide range of individuals from various geographical locations. Furthermore, surveys can be easily accessed and are useful in keeping the privacy of participants' answers.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages of using online surveys. Disadvantages include the inability to evaluate the integrity of the data, which depends highly on the honesty of participants, and the possibility of participants wanting to look good rather than being truthful (Wright, 2005). Limitations are addressed in more detail later in this chapter. Despite some disadvantages, there are many researchers who support the use of surveys as a mean to provide quantitative data (Allen et al., 2010; Kurdek, 2002; Lawrence et al., 2008; Wright, 2005). Instruments helped to provide the necessary information needed to answer the following research questions and hypotheses:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between military wives' marital satisfaction and length of husbands' deployment?

H_01 : Longer length of husbands' deployment will not predict lower levels of wives' marital satisfaction.

H_{a1} : Longer length of husbands' deployment will predict lower levels of wives' marital satisfaction.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between military wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment?

H_02 : There is no relationship between wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment.

H_{a2} : There is a negative relationship between wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between trust and marital commitment of military wives during husbands' deployment?

H_{03} : There is no relationship between trust and marital commitment of married military wives during husbands' deployment.

H_{a3} : There is a positive relationship between trust and marital commitment for married military wives during husbands' deployment.

Research Question 4: After controlling for attachment styles of wives, is there a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment?

H_{04} : After controlling for wives' attachment styles, there is no relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for married military wives during husbands' deployment.

H_{a4} : After controlling for wives' attachment styles, there is a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment.

Population and Sample

The population for the present study are nonworking (or stay at home) military wives over 18-years-old, whose husbands were deployed overseas at the time they completed the survey. Wives were to be able to comprehend English in order to accurately complete the survey. Whether the wives were in a second or third marriage did

not affect their ability to participate. The demographic information, including age group, military affiliation, ethnicity, husbands' ranks, years married, frequency of deployments, expected length of current deployment, and number of children was also evaluated. It should be understood that responses obtained from the sociodemographic questionnaire were not considered for inclusion or exclusion in the study but helped obtain a clearer understanding of the participants. The sample was recruited from military installations around the United States. There was no particular location representative of the military population because military families are frequently relocated.

A convenience sample was obtained by contacting military network leaders who had direct access to military wives. Military network leaders were asked to share the website link to the study's online survey with military wives. Individuals interested in the research project may have talked about it with other wives, giving them opportunities to participate in the study. Lastly, participants were also able to access the survey through the Walden University Research Participant Pool.

A statistical power analysis was conducted to determine the necessary sample size for the study. A sample size of at least 85 participants was needed based on the standard alpha of .05, power level of .80, and a medium effect size of .30 (Cohen, 1988). The effect size was determined following a review of the literature of similar research. Sample size was determined using tables from Cohen (1988).

Instrumentation and Materials

In the present study, I used six standardized instruments: (a) the RDAS (Busby et al., 1995), (b) the KMSS (Schumm et al., 1986), (c) the DTS (Larzelere & Huston, 1980),

(d) the “Events with Others” instrument (Shackelford & Buss, 2000), (e) four items from the CI (Stanley & Markman, 1992), and (f) the ECR-R (Fraley et al., 2000). A demographic questionnaire was created and delivered along with the assessment instruments through SurveyMonkey. The website link to the survey was provided to all the participants via websites.

Participants completed the survey anonymously and were not asked to provide identifying information such as name or address. The participants were required to acknowledge informed consent prior to beginning the survey by accepting the risks, benefits, and responsibilities of the participants. Participants were able to skip questions they did not want to answer or exit the survey at any time by simply closing the window.

Sociodemographic Questionnaire

A sociodemographic questionnaire (see Appendix A: Sociodemographic Questionnaire) created for this study was administered online in SurveyMonkey to obtain data on age group, branch of the military (Army, Air Force, Marine, Navy, Reserve, or National Guard), wives’ and husbands’ ethnicity, husbands’ military ranks, years married, frequency of deployments including past and current deployments, expected length of current deployment, and number of children. The geographical area was not of particular interest because of the frequent relocations of military couples.

Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale

The 14-item RDAS (see Appendix B: Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale) was introduced by Busby et al. (1995) and is a shorter version of the original 32-item DAS (Spanier, 1976). According to Spanier (1989), the DAS has demonstrated good

consistency, reliability, and validity with a test-retest coefficient of .96. Many studies used the DAS to measure marital satisfaction or relationship functioning of the participants (Coop Gordon, Hughes, Tomcik, Dixon, & Litzinger, 2009; Monson, Schnurr, Stevens, & Guthrie, 2004; Nelson Goff et al., 2007; Riggs, Byrne, Weathers, & Litz, 1998; Rusbult et al., 1998). Coop Gordon et al. (2009) used the DAS to assess the marital satisfaction of their participants. According to the authors, the DAS has demonstrated good reliability and validity. Monson et al. (2004) also opted for the 32-item DAS in measuring the military couples' marital satisfaction. Additionally, Nelson Goff et al. (2007) chose the DAS when assessing relationship functioning of the participants. Nelson Goff et al. mentioned that DAS demonstrated high reliability and validity. According to Busby et al., the RDAS is an improved shorter version of the original DAS.

The RDAS (Busby et al., 1995) has for its purpose to measure the adjustment quality in an intimate relationship, marital satisfaction, or relationship functioning. A recent study used the RDAS to measure marital adjustment of newlywed couples (Schramm, Marshall, Harris, & Lee, 2005). Crane, Middleton, and Bean (2000) explored the criterion scores for the RDAS. Results demonstrated that the RDAS has a strong correlation with the MAT as well as with the DAS. According to the authors, the RDAS is able to meet the same purposes as the DAS, which is to distinguish between distressed and nondistressed marriages (Crane et al., 2000). Furthermore, Busby et al. (1995) noted that the RDAS has strong validity and reliability.

The RDAS comprises the dyadic consensus subscale, the dyadic satisfaction subscale, and the dyadic cohesion subscale. According to Busby et al. (1995), the RDAS had a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .90 and a Guttman split-half reliability coefficient of .94. An example of a question used to assess marital adjustment is the following: "How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?" To measure the answer, the RDAS uses a Likert scale ranging from *Most of the time* (1) to *Never* (5). The subscale scores are then added to obtain a *t* score. According to Crane et al. (2000), the cutoff score for the RDAS is 48 for the wives. A score below 48 means that the marriage may be in distress, while a score above 48 may determine that the marriage is not distressed.

Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMSS)

The KMSS (see Appendix C: Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale; Schumm et al., 1986) is a 3-item self-report instrument, in which individuals are asked to rate each item on a 7-point scale ranging from *Extremely dissatisfied* (1) to *Extremely satisfied* (7). The participant's responses on all three items are summed to give the individual's total score. The score then reflects the level of marital satisfaction, with a higher score reflecting a higher level of marital satisfaction and a lower KMSS score reflecting a lower level of marital satisfaction. According to Schumm et al. (1986), the KMSS is a reliable and valid instrument designed to measure the level of marital satisfaction of an individual.

Numerous researchers have used the KMSS to measure marital satisfaction of their participants (Allen et al., 2010; Kurdek, 2002; Lawrence et al., 2008; Schramm et al., 2005; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004). The Cronbach's alpha of the KMSS in the study

conducted by Kurdek (2002) was high, with .97 for both husbands and wives. The coefficient alpha for wives in a study conducted by Lawrence et al. (2008) was also high with .94. According to Schramm et al. (2005), the KMSS is a quick and sample instrument with relatively high reliability (.89 to .97), and there is a high correlation between the RDAS and the KMSS, with Pearson coefficients of .78. Allen et al. (2010) mentioned the simplicity of the KMSS, and its usefulness to measure marital satisfaction. Allen et al. reported that the KMSS, although very short (three items), measures all items required to obtain a rating of marital satisfaction.

According to Crane et al. (2000), the cutoff score for the KMSS is 17 for the wives. A score below 17 means that the marriage may be in distress, while a score above 17 may determine that the marriage is not distressed.

Dyadic Trust Scale (DTS)

The DTS (see Appendix D: Dyadic Trust Scale; Larzelere & Huston, 1980) is an 8-item scale that has for purpose to measure the level of trust. Larzelere and Huston (1980) revealed that the DTS has demonstrated excellent face and construct validity as well as reliability. According to Larzelere and Huston, the DTS was unaffected by social desirability ($r = .00$) and had a very high reliability with a coefficient alpha of .93. Several researchers have used the DTS to measure trust (Coop Gordon et al., 2009; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004). The reliability coefficients in the study conducted by Coop Gordon et al. (2009) were .89 for men and .87 for women. The alpha reliability coefficients in the study conducted by Tallman and Hsiao (2004) were .84 for both, the husbands and the wives.

Larzelere and Huston (1980) included both dating and married participants for their research on the DTS. The dating sample included 120 female and 75 male participants with a mean age of 20.8 years. The married sample was composed of 127 participants, including 40 newlywed individuals (average age of 23.5 years), 42 longer married individuals (average age of 35.8 years), and 45 divorced individuals with a mean age of 33 years (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). The DTS item pool came from 57 items adapted from previously established scales. The selected items were then modified to fit the definition of dyadic trust (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). The item-total correlations of the DTS are high, with coefficients ranging from .72 to .89. Examples of items used to assess trust include “my partner is perfectly honest and truthful with me,” or “my partner is truly sincere in his promises” (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). Dyadic trust is associated with relationship intimacy.

Events With Others

The “Events with Others” instrument (see Appendix E: Events with Others) was developed and used by Shackelford and Buss (2000) to measure the likelihood of a partner to be unfaithful in the next year. In their study, Shackelford and Buss did not report information pertaining to the reliability or validity of the instrument. There are six types of infidelity that can be measured by the instrument: Flirting, passionately kissing, going on a romantic date, having a one night stand, having a brief affair, and having a serious affair. Participants in the current study were asked to rate items on 11-point scales. The scoring system was described by Shackelford and Buss as “the low end of the scale indicated 0%, the high end indicated 100%, with the scale marked off in 10%

increments” (p. 200). The participants were first presented a list of events such as “Partner flirts with a member of the opposite sex within the next year” or “Partner has a one-night stand with someone else within the next year.” The participants were then asked to circle three responses to each event: (a) estimating the likelihood that the event would occur, (b) estimating the likelihood that if the event happened, the participant would end the relationship, and (c) estimating the likelihood that if the event happened, the partner would end the relationship. The purpose of the “Event with Others” instrument was to measure the likelihood of the husbands’ unfaithfulness in the next year, from the wives’ perspective.

Revised Commitment Inventory (CI)

The original CI had 60 items within 10 subscales and was developed by Johnson (1978). Stanley and Markman (1992) then added two more subscales in order to meet the needs of a more diverse population. According to Stanley and Markman, half of the items on the CI represent positive statements, while the other half of the statements is worded negatively. Each subscale holds six items (three positive and three negative). When completing the CI, participants are asked to rate each item on a 7-point Likert scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. According to Stanley and Markman, the CI has good internal consistency and reliability demonstrated with coefficient alphas of .70 or above for all 12 subscales. The authors also mentioned that the CI demonstrated good validity, although they were unable to test the discriminant validity of some subscales (Stanley & Markman, 1992).

Allen, Rhoades, Stanley, and Markman (2010) used five items from the Dedication Scale of the CI to measure couples' identity, long term view, and priority of the relationship. For the purpose of the present study, only four items were needed to assess the wives' marital commitment (see Appendix F: Commitment Inventory). An example of a question used to assess marital commitment was "My relationship with my partner is more important to me than almost anything else in my life." According to Stanley and Markman (1992), the reliability coefficients for the four items CI, are $\alpha = .72$ and standardized item $\alpha = .73$. T

Experiences in Close Relationships - Revised Questionnaire (ECR-R)

The ECR-R (see Appendix G: Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised; Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) is a 36-item self-report questionnaire that has for purpose to assess the attachment styles of participants. The items found in the ECR-R derived from an Item Response Theory (IRT) analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000). The ECR-R consists of two subscales, each with 18 items. The subscales are Anxiety and Avoidance. Some of the items used to assess attachment styles in the Anxiety subscale include "I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me" and "I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them." Some of the items from the Avoidance subscale include "I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners" and "I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close." To reduce the possibility of discomfort of participants, the term "partners" was modified to the term "husband." Items were rated on a 7-point scale, with higher scores on the Anxiety subscale indicating more

significant fear for rejection and higher scores on the Avoidance subscale indicating greater discomfort with closeness. According to Fraley et al., 72% of the Anxiety items and 39% of the Avoidance items were found in the original ECR questionnaire.

To measure the reliability of the ECR-R, Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) assessed and compared four questionnaires measuring attachment styles. Of the questionnaires, the ECR-R demonstrated the highest test-retest correlations for the Anxiety subscale and for the Avoidance subscale with coefficients of .93 and .95 respectively (Fraley et al., 2000).

Other scales that could have assessed the attachment styles of the wives include the Experiences in Close Relationship (ECR), the Simpson inventory, the Adult Attachment Scale (AAS), or the Relationship Styles Questionnaire (RSQ). For instance, the RSQ measures all four styles of attachment, but has test-retest coefficients ranging from .44 to .77 (Fraley et al., 2000). For the purpose of the present study, the ECR-R was used to assess the wives' attachment styles.

Data Collection Procedures

The first step in the data collection process was to obtain approval for the study from the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Following IRB approval, the survey was posted online through SurveyMonkey and was also accessible via the Walden University Research Pool. Then, the selection of the convenience sample began. First, permissions from military network facilitators were obtained. E-mails were sent to military network leaders explaining the study. The study collected quantitative information through the use of a self-administered online survey. The study began with

presentation of the consent form followed by the sociodemographic questionnaire and six instruments: the DTS, RDAS, KMSS, revised CI, ECR – R, and "Events with Others." Online military network leaders were asked to post the online copy of the study poster to reach wives of deployed soldiers, inform them of the survey, and invite them to participate. In addition to e-mail invitations, it was anticipated that wives would share the survey's web link with other military wives. The participants received my e-mail address if they had questions or concerns pertaining to the study.

Participation in the study was voluntary. Confidentiality was maintained, as stipulated on the consent form, in order to protect the privacy of participants. For surveys collected, only the ones completed by wives whose husbands were deployed at the time of the survey were included in the data analysis. Data collection continued until the desired numbers of participants had completed the surveys. Surveys were self-administered online and were completed without my assistance. The participants were allowed as much time as necessary to complete the consent form and instruments. However, it was expected that the entire process would take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The 14-item RDAS and the 3-item KMSS were used to measure marital satisfaction. The DTS and the "Events with Others" instrument were used to measure trust and likelihood of infidelity, respectively. Lastly, the revised CI was used to measure marital commitment, and the ECR-R was used to measure attachment styles of wives. Items were very important to the accuracy of the scales measurement. Therefore, surveys containing multiple unanswered item on each scale were eliminated from the study.

Missing data on the information questionnaire were assigned a missing value code during data entry.

Validity

The purpose of scientific research includes determining whether there is a relationship between variables and if so, to explore the causality of such relationship. Internal validity addresses the causality of relationships determined during the study. To determine internal validity, it is critical to control for any extraneous variables (Rubin & Babbie, 2007). Strong internal validity helps to ensure that the study's results depict positive or negative causality between variables. One of the threats to internal validity is statistical regression. In order to reduce the likelihood of this threat, I aimed at obtaining a sample size of at least 125 participants.

External validity addresses the ability for the study to represent the desired population and situation. To have strong external validity, it is critical to choose the sample from a clearly defined population and situation. In the present study, the sample was military wives whose husbands were deployed at the time of the survey. According to Rubin and Babbie (2007), main threats to external validity are individuals, locations, or times. The present study employed an online survey, which required participants to have Internet access. Most military installations offer free internet access at local library or education center. As far as location of military wives, it was not a threat to external validity because military families are located and relocated throughout most states.

Data Analyses

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21.0 was used to analyze the raw data collected. Data was first analyzed with standard descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages. Bivariate comparisons were then calculated using Pearson correlations and *t* tests for independent means.

To examine Hypothesis 1, bivariate joint frequency distributions was used to examine length of deployment and wives' marital satisfaction.

To examine Hypothesis 2, Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust. Pearson correlation was the appropriate statistic to examine the strength of linear dependence between two interval-level variables.

To examine Hypothesis 3, Pearson correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between trust and marital commitment of wives. Pearson correlation is the appropriate statistic to examine the strength of linear dependence between two interval-level variables.

To examine Hypothesis 4, two multiple regression analyses were conducted using wives' marital commitment and trust level as predictor variables and attachment styles as mediators. During the first analysis, adjustment was used as criterion variable. During the second analysis, marital satisfaction was used as criterion variable.

Measures for the Protection of Participant Rights

Ethical standards were followed in the present study, as instructed by APA ethics code (APA, 2002). Walden University IRB approval was obtained prior to collecting any data. The approval number was 08-20-12-0126167. Participants were not asked to provide identifying information, and thus, their privacy and confidentiality remained protected. The main page on the survey site helped clarify the purpose and the procedures of the study. Potential participants then reviewed a clear, concise, and easy to understand consent form, in which they were asked to agree by opting “yes” prior to participation. This consent form offered deeper explanations about the voluntary nature of participation in the study and the rights of participants to withdraw at any time. Participants received assurance that their answers would be kept confidential and that results would not include personal data.

In the event where participants had questions or concerns pertaining to the study, they were able to reach me via e-mail. If participants were interested in receiving a copy of the study results, they were given the option to e-mail me and request such copy. Data were stored in my password-protected personal computer until reviewed. Once the reviews of the results were submitted, all e-mail correspondences and addresses were deleted from my personal computer. To ensure protection of confidentiality and privacy of participants, all surveys will be destroyed 4 years following completion of the study.

Summary

This quantitative study employed a survey method consisting of a sociodemographic questionnaire and six instruments to examine the relationship between

perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction in a convenience sample of military wives whose husbands were deployed overseas. Participants were recruited with the help of websites military network facilitators. Word of mouth recruitment from participating wives sharing the survey weblink with other wives of deployed soldiers was also encouraged. Once the IRB approved the study proposal, data collection began. Bivariate correlation and multiple regression model were used to analyze the collected data. The present study will contribute to the current body of research related to the effect of deployment on marital satisfaction, more specifically looking at marital commitment and trust for military wives.

The psychological wellbeing of military personnel could be affected by separation caused by deployment, consequently affecting their work performance (Huffman, Culbertson, & Castro, 2008; NHMRC, 2006). A better understanding of issues related to infidelity, trust, and marital satisfaction at the predeployment and deployment phases can empower mental health professionals to address marital functioning of military couples. It is critical for research related to military marriages to increase the current knowledge and understanding about infidelity, trust, and marital commitment in relations to marital satisfaction, especially in light of the increased divorce rate, domestic violence, and suicide rate of military personnel.

In Chapter 4, an overview of the research questions is presented. The chapter discusses the purpose of the study and research instruments that were used to collect data.

Descriptive statistics of the participants, data analysis procedures, answers to research questions, and an examination of the assumptions are also discussed.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter begins with an overview of the purpose of the study, research questions, and hypotheses. This information is followed by the time frame of the study and the events that resulted in actual and usable data. Third, descriptive and sociodemographic characteristics, scale reliability, and examination of the assumptions are presented. I conclude the chapter with a summary of findings of the statistical analyses and a preview of Chapter 5.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during their husbands' deployment. Interdependence theory and risk and resilience theoretical perspective were used as the theoretical frameworks for the study. The research questions and hypotheses were as follows:

RQ1: What is the relationship between military wives' marital satisfaction and length of husbands' deployment?

*H*₀1: Longer length of husbands' deployment will not predict lower levels of wives' marital satisfaction.

*H*_a1: Longer length of husbands' deployment will predict lower levels of wives' marital satisfaction.

RQ2: What is the relationship between military wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment?

*H*₀2: There is no relationship between wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment.

H_{a2}: There is a negative relationship between wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust during husbands' deployment.

RQ3: What is the relationship between trust and marital commitment of military wives during husbands' deployment?

H₀₃: There is no relationship between trust and marital commitment of married military wives during husbands' deployment.

H_{a3}: There is a positive relationship between trust and marital commitment for married military wives during husbands' deployment.

RQ4: After controlling for attachment styles of wives, is there a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment?

H₀₄: After controlling for wives' attachment styles, there is no relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for married military wives during husbands' deployment.

H_{a4}: After controlling for wives' attachment styles, there is a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment.

To accomplish the objectives of the study, participants completed a self-administered online survey with six standardized instruments: the RDAS (Spanier, 1976), the KMSS (Schumm, Paff-Bergen, Hatch, & Obiorah, 1986), the DTS (Larzelere & Huston, 1980), the "Events with Others" questionnaire (Shackelford & Buss, 2000), four items from the CI (Stanley & Markman, 1992), and the ECR-R questionnaire (Fraley,

Waller, & Brennan, 2000). A sociodemographic questionnaire was also administered to collect data such as age group, military branch, wives' and husbands' ethnicity, husbands' military ranks, years married, frequency of deployments including past and current deployments, expected length of current deployment, and number of children. Additionally, to control for external factor such as wives' anxious or avoidant attachment and wives' attachment styles were assessed in relation to trust and marital commitment. All statistical tests used the .05 level of significance.

I hypothesized that longer length of deployment would predict lower marital satisfaction. In addition, I hypothesized that wives' ratings of perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity would significantly predict trust level, consequently predicting the level of marital commitment of military wives during deployment. Lastly, the ratings of trust and marital commitment were hypothesized to predict marital satisfaction for married military wives during deployment.

Data Collection

Prior to analysis, data were screened to ensure accurate completion of instruments. One hundred forty-two prospective participants accessed the study via SurveyMonkey between November 2012 and November 2013. Based on the power analysis for sample size previously discussed in Chapter 3, the initial targeted sample size was 85 participants. By November 2013 a sample size of 142 was reached, and data collection efforts were discontinued. Of the 142 participants, the data from 127 participants were deemed usable as a result of partial completion or completion of surveys and therefore were included for analysis. Of the 127 participants, some skipped

items on one or more of the survey instruments. Of these cases, less than 20% of data were missing per case. Based on recommendations obtained from the CI, ECR-R, and DTS scales developers (personal communication, 2014), syntax was to be set so that SPSS would produce a mean score if only one or two items from the scale were missing. This procedure gave each participant a mean for their scale items based on the ones they did answer. According to Downey and King (1998), sample item mean substitution is considered an effective data replacement method for variables missing less than 20% of data values.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS, software package 21st Edition. In the preliminary analysis, the assumptions of linearity of variance were assessed to discover whether a relationship exists between the variables. The assumption was a linear relationship exists between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction of wives during husbands' deployment.

Data cleaning was needed to address inadvertent errors that could have occurred during data collection such as missing data and insufficient data due to missing values. Out of 142 respondents who began the study, 127 cases were included for analysis in the present study. Fifteen cases were deleted prior to data analysis because they only answered questions from the demographic questionnaire and did not complete any of the scales.

Of the 127 participants who completed the majority of the survey, eight participants did not respond to the question on the demographic questionnaire regarding their husbands' length of deployment. These missing values could not be replaced with a

measure of central tendency. However, the differences in distribution sizes should not affect the outcome of the analyses due to the large sample size of the study (Boneau, 1960).

The skewness and the kurtosis of the primary variables involved in the research questions were measured and examined in order to identify errors related to the distributions. The DTS demonstrated a negatively skewed distribution (-1.14), and the kurtosis of the distribution was at 0.70. The distribution of the responses on the CI resulted in a negative skew of 1.20, and a kurtosis distribution of 0.48. The KMSS demonstrated a negatively skewed distribution (-1.70), and the kurtosis of the distribution was slightly elevated at 2.30. Lastly, the RDAS demonstrated a negatively skewed distribution (-1.45), and the kurtosis of the distribution was also slightly elevated at 2.72. As shown in Table 1, measures of skewness and kurtosis for DTS, CI, KMSS, and RDAS showed marginal platykurtic characteristics. The results did not produce a curve that deviated significantly from a normal distribution, and therefore validated the assumption of normality.

Table 1

Central Tendency, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis for DTS, CI, KMSS, and RDAS

Variable	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
DTS	5.73	1.27	-1.14	0.70
CI	4.53	0.57	-1.20	0.48
KMSS	5.83	1.54	-1.70	2.30
RDAS	3.59	0.71	-1.45	2.72

Note. DTS = Dyadic Trust Scale; CI = Commitment Inventory; KMSS = Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale; RDAS = Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

Descriptive and Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics for the 127 military wives ($M = 31.55$ years, $SD = 8.42$) who participated in the study. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 57 years old. The ethnic distribution showed that the majority of participants were White/Caucasian (80.3%). Of the sample, 71.7% of participants were married to White/Caucasian service members. Army wives constituted 47.2% of the sample, followed by Navy (19.7%), Air Force (17.3%), Reserve/National Guard (8.7%), and Marine (7.1%). Nearly half of military husbands (45.7%) were of E-5 through E-9 ranking status, 22.8% were ranked between E-1 and E-4, 17.3% between O-1 and O-3, 10.2% between O-4 and O-6, and two participants were married to military personnel with ranking status O-7 or above. Roles and responsibilities in the military are contingent to military ranks. All branches of the military operate on a ranking system that goes from E-1, being the lowest enlisted rank to E-9, being the highest enlisted rank, and O-1, being the lowest officer rank to O-10 or O-11 being the highest officer rank. The rank of E-1 represents enlisted military personnel who are referred to in the Air Force as Airman Basic, in the Army and Marine as Private, and in the Navy as Seaman Recruit. The rank of E-9 represents enlisted military personnel who are referred to in the Air Force as Chief Master Sergeant, in the Army and Marine as Sergeant Major, and in the Navy as Master Chief Petty. The rank of O-1 represents military officers who are referred to in the Air force, Army, and Marine as Second Lieutenant, and in the Navy as Ensign. The rank of O-10 represents military officers who are referred to in the Air Force, Army, and Marine as General, and in the Navy as Admiral. The rank of O-11 is only given during wartime

and represents either the General of the Air Force, General of the Army, or Fleet Admiral for the Navy. The Marines do not have the officer rank of O-11 during wartime. The length of time that participants were married ranged from 1 year to 32 years, with over 50% of the participants married between 1 to 5 years. Over half of the participants reported their husbands' current deployment as his first or second deployment, while nearly 30% of the participants reporting the deployment as being their husband's third or fourth deployment. Deployments at the time of survey completion were expected to last less than 6 months for 16% of the participants, 6 months to 1 year for 73.1% of the participants, and over 1 year for 10.9% of the participants. Forty-three percent of the sample had no children living at home, 42.3% had one or two children, and over 14% of the participants had three or more children living at home.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N = 127)

Variables	N	%
Wives' age group		
18 to 24	29	23.8
25 to 29	28	23
30 to 34	22	18
35 to 39	17	14
40 to 44	9	7.4
45 to 49	8	6.6
50 and over	3	1.6
Wives' ethnicity		
White	102	80.3
Black	10	7.9
Hispanic	7	5.5
Asian	3	2.4
White and Hispanic	2	1.6
Black and Hispanic	1	0.8
Husbands' ethnicity		
White	91	71.7
Black	15	11.8
Hispanic	8	6.3
Asian	4	3.1
White and Hispanic	2	1.6
White and Asian	2	1.6

(table continues)

Variables	N	%
Husbands' branch in Armed Forces		
Army	60	47.2
Air Force	22	17.3
Marine	9	7.1
Navy	25	19.7
Reserve/National Guard	11	8.7
Husbands' rank		
E-1 through E-4	29	22.8
E-5 through E-9	58	45.7
W-1 through W-5	3	2.4
O-1 through O-3	22	17.3
O-4 through O-6	13	10.2
O-7 and Above	2	1.6
Years married to spouse		
1 year or less	23	18.1
2 to 3 years	33	25.9
4 to 10 years	41	40.3
11 to 20 years	23	18.2
21 years or over	7	5.6
Times deployed		
First deployment	40	31.5
Second or third	54	56.7
Fourth or fifth	20	15.7

(table continues)

Variables	N	%
Times deployed		
Sixth or more	13	10.3
Length of current deployment		
Less than 6 months	19	16
6 Months to 1 year	87	73.1
More than one year	13	10.9
No answer	8	6.3
Children living at home		
No child	55	43.3
1 or 2	54	42.5
3 or 4	15	11.8
More than 5	2	1.6
No Answer	1	0.8

Scale Reliability

Participants completed six survey instruments and one demographic questionnaire. They completed two survey instruments to measure marital satisfaction. The first survey instrument was the RDAS, which is a self-report questionnaire that assesses seven dimensions of couple relationships within three overarching categories including Consensus in decision making, values and affection, Satisfaction in the relationship with respect to stability and conflict regulation, and Cohesion as seen through activities and discussion.

The RDAS contains fourteen items rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*always disagree*) to 5 (*always agree*) on the first 6 items, 0 (*all of the time*) to 5 (*never*) on the next four items, 0 (*never*) to 5 (*more often*) on items 12 to 14, and a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*every day*) on item 11. In this study, the minimum scale score for all 14 items was 0, and the maximum scale score was 4 on item 11 and 5 on all other items. Scores on the RDAS can range from 0 to 69 with higher scores indicating greater relationship satisfaction and lower scores indicating greater relationship distress. In this study, scores ranged from 11 to 64, and the RDAS yielded a Cronbach's alpha level of 0.87. The internal consistency of the scale was high and in the acceptable range of .70 or higher (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). The RDAS has been found to have a Cronbach's alpha level of .90. In terms of discriminant validity, the RDAS has been found to successfully differentiate between 81% of distressed and non-distressed cases (Crane et al., 2000).

The second survey instrument to measure marital satisfaction was the KMSS, which is a self-report questionnaire that assesses marital satisfaction. The KMSS contains three items in which participants were asked to indicate the degree of satisfaction with their current marriage relationship. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*extremely dissatisfied*) to 7 (*extremely satisfied*). Low scores indicate low levels of satisfaction, and high scores indicate high levels of satisfaction. In this study, the minimum scale score for all 3 items was 1 (13 participants), and the maximum scale score was 7 (170 participants). The scale minimum score for the KMSS

is 1, and the maximum score is 21. In this study, scores ranged from 3 to 21, and the KMSS yielded a Cronbach's alpha level of 0.98.

The DTS was used to measure wives' trust. It contains eight items rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Items 1, 2, and 6 are negatively keyed items so that agreement with these items represents a low level of trust and disagreement with this item represents a high level of trust. This item was reverse-coded so that 1 = 7, 2 = 6, 3 = 5, 4 = 4, 5 = 3, 6 = 2, and 7 = 1. The scale minimum score was 8, and the maximum score was 56. High scores indicated a high level of trust, and low scores represented a low level of trust. In this study, scores ranged from 13 to 43, and the trust scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha level of .89.

The revised CI was used to measure wives' marital commitment. It contains four items rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Item 2 was a negatively keyed item so that agreement with this item represented a low level of commitment and disagreement with this item represented a high level of commitment. This item was reverse-coded so that 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 4 = 2, and 5 = 1. The scale minimum score was 4, and the maximum score was 20. High scores indicated a high level of commitment, and low scores represented a low level of commitment. In the present study, scores ranged from 8 to 20, and the commitment scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha level of .65 with only four items.

The "Events with Others" questionnaire was the fourth survey instrument, and was used to measure the likelihood of spousal infidelity as perceived by the participants. Participants estimated the likelihood of their husbands committing each of six types of

infidelity with a member of the opposite sex in the next year: a) flirting, b) passionately kissing, c) going on a romantic date, d) having a one night stand, e) having a brief affair, and f) having a serious affair. Participants then provided parallel estimates for their own likelihood of committing the six types of infidelity. Participants provided estimates on separate 11-point scales for each type of infidelity. The low end of the scale indicated 0%, the high end indicated 100%, with the scale marked off in 10% increments. The “Event with Others” questionnaire was divided into four scales: a) Likelihood of husband’s infidelity, b) likelihood of wives’ infidelity, c) probability that husbands would end relationship if even occurs, and d) probability that wives would end relationship if event occurs. For the purpose of the present study, the focus remained on the wives’ perceptions of the likelihood of their husbands’ infidelity. Thus, only the items including probability of husbands’ infidelity were included in data analysis. The Probability of Husbands’ infidelity scale minimum score was 6, and the maximum score was 66. In the present study, the “Event with Others” questionnaire scores ranged between 6 and 56, and the scale yielded a Cronbach’s alpha level of .82.

The ECR-R, which was used to measure wives’ anxious and avoidant attachment styles, contains a total of thirty-six items rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The first 18 items comprise the attachment-related anxiety scale. Items 9 and 11 were negatively keyed items so that high numbers on those items represent low anxiety rather than high anxiety. These items were reverse-coded so that 1 = 7, 2 = 6, 3 = 5, 4 = 4, 5 = 3, 6 = 2, and 7 = 1. The scale minimum score was 18, and the maximum score was 126. To obtain a score for attachment-related

anxiety, participants' responses to items 1 – 18 were averaged. High scores indicated high level of attachment-related anxiety, and low scores represented a low level of attachment-related anxiety. In the present study, the scale minimum score was 18, and the maximum score was 115. The attachment-related anxiety scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha level of .94.

Items 19 to 36 on the ECR-R comprise the attachment-related avoidance scale. Items 20, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, and 36 were negatively keyed items so that high numbers on those items represent low avoidance rather than high avoidance. These items were reverse-coded so that 1 = 7, 2 = 6, 3 = 5, 4 = 4, 5 = 3, 6 = 2, and 7 = 1. The scale minimum score was 18, and the maximum score was 126. To obtain a score for attachment-related *avoidance*, participants' responses to items 19 – 36 were averaged. High scores indicated high level of attachment-related avoidance, and low scores represented a low level of attachment-related avoidance. In the present study scores ranged from 18 to 115, and the attachment-related avoidance scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha level of .94.

Results

Four separate analyses were run; the first analysis examined the relationship between marital satisfaction and the length of deployment. The second analysis examined the relationship between perceived likelihood of infidelity and level of trust. The third analysis examined the relationship between trust and marital commitment. After controlling for attachment styles of wives, the fourth analysis examined the relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction. A multiple regression

analysis was conducted to examine the predictive strength that the predictor variables (trust and marital commitment) had on the criterion variable (marital satisfaction) after controlling for wives' attachment styles (attachment-related anxiety, and attachment-related avoidance).

Bivariate Correlation

Correlation coefficient analysis was used to identify significant bivariate relationship between variables. According to Pallant (2010), it is hoped that a strong correlation exists between the dependent variable and predictor variables, but not between each other. The amount of correlation indicates the extent to which two or more variables are associated. Correlation coefficients range from -1.0 to 1.0. Table 3 demonstrate the bivariate correlations that were conducted to examine the relationship between the primary variables of interest.

Table 3

Pearson Correlations Between DTS, CI, KMSS, and RDAS (N = 127)

Variable	CI	KMSS	RDAS
DTS	.63**	.76**	.71**
CI		.62**	.58**
KMSS			.79**

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

DTS = Dyadic Trust Scale; CI = Commitment Inventory; KMSS = Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale; RDAS = Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

Hypothesis 1

In the first research question, I examined whether there is a relationship between the level of wives' marital satisfaction and length of husbands' current deployment.

Bivariate correlation revealed no relationship between length of deployment and marital

satisfaction (as measured by the KMSS and the RDAS). The results of this analysis indicated that there was not a significant association between wives' marital satisfaction as measured by the KMSS and length of husbands' current deployment ($r = .09, p = .34$) or between wives' marital satisfaction as measured by the RDAS and length of husbands' deployment ($r = .02, p = .87$). As such, this hypothesis was not supported by the correlation analyses.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis predicted that there would be a relationship between perceived likelihood of infidelity and trust for military wives during their husbands' deployment. Results from the bivariate correlation analysis revealed that a relationship was found between the variables perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity and dyadic trust ($r = -.51, p = .000$). As such, the hypothesis was supported. Results indicate that wives who perceived a higher likelihood for their husbands' infidelity reported lower levels of trust. According to Cohen (1988), a Pearson correlation of $r = .10$ is considered weak, $r = .30$ is considered a moderate correlation, and $r = .50$ is considered a strong correlation.

Hypothesis 3

To examine Hypothesis 3, Pearson correlations was conducted to examine the relationship between trust and marital commitment of wives. Pearson correlation is the appropriate statistic when examining the strength of linear dependence between two interval-level variables. There was a significant relationship between DTS and the revised

CI scales ($r = .63, p = .000$). As such, results indicate that wives who reported higher levels of trust also reported higher commitment to the marriage.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis predicted that a significant relationship exists between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction of military wives controlling for wives' attachment styles. Thus, after controlling for attachment styles of wives, it was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives during their husbands' deployment. I was only able to include responses from 119 participants on this regression analysis, as a result of participants who did not answer more than two questions on eight items from the ECR-R scale. Table 4 provides results of the multiple regression analysis using marital satisfaction, as measured by the KMSS, as a criterion variable and trust as measured by the DTS and marital commitment as measured by four items from the CI, as predictor variables and Attachment Styles Scales (anxiety and avoidance) as measured by the ECR-R, as mediator variables. The multiple regression analyses was significant, $F(2, 115) = 49.14, p = .000$, accounting for 24.83% of the variance in Marital Satisfaction (KMSS) scores. The DTS scale was statistically significant in the model ($\beta = .44, p = .000$), and the CI scale was also statistically significant in the model ($\beta = .25, p = .002$).

Table 4

Regression Summary Table: ECR-R (anxiety), ECR-R (Avoidance), DTS, CI, and KMSS (N = 119)

Predictor variables	B	SE	β	t	Sig
Attachment (Anxiety)	-.24	.10	-.20	-2.33	.022
Attachment (Avoidance)	-.02	.12	-.01	-.14	.889
Trust	.53	.11	.44	4.70	.000
Marital commitment	.66	.21	.25	3.18	.002

Note. Dependent variable: KMSS
 $R^2 = .62$ ($p = .000$); Adjusted $R^2 = .61$

Table 5 presents the multiple regression analysis using the Marital Satisfaction scale RDAS as the criterion variable and DTS and CI as predictor variables and wives' attachment styles to control for this factor. The multiple regression analyses was significant $F(2, 115) = 34.01, p = .000$, accounting for 15.17% of the variance in Marital Satisfaction (RDAS) scores. The DTS scale was statistically significant in the model ($\beta = .39, p = .000$), and the CI scale was also statistically significant in the model ($\beta = .20, p = .025$). The results of the correlation and regression analyses present support for the second and third hypotheses. As such, trust and marital commitment are significant predictors of marital commitment when wives' attachment styles are in the model. Wives' attachment styles were also predictors of marital satisfaction.

Table 5
Regression Summary Table: ECR-R (anxiety), ECR-R (Avoidance), DTS, CI, and RDAS (N = 119)

Predictor variables	B	SE	β	t	Sig
Attachment (Anxiety)	-.076	.05	-1.4	-1.50	.14
Attachment (Avoidance)	-.081	.06	-.12	-1.33	.19
Trust	.22	.06	.39	3.86	.000
Marital commitment	.24	.10	.20	2.27	.025

Note. Dependent variable: RDAS
 $R^2 = .54$ ($p = .000$); Adjusted $R^2 = .53$

Summary of Findings

Data were collected from a total of 127 military wives whose husbands' were deployed at the time of participation. The research hypotheses were tested using logistic regression and correlation analyses. The present study offered important findings pertaining to military wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction.

Length of husbands' deployment was not significantly related to wives' marital satisfaction. That is, as the length of husbands' deployment increased, wives' marital satisfaction did not significantly decrease. As wives' perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity decreased, their trust level increased. Also, as wives' trust level increased, they reported higher marital commitment, indicating a significant positive relationship. Higher levels of marital commitment were related to higher level of marital satisfaction.

Attachment styles were not the only predictor of wives' marital satisfaction. For the standard multiple regression modeling conducted in the fourth hypothesis, DTS and CI were observed to have statistically significant predictive utility for marital satisfaction as

measured by the KMSS and the RDAS when controlling for wives' attachment styles.

The findings established a basis for multiple conclusions about marital satisfaction during military deployment.

The data collected for this study supported the research hypothesis that perceived likelihood of infidelity is related to wives' trust and marital commitment, which consequently is related to wives' marital satisfaction after controlling for their attachment styles, during their husbands' deployment. These results, interpretations, and implications for social change will be further discussed in Chapter 5. Additionally, a discussion of strengths and limitations of the study, theoretical considerations, recommendations for future action and further research, and a summary of the study will conclude the chapter.

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter includes a summary of the study, a review of the results, an interpretation of the findings, and a discussion of how this study relates to the current body of literature on trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction of military wives during their husbands' deployment. Chapter 5 also includes the limitations and strengths of the study and implications for positive social change. Finally, recommendations for further research are made.

Study Overview

The purpose of this nonexperimental, quantitative study was to explore some issues faced by military couples during deployment, which could impact job performance and retention of military personnel, divorce rate, domestic violence rate, psychological needs of military personnel and spouses, and suicide rate in the military. More specifically, in this study, I explored the relationship between perceived likelihood of marital infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction for military wives whose husbands are deployed. In addition, to control for external factors, the wives' attachment styles were assessed in relation to trust level and marital commitment. The primary aim of this study was to understand if wives' perception of likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, and marital commitment was related to marital satisfaction during their husbands' deployment to better understand the need for psychological services, such as marital counseling and education for married military couples during all phases of deployment.

Military wives experience challenges that are unique to them due to frequent relocations and husbands' duty to the country. Unresolved conflicts likely increase stress and anxiety for military couples during deployment (Olmstead et al., 2009). In addition, research has shown higher divorce rates for military couples when compared with the general population, consequently affecting work performance and life satisfaction of many military personnel and their family members (Bagley et al., 2010; McNulty, 2005; Orthner & Rose, 2009).

As variables that contribute to marital satisfaction are identified and studied, interventions can be promoted that could increase resiliency factors in military couples, thereby reducing instances of marital dissolution. Research questions for this study addressed the relationship between perceived likelihood of infidelity as measured by the "Events with Others" questionnaire and trust as measured by the DTS. I also examined the relationship between trust, as measured by the DTS, and marital commitment, as measured by the CI Revised. The relationship between marital commitment, as measured by the commitment inventory revised and marital satisfaction as measured by the RDAS and the KMSS were also examined. A research question involved how perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity may be related to wives' ability to trust their deployed husband. Trust was also explored in relation to marital commitment. Lastly, I explored the relationship between trust marital commitment and marital satisfaction for military wives after controlling for attachment styles.

There is a large body of research supporting the challenges faced by military marriages and the effect of deployment on marital functioning. Findings demonstrating

the relationship between trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction in nonmilitary marriages are also well documented. This study and its fundamental importance was justified by the dearth of empirical data in the literature concerning the effect of deployment on military marriages, more specifically on the level to which wives perceive their husbands' likelihood of infidelity to the marriage, and its impact on trust, marital commitment, and overall marital satisfaction during deployment.

Interpretation of the Findings

Length of Deployment and Marital Satisfaction

The results of the study did not support the first hypothesis, stating there is a significant relationship between length of husbands' deployment and wives' marital satisfaction as measured by the KMSS and the RDAS. In the present study, increased length of deployment was not related to lower marital satisfaction for wives during deployment. This is consistent with a study by Karney and Crown (2011), who also reported that length of deployment was not linked to marital satisfaction. The range of deployment is typically between 3 months and 12 months, not to exceed 18 months. It should be noted that the findings in the current study focused on length of deployment and do not imply that deployment does not have significant impact on marital satisfaction. Over half of participants in the present study were experiencing husbands' second or third deployments, and over 73% of husbands were deployed between 6 months to 12 months. Only 10.9% of wives reported that husbands would be deployed for over 12 months. Previous studies found that deployment was significantly related to increased marital conflicts (Lundquist, 2007; SteelFisher et al., 2008; Mansfield et al.,

2010). In order to have a better understanding of the relationship between deployment and marital satisfaction, a comparative analysis should be employed with a sample of wives whose husbands are not deployed, and a sample of wives whose husbands are deployed. The present study did not include a comparable sample with military wives whose husbands were not deployed. Communication, location of deployment, and family support are also other factors that could impact marital satisfaction during deployment, but were not included in the present study.

Perceived Likelihood of Spousal Infidelity and Trust

The results of the study supported the second hypothesis, stating there is a significant relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity as measured by part of the “Events with Others” questionnaire and wives’ level of trust as measured by the DTS. From resilience and interdependence theoretical perspectives, the perception of likelihood of spousal infidelity by military wives during deployment remains an important construct in the present study. The strong negative relationship observed between probability of husbands infidelity and level of trust in the present study is supported by the position held by Charny and Parnass (1995) who suggested that infidelity can lead to decreased levels of trust and feelings of abandonment. Similarly, Blunk (1995) reported that infidelity has been found to have negative consequences on marriage. In the present study, actual infidelity was not a variable of interest, but rather wives’ perceived likelihood of husbands’ infidelity. In regard to perception rather than actual behavior, Stafford and Canary (1991) reported that perceptions of partners’ behaviors can significantly impact the marital relationship, even without knowledge of

the actual behavior. From this point of view, wives' perception can have a negative impact on their levels of trust. Possible factors influencing perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity during deployment include lack of positive communication, emotional withdrawal, stress, and decreased interdependence. A research study conducted by Alt (2006) revealed that nearly 70% of wives of deployed soldiers believed that infidelity happens frequently during deployment. It is critical for mental health providers who work with the military population to be aware and understand how wives' perception of husbands' infidelity can influence their levels of trust. Mental health professionals could provide wives with therapeutic tools, techniques, and skills to cope with such challenges during deployment and following deployment.

Trust and Marital Commitment

The results of the study supported the third hypothesis, stating there is a significant relationship between trust and marital commitment for military wives during husbands' deployment. The analysis in the present study showed higher levels of trust in wives who expressed higher levels of marital commitment. Interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibault, 1978) demonstrates relationships between trust, commitment, prorelationship behaviors, and marital satisfaction (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998; Wieselquist et al., 1999). According to Kelly and Thibaut (1978), partners seek to commit to relationships that are perceived as equitable and able to meet their needs, consequently engaging in more prorelationship behaviors and reaching a deeper level of interdependence. According to risk and resilience theoretical perspective, during deployment wives develop a deeper sense of resilience and independence (Orthner &

Rose, 2009). Military couples are faced with challenges during deployment that are unique to them. According to Wieselquist et al. (1999), trust and commitment are critical components of marriage. Prorelationship behaviors, positive communications, and low perception of likelihood of husbands' infidelity appear to increase wives' levels of trust. In turn, higher levels of trust for wives impacts their ability to remain committed to the marital relationship during deployment. As such, military couples should thrive to continue to engage in prorelationship behaviors in all phases of deployment. Other factors that have not been considered in the present study can also impact levels of trust for military wives, such as difficulties in previous relationships difficulties, divorce of parents, and/or previous negative experiences in current relationship. These factors could be explored in a subsequent study.

Controlling for Attachment Styles

The fourth and last hypothesis was supported, stating, after controlling for attachment-related anxiety and attachment-related avoidance, marital commitment and trust of wives are significant explanatory variables of marital satisfaction during husbands' deployment. The analysis in the present study showed a significant positive relationship between marital commitment, trust, and marital satisfaction for military wives during husbands' deployment. In other words, the results showed that when attachment style was factored into the equation, the predictive variables influenced marital satisfaction positively or they were significant explanatory variables of marital satisfaction among military wives.

As stated in Chapter 2, wives can experience a sense of emotional loss, increased responsibilities, and a significant need for role adjustments during deployment (NHMRC, 2006). Findings of previous studies confirmed that long periods or frequent separations have a significant negative impact on relationships (Orthner & Rose, 2009; Stafford, Merolla, & Castle, 2006). According to Orthner and Rose (2009), wives whose husbands are deployed must adjust from a dependent state to an independent one. Frequent or lengthy separations of couples can lead to habitual independence for wives who may have difficulty readjusting following deployment (Stafford, et al., 2006). An older study by Arlitt (1943) explored the cause and effect of separation that can lead to a partner's withdrawal during WWII. In addition, findings have shown that negative exchanges occurring during separations can lead a partner to experience a sense of withdrawal and negative emotions regarding physical reunion with spouse (Arlitt, 1943; Basham, 2008; McNulty, 2005). According to Basham (2008), it is not uncommon for military personnel to withdraw emotionally and to avoid contact with their wives. Consequently, wives may perceive the husbands' behavior to be antirelationship and committed more to the military rather than the marriage. In turn, wives likely become themselves less committed to the marital relationship. Findings have shown that there is a strong relationship between marital commitment and trust (Finkel et al., 2002). Evidence shows that prorelationship behaviors, cooperation, and trust are important factors during relational conflicts, and are significantly related to higher marital satisfaction (Finkel et al., 2002; Kurdek, 2002; Rusbult et al., 1998; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004; Wieselquist et al., 1999). In light of this assertion, the resilience theory (Orthner & Rose, 2009) held expectations that

marital commitment during deployment would be lower. Interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibault, 1978) held expectations that affirmative perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity would decrease trust level and marital commitment, and consequently decrease marital satisfaction for wives during deployment.

Findings from this study confirmed that perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity plays a role in wives' level of trust. Wives who did not predict that their husbands would be unfaithful during deployment were found to have high levels of marital commitment. Further research into the relationship between likelihood of spousal infidelity and trust might provide a clue as to the relationship between likelihood of spousal infidelity and marital commitment. Marital commitment also played a role in determining trust of wives during deployment. Findings from this research study supported the notion that the levels of trust for wives whose husband are deployed contributed to the level of commitment or dedication they have regarding their marital relationship. The implication is that wives who have lower trust towards their marital relationship have lower levels of marital commitment. Results from the present research study also supported previous findings with regard to the impact of trust and marital commitment on marital satisfaction (Rusbult et al., 1998; Wieselquist et al., 1999). Wives' marital commitment and trust were found to be related to their marital satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundations for this study are interdependence theory and risk and resilience theory. The risk and resilience theoretical perspective contends that wives who are separated from their husbands due to work demands tend to feel a sense of resilience

and confusion (Orthner & Rose, 2009). As applied to the present study, the risk and resilience theory (Orthner & Rose, 2009) held expectations that wives of deployed military personnel would perceive their husbands' marital commitment as low, consequently decreasing wives' level of marital commitment. According to previous research, there is a strong relationship between commitment, prorelationship behaviors, trust, and marital satisfaction (Rusbult et al., 1998; Wieselquist et al., 1999). The theoretical basis for this study supported the premise of the interdependence theory. According to Finkel et al. (2002), observation of a partner's prorelationship behaviors, often demonstrated by marital commitment and fidelity, can significantly impact trust for the receiving partner. Research has shown that trust is a critical component of relationships and significantly impacts marital satisfaction (Finkel et al., 2002; Kurdek, 2002; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004). During deployment, wives may perceive husbands' behaviors and commitment to be military centered rather than prorelationship.

As applied to the present study, interdependence theory (Kelley & Thibault, 1978) held expectations that marital commitment would impact trust level and marital satisfaction for military wives. This theory stipulates that trust does not develop solely from personality traits as presented in attachment theory (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Prorelationship behaviors, marital commitment, and satisfaction have significant influence on the longevity of intimate relationships (Kelly & Thibaut, 1978; Stafford & Canary, 1991). Perception rather than the actual behavior of one's partner reflects an individual's experiences with interaction (Stafford & Canary, 1991). Thus, wives' perception of their husbands' marital commitment would likely significantly impact their

own commitment to the marriage. Within the tenets of interdependence theory, higher dependence increases marital commitment, consequently increasing marital satisfaction (Rusbult et al., 1998). As applied to the present study, the risk and resilience theoretical perspective (Orthner & Rose, 2009) as well as interdependence based theory (Kelly & Thibaut, 1978) helped predict marital commitment, trust level, and marital satisfaction of military wives whose husbands were deployed.

Experience of couples and relational conflicts significantly impact marital satisfaction. Prorelationship behaviors such as frequent communication, dedication, and faithfulness, demonstrated even when apart, they are more likely to increase trust and thus increase marital commitment during deployment. However, questions are left unanswered about the influence that attachment processes may have on military marriages, and what factors directly or indirectly impact the functioning of such marriages during all three phases of deployment.

Limitations of the Study

Empirical studies that employ self-reporting methods are subject to limitations that may impact the reliability of data collection. In the present study, the use of a self-report measure was a limitation. Some participants did not complete the entire survey, and it is not known if participants answered all questions truthfully. Wives may not have been insightful and honest in their responses due to unidentified constraints. Although self-report measures offered insight into wives' own perspectives, possible validity problems could have occurred because some participants might be deceived about their own experiences and beliefs (Barker, Pistrang, & Elliott, 2005). For these reasons,

caution should be used when interpreting these data. Another limitation of the study was the use of the “Events with Others” questionnaire because of its lack of established validity. In their study, Shackelford and Buss (2000) did not report information pertaining to the reliability or validity of the instrument. There is also the assumption that other factors could possibly impact the generalizability of findings, consequently affecting the validity of conclusions. The convenience sample limited the generalizability of the findings since the sample may not be representative of the larger population of military wives whose husbands are deployed. A larger sample may have added to the generalizability and significance of the study outcomes.

Another limitation in this study is self-selection bias as respondents overrepresented a certain demographic population, namely, white (80.3%), army wives (47.2%), whose husbands’ ranks are between E-5 and E-9 (45.7%), and only 10.9% of husbands were expected to be deployed for over 1 year. Of the 127 wives in the present study, 46.8% of wives were between the age of 18 to 29 years old, while 47.6% were 30 years old or older. Only 7.9% of wives were of Black ethnicity. Slightly over 22% of husbands had ranking status between E-1 and E-4 and 17.3% between O-1 and O-3. In comparison, the demographic distribution of the military (Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, 2014) in 2013 was represented by 76.5% White service members, and 16.5% Black service members. The large majority served in the Army (21%), followed by the Air Force (13%), the Navy (12.7%), the Army Reserve (12.1%) and the Marine Corp (7.8%). Slightly over half (52.6%) of the spouses (including husbands) were under the age of 30 years old, and 47.4% were over the age of 30. More specifically, of

the 1,106,664 military spouses, 23.5% were 26 to 30 years old, while 22.8% were 25 years old or younger, and 20.3% were 41 years old or older. Husbands were represented by 38.9% E-5 to E-9 ranking status, 43.6% ranked between E-1 and E-4, and 9.6% ranked between O-1 and O-3. According to Goodman, et al. (2013), the average deployment lengths are 9 months for the Army, 6 months for the Air Force, and 6 to 7 months for the Navy service members. Thus, wives identifying as Black were underrepresented, as well as wives whose husbands were of E-1 to E-4 ranking status, and wives under the age of 30 years old.

The use of online survey could have limited the overall number of surveys collected because potential participants may not have had access to a computer or the internet, consequently not having the chance to participate in the study. In addition, lack of face-to-face interaction in data collection could have led to missing or inaccurate information. For example, I could not have detected participants who were not proficient with the English language or who were engaging in other demanding activities while completing the online survey.

Implications for Social Change

The addition of this research to the body of knowledge is an implication for positive social change such that the findings may inform behavioral health providers and military organizations about the impact that perceived likelihood of infidelity, trust, and marital commitment have on marital satisfaction during deployment. High divorce rates remain a problem in America, and more specifically for military couples (Crespi & Howe, 2001; Dunlevy, 2011; Hogan & Seifert, 2010; Karney, Loughran, & Pollard,

2012; Lundquist, 2007). Since the beginning of the War on Freedom, there has been an increase in the divorce rate, domestic violence cases, and psychological health care needs for military wives (McNulty, 2005). The impact of divorce on the physical, mental, and emotional wellbeing of military personnel, wives, and their children is far reaching across communities, and into local and global organizations. According to Bello, Brandau-Brown, and Ragsdale (2008), marital satisfaction is a prime indicator for marital success or dissolution. Marital functioning could be especially impacted during deployment if military couples were experiencing marital conflicts prior to deployment. As variables that contribute to marital satisfaction are identified and explored, interventions can be promoted to increase wives' resiliency factors and marital satisfaction, consequently reducing the current rate of divorce or separation. Military couples may be better educated on how to deal with trust and marital commitment issues at all three phases of deployment (predeployment, deployment, and postdeployment). Long-term positive marital commitment and higher trust level during deployment could increase marital functioning of military couples at all phases of deployment. Clinicians who work with military families can influence the emotional and mental wellbeing of service members and their wives using strategies that effectively assimilate resilience and interdependence concepts into their theory and practice in couples and family counseling. Assessing conflicts, trust, and marital commitment during the predeployment phase could help clinicians effectively work to change negative patterns of interaction, making treatment outcomes more efficient and productive.

The present study will increase knowledge and understanding of the psychological impact of deployments and related stressors on military wives' and their marriage. Theoretical explanations and empirical research continues to be needed to understand the impact of deployment on marriages and wellbeing of spouses, what influences have greater impact on families from the negative demands of military related separation, and the effective approaches needed to support military families and help them in therapeutic settings. Results of this study imply that decreased interdependence, increased resilience, and low marital commitment can be significant hindering factors to military marriages during deployment. As shown in this study, increased trust and marital commitment during deployment are likely to positively affect military wives' marital satisfaction. The present study provides insight into how interdependence and resilience theories can assist family therapists and clinicians in decreasing marital commitment and trust issues for military wives prior to deployment.

Recommendations for Further Research

The research findings of this study demonstrated that further research is needed to obtain a better understanding of support needed to strengthen military marriages during deployment. Further research could support the hypotheses presented in this study verifying that increased level of trust and marital commitment during deployment increase marital satisfaction of wives. One recommendation for future study is to explore factors such as perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction with different samples such as male spouses married to female military personnel during deployment. Further assessment of wives' conflict management

techniques and communication skills are recommended for future research because of their possible impact on trust and marital commitment at all phases of deployment.

Using a similar study with wives of a specific race, such as African American, may show different outcomes than discovered in the present study. Further research could prove beneficial in increasing knowledge and understanding of the high divorce rate in the military.

Demographic features have been at the heart of multiple studies and are important factors to understanding levels of marital satisfaction (Orathinkal & Vansteenwegen, 2007). The demographic variables considered in this study were age group, ranks, race, number of children living at home, years married, and deployment history. Other factors not considered include cultural factors, specific economic status, previous marriages, and the influence of parents' divorce. Other research studies have concluded that relationships between demographic variables and marital satisfaction exist. Findings in the current study may be explained by specific demographics of military wives dedicated to the country's Armed Forces who are committed to supporting their husbands, regardless of personal or marital conflicts they are currently facing.

Conclusion

As research has shown, military marriages are faced with new challenges since the beginning of War on Freedom and the increase in deployment of Armed Forces. Military couples are faced with challenges such as anxiety, infidelity, mistrust, and divorce. In addition, there has been an increased need for physical and psychological healthcare for military wives.

The present study was conducted in response to the recommendation to better understand marital challenges faces by wives during husbands' military deployment. This study focused on a sample of military wives ($N = 127$) to examine the relationship between perceived likelihood of spousal infidelity, trust, marital commitment, and marital satisfaction. Literature on interdependence theory shows that prorelationship behaviors, cooperation, commitment, and trust help couples cope during crisis which in turn increases marital satisfaction. While partners' marital commitment can increase trust, trust develops largely from experiences and perceptions of the other spouse's behaviors. (Finkel et al., 2002; Kurdek, 2002; Rusbult et al., 1998; Tallman & Hsiao, 2004; Wieselquist et al., 1999).

According to the findings, length of husbands' deployment was not related to wives' marital satisfaction. Approximately 6 % of wives reported disagreement with their husband regarding career decisions. The large majority of wives (76.8%) admitted to having quarrels with their husbands occasionally to all of the time, while also feeling able to trust in their husband. As this research has shown, wives who trust and are committed to their marriage are more likely to be satisfied and enjoy the benefits of marriage, even during husbands' deployment.

The theoretic frameworks were not meant as competing alternatives to attachment theory, but rather to add a new dimension to attachment theory in regards to trust. Attachment theory has its roots in Bowlby's work (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). According to Ainsworth and Bowlby (1991), attachment theory is based on the tenet that children form attachment in childhood that carries into adulthood. The theory stipulates

that individuals' internal model significantly impacts their reactions to bonding and social relations. According to attachment theory, infants are born with a need for attachment, and the caregiver's response to those needs impacts the infant's internal working model. This internalized working model will continue to influence individuals' intimate relationships into adulthood. Thus, attachment styles of the wives in the present study likely influenced the level of trust they are willing to give their husbands. The Anxiety Attachment scale was statistically significant, and the Avoidant Attachment scale was also statistically significant in the model. However, other factors such as past experiences, conflicts prior to deployment, and communication during deployment should also be considered when addressing military marriages during deployment. Additionally, when soldiers are deployed and faced with traumatic events, their experiences could lead them to lose their sense of security, which could in turn affect their styles of attachment (Basham, 2008). Wives can be faced with personal challenges during deployment which could in turn affect their attachment patterns. Knowledge of the factors that contribute to marital conflicts using interdependence and risk and resilience theories as well as attachment theory, can be utilized by clinicians in their efforts to educate wives and military couples in the predeployment phase. Empirical knowledge is necessary to help prevent marital separation and dissolution and to increase the rate of satisfying marriages in our military population. Lower mental health problems of military wives and more satisfying marital functioning of service members of the Armed Forces and their spouse can have a far reaching impact on the military population and communities across the country.

References

- Adams, P. (2005). Rear detachment officer training emphasizes taking care of soldiers and families. *Army Reserve Magazine*, 50(13), 32-34. Retrieved from <http://www.usar.army.mil/resources/Pages/WarriorCitizen.aspx>
- Adler-Baeder, F., Pittman, J. F., & Taylor, L. (2005). The prevalence of marital transitions in military families. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 44(2), 91-106. doi:10.1300/J087v44n01-05
- Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist*, 46(4), 331-341. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.333
- Albano, S. (1994). Military recognition of family concerns: Revolutionary War to 1993. *Armed Forces & Society*, 20(2), 283-302. Retrieved from <http://afs.sagepub.com/>
- Allen, E. S., Atkins, D. C, Baucom, D. H., Snyder, D. K., Coop Gordon, K. C, & Glass, S. P. (2005). Intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors in engaging in and responding to extramarital involvement. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 12, 101-130. doi:10.1093/clipsy.bpi014
- Allen, E. S., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2010). Hitting home: Relationships between recent deployment, posttraumatic stress symptoms, and marital functioning for Army couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(3), 280-288. doi:10.1037/a0019405

- Alt, B. S. (2006). *Following the flag: Marriage and the modern military*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 612-624. doi: 10.2307/353949
- Arlitt, A.H. (1943). How separation affects the family. *Marriage and Family Living*, 5(1), 1-21. doi:10.2307/347692
- Atkins, D. C., Baucom, D. H., & Jacobson, N. S. (2001). Understanding infidelity: Correlates in a national random sample. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(4), 735-749. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.15.4.735
- Avellar, S., & Smock, P. J. (2005). The economic consequences of the dissolution of cohabiting unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(1), 315 – 327. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2005.00118.x
- Barker, C., Pistrang, N., & Elliott, R. (2005). *Research methods in clinical psychology: An introduction for students and practitioners* (2nd Ed.). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bagley, S. C., Munjas, B., & Shekelle, P. (2010). A systematic review of suicide prevention programs for military or veterans. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 40(3), 257-265. doi:10.1521/suli.2010.40.3.257
- Basham, K. (2008). Homecoming as safe haven or the new front: Attachment and detachment in military couples. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 36(1), 83-96. doi:10.1007/s10615-007-0138-9

- Bell, N. S., Harford, T. C., Amoroso, P. J., Hollander I. E., & Kay, A. B. (2010). Prior health care utilization patterns and suicide among U.S. army soldiers. *Suicide and life-threatening behavior*, *40*(4), 407-415. doi:10.1521/suli.2010.40.4.407
- Bello, R. S., Brandau-Brown, F. E., & Ragsdale, J. D. (2008). Attachment style, marital satisfaction, commitment, and communal strength effects on relational repair message interpretation among remarrieds. *Communication Quarterly* *56*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1080/01463370701838968.
- Bradbury, T., Fincham, F., & Beach, S. (2000). Research on the nature and determinantsof marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage & the Family* *62*(4), 964-980. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x
- Brimhall, A., Wampler, K. W., & Kimball, T. (2008). Learning from the past, altering the future: A tentative theory of the effect of past relationships on couples who remarry. *Family Process*, *47*(3), 373-387. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2008.00259.x
- Busby, D. M., Crane, D. R., Larson, J. H., & Christensen, C. (1995). A revision of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal or marital and family therapy*, *21*(3), 289-308. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.1995.tb00163.x
- Buunk, B. P. (1995). Sex, self-esteem, dependency and extradyadic sexual experience as related to jealousy responses, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *12*(1), 147-153. doi:10.1177/0265407595121011

- Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Boldry, J. G., & Rubin, H. (2010). Trust, variability in relationship evaluations, and relationship processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(1), 14–31. doi:10.1037/a0019714
- Chapin, M. (2009). Deployment and families: Hero stories and horror stories. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 79*, 263–282. doi:10.1080/00377310903130316
- Charny, I. W., & Parnass, S. (1995). The impact of extramarital relationships on the continuation of marriages. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 21*(1), 100-115. doi:10.1080/00926239508404389
- Coop Gordon, K., Hughes, F. M., Tomcik, N. D., Dixon, L. J., & Litzinger, S. C. (2009). Widening spheres of impact: The role of forgiveness in marital and family functioning. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*(1), 1–13. doi:10.1037/a0014354
- Crane, D. R., Middleton, K. C., & Bean, R. A. (2000). Establishing criterion scores for the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale and the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 28*, 53-60. doi:10.1080/019261800261815
- Department of Defense. (2009). Department of Defense active duty military personnel by rank/grade. Retrieved from <http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/rg0909f.pdf>
- Department of Defense. (2010a). Active duty military personnel strengths by regional area and by country. Retrieved from <http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/history/hst1009.pdf>
- Department of Defense. (2010b). Armed Forces strength figures for December 31, 2010. Retrieved from <http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/ms0.pdf>

- Department of the Army. (2006). *Army Regulation 600-20*. Army Command Policy.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Di Nola, G. M. (2008). Stressors afflicting families during military deployment. *Military Medicine*, 173(5), v-vii. Retrieved from <http://publications.amsus.org/>
- Eaton, K. M., Hoge, C. W., Messer, S. C., Whitt, A. A., Cabrera, O. A., McGurk, D,... Castro, C. A. (2008). Prevalence of mental health problems, treatment need, and barriers to care among primary care-seeking spouses of military service members involved in Iraq and Afghanistan deployments. *Military Medicine*, 173(11), 1051-1056. doi:10.7205/MILMED.173.11.1051
- Ender, M. G., Campbell, K. M., Davis, T. J., & Michaelis, P. R. (2007). Greedy media: Army families, embedded reporting, and War in Iraq. *Sociological Focus* 40, 48-71. doi:10.4324/9780203844335.ch23
- Faber, A. J., Willerton, E., Clymer, S. R., MacDermid, S. M., & Weiss, H. M. (2008). Ambiguous absence, ambiguous presence: A qualitative study of military reserve families in wartime. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(1), 222-230. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.2.222
- Finkel, E. J., Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., & Hannon, P. A. (2002). Dealing with betrayal in close relationships: Does commitment promote forgiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 956-974. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.956

- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item-response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(1), 350-365. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.78.2.350
- Gambardella, L. C. (2008). Role-Exit theory and marital discord following extended military deployment. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care, 44*(3). doi:10.1111/j.1744-6163.2008.00171.x
- Grace, G., & Steiner, M. (1978). *Navy wives as a factor influencing retention among Navy enlisted personnel*. Arlington, VA: USN-Manpower R & D Program, Office of Naval Research.
- Grinstein-Weiss, M., & Sherraden, M. (2006). Saving performance in individual development accounts: Does marital status matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*(1), 192 – 204. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00241.x
- Hertlein, K. M., Wetchler, J. L., & Piercy, F. P. (2005). Infidelity: An overview. *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy, 4*(2/3), 5-16. doi:10.1300/J398v04n02-02
- Hogan, P. F. & Furst Seifert, R. F. (2010). Marriage and the military: Evidence that those who serve marry earlier and divorce earlier. *Armed Forces & Society, 36*(3), 420-438. doi:10.1177/0095327X09351228
- Huebner, A. J., Mancini, J. A., Bowen, G. L., & Orthner, D. K. (2009). Shadowed by war: Building community capacity to support military families. *Family Relations, 58*(2), 216-228. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00548.x

- Huffman, A. H., Culbertson, S. S., & Castro, C. A. (2008). Family-friendly environments and U.S. Army soldier performance and work outcomes. *Military Psychology, 20*(4), 253-270. doi:10.1080/08995600802345162
- Iverson, A. C. Fear, N. T., Simonoff, E., Hull, L., Horn, O., Greenberg, N,... Wessely, S. (2007). Influence of childhood adversity on health among male UK military personnel. *British Journal of Psychiatry 191*(1), 506–511. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.107.039818
- Johnson, M. P. (1978). *Personal and structural commitment: Sources of consistency in the development of relationships*. Paper presented at the theory construction and research methodology workshop. National Council on Family Relations annual meetings, Philadelphia. PA.
- Johnson, S. J., Sherman, M. D., Hoffman, J. S., James, L. C., Johnson, P. L., Lochman, J..., and Riggs, D. (2007). *The psychological needs of U.S. military service members and their families: A preliminary report* (Presidential Task Force on Military Deployment Services for Youth, Families and Service Members). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Karney, B. R. & Crown, J. S. (2011). Does deployment keep military marriages together or break them apart? Evidence from Afghanistan and Iraq. *Risk and Resilience in U.S. Military Families, 23-45*, doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7064-0_2
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Kline, S. L. & Stafford, L. (2004). A comparison of interaction rules and interaction frequency in relationship to marital quality. *Communication Reports, 17*(1), 11-26. doi:10.1080/08934210409389370
- Kotrla, K., & Dyer, P. (2008). Using marriage education to strengthen military families: Evaluation of the active military life skills program. *Social Work & Christianity, 35*(3), 287-311. Retrieved from <http://www.nacsw.org/>
- Kurdek, L. A. (2002). Predicting the timing of separation and marital satisfaction: An eight year prospective longitudinal study. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(1), 163-179. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00163.x
- Larzelere R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The Dyadic Trust Scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 42*(3), 595-105. doi:10.2307/351903
- Lawrence, E., Bunde, M., Barry, R. A., Brock, R. L., Sullivan, K. T., Pasch, L. A. . . . , Adams, E. E. (2008). Partner support and marital satisfaction: Support amount, adequacy, provision, and solicitation. *Personal Relationships, 15*(4), 445-463. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2008.00209.x
- Lincoln, A., Swift, E., & Shorteno-Fraser, M. (2008). Psychological adjustment and treatment of children and families with parents deployed in military combat. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 64*(8), 984-992. doi:10.1002/jclp.20520
- Logan, K.V. (1987). The emotional cycle of deployment. *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, 113*(1), 43-47. Retrieved from <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings>

- Lundquist, J. H. (2007). A comparison of civilian and enlisted divorce rates during the early all volunteer force era. *Journal of Political & Military Sociology*, 35(2), 199-217. Retrieved from <http://www.pmsaronline.org/>
- Mao, A., & Raguram, A. (2009). Online infidelity: The new challenge to marriages. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 51(4), 302-304. doi:10.4103/0019-5545.58299
- Marshall, A. D., Panuzio, J., & Taft, C. T. (2005). Intimate partner violence among military veterans and active duty servicemen. *Clinical Psychology Review* 25, 862–876. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2005.05.009
- Martin, J., Ghahramanlou-Holloway, M., Lou, K. & Tucciarone, P. (2009). A comparative review of U.S. military and civilian suicide behavior: Implications for OEF/OIF suicide prevention efforts. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 31(2), 101-118. Retrieved from <http://www.amhca.org/?page=jmhc>
- McCarroll, J. E., Castro, S., Nelson, E. M., Fan, Z., Evans, P. K., & Rivera, A. (2008). Characteristics of domestic violence incidents reported at the scene by volunteer victim advocates. *Military Medicine*, 173(9), 865-870. doi:10.7205/MILMED.173.9.865
- McFadyen, J. M. (2005). Examining the impact of workplace supports: Work-family fit and satisfaction in the U.S. military. *Family Relations*, 54(1), 131-144. doi:10.1111/j.0197-6664.2005.00011.x

- McNulty, P. A. F (2005). Reported stressors and health care needs of active duty Navy personnel during three phases of deployment in support of the war in Iraq. *Military Medicine*, 170(6), 530-535. Retrieved from <http://publications.amsus.org/>
- MHS inc. (2011). Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Retrieved from <https://ecom.mhs.com>
- Milliken, C. S., Auchterlonie, J. L., & Hoge, C. W. (2007). Longitudinal assessment of mental health problems among active and reserve component soldiers returning from the Iraq war. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 298, 2141-2148. doi:10.1001/jama.298.18.2141
- Monson, C. M., Schnurr, P. P., Stevens, S. P., & Guthrie K. A. (2004). Cognitive–Behavioral Couple’s Treatment for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: Initial Findings. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 17(4), 341–344. doi:10.1023/B:JOTS.0000038483.69570.5b
- National Healthy Marriage Resource Center. (2006). Research based answers to frequently asked questions about military service and marriage. Retrieved from www.healthymarriageinfo.org
- National Military Family Association. (2005). Cycles of deployment: An analysis of survey responses from April through September. Retrieved from <http://support.militaryfamily.org/site/DocServer/NMFACyclesofDeployment9.pdf?docID=5401>
- Nelson Goff, B. S., 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(3), 344-353. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.344

- Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (2014). 2013 demographics: Profile of the military community. Department of Defense. Retrieved from http://www.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2013_Demographics_Report.pdf
- Olmstead, S. B., Blick, R. W., & Mills, L. I. (2009). Helping couples work toward the forgiveness of marital infidelity: Therapists' perspectives. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 37*(1), 48–66. doi:10.1080/01926180801960575
- Olson, M. M., Russell, C. S., Higgins-Kessler, M., & Miller, R. B. (2002). Emotional processes following disclosure of an extramarital affair. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 28*(4), 423-434. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2002.tb00367.x
- Orathinkal, J. A., & Vansteenwegen, A. (2007). Religiosity and forgiveness among first-married and remarried adults. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 10*, 379– 394. doi:10.1080/13674670600785545
- Orthner, D. K., & Rose, R. (2009). Work separation demands and spouse psychological well-being. *Family Relations, 58*(1), 392–403. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00561.x
- Pincus, S., House, R., Christenson, J., & Adler, L. (2007). *The emotional cycle of deployment: A military family perspective. My Hooah 4 Health*. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine, Office of the Chief, Army Reserve.
- Raiha, N. K. (1986). *Dual-career couples in the U.S. Army: A descriptive study*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

- 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
- Riggs, D. S., Byrne, C. A., Weathers, F. W., & Litz, B. T. (1998). The quality of the intimate relationships of male vietnam veterans: Problems associated with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 11*(1), 87-101. doi:10.1023/A:1024409200155
- Rotter, J. C., & Boveja, M. E. (1999). Counseling military families. *The Family Journal, 7*(4), 379-382. doi:10.1177/1066480799074009
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2007). *Research methods for social work* (6th edition). Florence, KY: Wadsworth.
- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships, 5*(4), 357-391. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00177.x
- Ryan, F. J., & Bevilacqua, J. J. (1964). The military family: An asset or a liability? *Military Medicine, 29*, 956-959. Retrieved from <http://publications.amsus.org/>
- Sahlstein, E., Maguire, K. C., & Timmerman, L. (2009). Contradictions and praxis contextualized by wartime deployment: Wives' perspectives revealed through relational dialectics. *Communication Monographs, 76*(4), 421-442. doi:10.1080/03637750903300239

- Sayer, N. A., Noorbaloochi, S., Frazier, P., Carlson, K., Gravely, A., & Murdoch, M. (2010). Reintegration problems and treatment interests among Iraq and Afghanistan combat veterans receiving VA medical care. *Psychiatric Services, 61*(6), 589-597. doi:10.1176/ps.2010.61.6.589
- Schramm, D. G., Marshall, J. P., Harris, V. W., & Lee, T. R. (2005). After "I do": The newlywed transition. *Marriage & Family Review, 38*(1).doi:10.1300/J002v38n01_05
- Schumm, W. R., Knott, B., Bell, D. B. & Rice, R. E. (1996). The perceived effect of stressors on marital satisfaction among civilian wives of enlisted soldiers deployed to Somalia for Operation Restore Hope. *Military Medicine, 161*(10), 601-606. Retrieved from <http://publications.amsus.org/>
- Schumm, W. R., Paff-Bergen, L. A., Hatch, R. C., Obiorah, F. C., Copeland, J. M., Meens, L. D. & Bugaighis, M. A. (1986). Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 48*, 381–387. doi:10.2307/352405
- Schumm, W. R., Silliman, B., & Bell, D. B. (2000). Perceived premarital counseling outcomes among recently married Army personnel. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 26*(2), 177-186. doi:10.1080/009262300278579
- Scoville, S. L., Gubata, M. E., Potter, R. N., White, M. J., & Pearse, L. A. (2007). Deaths attributed to suicide among enlisted U.S. Armed Forces recruits, 1980-2004. *Military Medicine, 172*(10), 1024-1031. Retrieved from <http://publications.amsus.org/>

- Seal, K. H., Bertenthal, D., Maguen, S., Kristian G., Chu, A., & Marmar, C. R. (2008). Getting beyond "Don't Ask; Don't Tell": An evaluation of US Veterans Administration postdeployment mental health screening of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. *American Journal of Public Health, 98*(4), 714-720. Retrieved from <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/>
- Selby, E. A., Anestis, M. D., Bender, T. W., Ribeiro, J. D., Nock, M. K., Rudd, M. et al. (2010). Overcoming the fear of lethal injury: Evaluating suicidal behavior in the military through the lens of the interpersonal–psychological theory of suicide. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*(3), 298-307. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2009.12.004
- Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Marital satisfaction and spousal cost-infliction. *Personality and Individual Differences 28*(5), 917-928. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00150-6
- Sherwood, E. (2009). Clinical assessment of Canadian military marriages. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 37*(4), 332-339. doi:10.1007/s10615-007-0108-2
- Shores, K. A., & Scott, D. (2005). Leisure constraints among military wives. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 23*(3), 1-24. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00150-6
- Somerville, K. J. (2009). The military report card concerning domestic violence and sexual assault, including compliance with the Lautenberg amendment. *Family Law Quarterly, 43*(2), 301-314. Retrieved from http://www.americanbar.org/publications/family_law_quarterly_home.html

- Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 38(1), 15-28. doi: 10.2307/350547
- Spanier, G. (1989). Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Retrieved February 27, 2011, from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.
- Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender, and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 217-242. doi:10.1177/0265407591082004
- Stafford, L., Merolla, A. J., & Castle, J. D. (2006). When long-distance dating partners become geographically close. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 901–919. doi:10.1177/0265407506070472
- Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing commitment in personal relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54(1), 595–608. doi:10.2307/353245
- SteelFisher, G. K., Zaslavsky, A. M., & Blendon, R. J. (2008). Health-related impact of deployment extensions on spouses of active duty Army personnel. *Military Medicine*, 173(3), 221-229. doi: 10.7205/MILMED.173.3.221
- Tallman, I. & Hsiao, Y. L. (2004). Resources, cooperation, and problem solving in early marriage. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(2), 172–188. doi:10.1177/019027250406700204
- Thibaut, J. W. & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Van de Rijt, A., & Buskens, V. (2006). Trust in intimate relationships: The increased importance of embeddedness for marriage in the United States. *Rationality & Society, 18*(2), 123-156. doi:10.1177/1043463106063319
- Waite, L. J., & Gallagher, M. (2000). *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Westhuis, D. (2006). *Thematic analysis of comments: 2005 Survey of Army Families V*. Report prepared for U.S. Army Community and Family Support Center. Indiana School of Social Work, University of Indiana.
- Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Foster, C. A., & Agnew, C. R. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 942-966. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.942
- Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 10*(3). doi:10.1111/j.10836101.2005.tb00259.x

Appendix A: Sociodemographic Questionnaire

Please complete this sociodemographic section of the survey. It is important that you answer each question carefully and accurately. No personal information will be revealed in the study results.

1. Please indicate your age: ____

2. What is your Ethnicity? (Please select all that apply)

White ____

Black ____

Hispanic ____

Asian ____

Other ____

3. What is your husband's Ethnicity? (Please select all that apply)

White ____

Black ____

Hispanic ____

Asian ____

Other ____

4. What is your husband's military affiliation?

Army ____

Air Force ____

Marine ____

Navy ____

Reserve/National Guard ____

5. What is your husbands' military status?

E-1 through E-4 ____

E-5 through E-9 ____

W-1 through W-5_____

O-1 through O-3_____

O-4 through O-6_____

O-7 and above_____

6. How many years have you been legally married to your current spouse? _____

7. How many times has your husband deployed in the last 10 years? _____

8. How long is your husband's current deployment expected to be?

Less than 6 months_____

6 months to 1 year_____

More than one year_____

9. How many children are living with you? _____

Appendix B: Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale and Permission for Use

Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your husband for each item.

	Always Agree (5)	Almost Always Agree (4)	Occasionally Agree (3)	Frequently Disagree (2)	Almost Always Disagree (1)	Always Disagree (0)
1. Religious matters						
2. Demonstrations of affection						
3. Making major decisions						
4. Sex relations						
5. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)						
6. Career decisions						

	All the Time (0)	Most of the time (1)	More often than not (2)	Occasionally (3)	Rarely (4)	Never (5)
7. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?						
8. How often do you and your partner quarrel?						
9. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together)?						
10. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"?						

	Every Day (4)	Almost Every Day (3)	Occasionally (2)	Rarely (1)	Never (0)
11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?					

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

	Never (0)	Less than once a month (1)	Once or twice a month (2)	Once or twice a week (3)	Once a day (4)	More often (5)
12. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas						
13. Work together on a project						
14. Calmly discuss something						

Subject: RE: Need information about the RDAS
Date: Fri, May 6, 2011 10:14 am

You don't need permission as the scale was included in its entirety in the appendix of the following article. It also has the scoring numbers in the appendix. You just need to cite the study in any research you complete.

Dean

Busby, D. M., Crane, D. R., Larson, J., & Christensen, C. (1995). A revision of the dyadic adjustment scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 21*, 289-308.

Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2011 7:30 PM
To: Dean Busby
Subject: Need information about the RDAS

Dr. Busby,

My name is Myriam McCray and I am currently working on a PhD at Walden University. I began a dissertation looking at the relationship between perceived spousal marital commitment, trust, and marital satisfaction of military wives during deployment. I am wondering if I can use the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale for my study. I ask permission to the publisher via rightslink, but wanted further approval from the authors. I also am wondering if you could send me the RDAS scale as well as information on scoring. I have completed the first three chapters, have obtained permission from all other scales developers, and am ready to move forward with the proposal at this point. I will attach a copy of my poster to this email.

Thanks for your help,

Myriam L. McCray
Ph.D. in Psychology Program
Counseling Specialization Student

Appendix C: Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale and Permission for Use

Please answer each of the following questions by indicating how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the idea expressed.

Extremely dissatisfied	= 1
Very dissatisfied	= 2
Somewhat dissatisfied	= 3
Mixed	= 4
Somewhat satisfied	= 5
Very satisfied	= 6
Extremely satisfied	= 7

1. How satisfied are you with your marriage?
2. How satisfied are you with your husband as a spouse?
3. How satisfied are you with your relationship with your husband?

Date: Mon, May 2, 2011 1:37 pm

Attachments: KMS7_survey_format.doc (47K), KMS.ART-Dec2000.doc (155K)

Dear Myriam,

You are welcome to use the KMSS at no cost for your research. I might suggest you consider looking at a dissertation by Janet Crow from Kansas State University in which she used the KMSS. Her dissertation should be available electronically from K-State's website.

I am attaching some older information on the scale for your reference.

Let me know how your research turns out!

Thanks,

Walter Schumm

Dr. Schumm,
My name is Myriam McCray and I am currently working on a PhD at Walden University. I began a dissertation looking at the relationship between perceived spousal marital commitment, trust, and marital satisfaction of military wives during deployment. I am wondering if I can use your Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMSS) for my study. I will attach a copy of my poster to this email. I have completed the first three chapters and am ready to move forward with the proposal at this point.

Thanks for your help,

attachment "McCray_Poster_Form.doc"

Myriam L. McCray
Ph.D. in Psychology Program
Counseling Specialization Student

Appendix D: Dyadic Trust Scale and Permission for Use

Please score each of the following statements by indicating how strongly you agree or disagree with the idea expressed.

Strongly disagree	= 1
Disagree	= 2
Somewhat disagree	= 3
Mixed	= 4
Somewhat agree	= 5
Agree	= 6
Strongly agree	= 7

1. My husband is primarily interested in his own welfare*
 2. There are times when my husband cannot be trusted*
 3. My husband is perfectly honest and truthful with me
 4. I feel that I can trust my husband completely
 5. My husband is truly sincere in his promises
 6. I feel that my husband does not show me enough consideration*
 7. My husband treats me fairly and justly
 8. I feel that my husband can be counted on to help me
- (*Reverse-scored Items)

Sent: Sat, Apr 30, 2011 11:38 pm
Subject: RE: Using the DTS for a dissertation

Myriam--

You have my permission to use the Dyadic Trust Scale. If you want me to send you a copy of the scale and some early information about it, let me know.

Robert E. Larzelere

Appendix E: Events with Others and Permission for Use

Instructions: Below are listed a series of events. We would like you to make three responses to each event: 1) estimate the probability or likelihood that the event would occur within the next year; 2) estimate the probability or likelihood that if the event occurred, you would end the relationship; and 3) estimate the probability that if the event occurred, your husband would end the relationship. Circle the number that best corresponds to your estimate of each of these probabilities of occurrence; then, insert estimates on following items.

(1) Husband flirts with a member of the opposite sex within the next year.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Probability that event would occur

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

If event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

If the event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(2) Husband passionately kisses a member of the opposite sex within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(3) Husband goes out on a romantic date with someone else within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(4) Husband has a one-night stand with someone else within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(5) Husband has a brief affair within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(6) Husband has a serious affair within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(7) You flirt with a member of the opposite sex within the next year

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(8) You passionately kiss a member of the opposite sex within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(9) You go out on a romantic date with someone else within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(10) You have a one-night stand with someone else within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(11) You have a brief affair within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

(12) You have a serious affair within the next year.

_____ % probability that event would occur within the next year

_____ % if event occurred, probability that you would end the relationship

_____ % if event occurred, probability that husband would end relationship

Subject: Re: Using your instrument for my dissertation
Date: Mon, May 2, 2011 11:46 am

Dear Myriam,

Yes, you have my permission. Unfortunately, I do not have any data on validity or reliability.

Please let me know of any interesting results you find using this instrument.

Best wishes,

David

'At 06:15 AM 5/2/2011, you wrote:

Dr. Buss, <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />
My name is Myriam McCray and I am currently working on a PhD at Walden University. I began a dissertation looking at the relationship between perceived spousal marital commitment, trust, and marital satisfaction of military wives during deployment. I am wondering if I can use your "Events with Others" instrument for my study. I also would like to know if you give me permission to change the term "partner" to "husband" for the purpose of my study. I also would love to know whether or not there were validity and reliability coefficients established with the instrument. I will attach a copy of my poster to this email. I have completed the first three chapters and am ready to move forward with the proposal at this point.

Thanks for your help,

attachment "McCray_Poster_Form.ppt"

*Myriam L. McCray
Ph.D. in Psychology Program
Counseling Specialization Student*

Appendix F: Commitment Inventory-Revised and Permission for Use

Please answer each of the following questions by indicating how strongly you agree or disagree with the idea expressed.

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 My relationship with my partner is more important to me than almost anything else in my life.

1 2 3 4 5 I may not want to be with my partner a few years from now.

1 2 3 4 5 I like to think of my partner and me more in terms of "us" and "we" than "me" and "him."

1 2 3 4 5 I want this relationship to stay strong no matter what rough times we may encounter.

Subject: Commitment stuff

Date: Wed, May 4, 2011 4:22 pm

Attachments: Stanley_Commitment_Measures.zip (1053K)

Hello Myriam,

Howard Markman forwarded your message to me. I didn't have time to look at anything, but you can surely use any of the measures we have that you would like to use. Note that you have a lot of options. There are all manner of variations of dedication (varying lengths from 4 items up to 42 or something like that. The 14 or 12 item versions have been used a lot).

I'm going to attach two large zipped files. One is all about measurement options. In that chunk, unzip the file (right click, select "extract all" on a PC. on a mac, just double click on the zipped file). See the "read first" document.

Next, another email!

S

Appendix G: Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised and Permission for Use

Instructions: The statements below concern how you feel in emotionally intimate relationships. I am interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree.

Strongly disagree	= 1
Disagree	= 2
Somewhat disagree	= 3
Mixed	= 4
Somewhat agree	= 5
Agree	= 6
Strongly agree	= 7

1. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.
2. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.
3. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.
4. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
5. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.
6. I worry a lot about my relationships.
7. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.
8. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.
9. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.
10. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.
11. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
12. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.
13. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
14. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
15. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.
16. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner.
17. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.
18. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.
19. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
20. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.

21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
22. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.
23. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
24. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
25. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
26. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
27. It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.
28. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
29. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
30. I tell my partner just about everything.
31. I talk things over with my partner.
32. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
33. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
34. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.
35. It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.
36. My partner really understands me and my needs.

Subject: Re: Using the ECR-R for my Dissertation
Date: Sun, May 1, 2011 10:00 pm

Please feel free to use the ECR-R.

~ Chris

Dr.Fraley ,

My name is Myriam McCray and I am currently working on a PhD at Walden University. I began a dissertation looking at the relationship between perceived spousal marital commitment, trust, and marital satisfaction of military wives during deployment. I am wondering if I can use your Experiences in Close Relationships - Revised (ECR-R) questionnaire for my study. I will attach a copy of my poster to this email. I have completed the first three chapters and am ready to move forward with the proposal at this point.

Thanks for your help,

attachment "McCray_Poster_Form.ppt"

*Myriam L. McCray
Ph.D. in Psychology Program
Counseling Specialization Student*