

Trust and Marital Satisfaction among Single and Dual Career Couples



Ammara Asif
and St Saim



MedCrave
Step into the World of Research

Trust and Marital Satisfaction among Single and Dual Career Couples

About The Authors

Ammara Asif* and St Saim

Department of Psychology, My Psychologist
Community, Life Counseling Center, Dubai

*Corresponding author:

Ammara Asif, Department of Psychology, My
Psychologist Community, United Arab Emirates, Life
Counseling Center, Dubai, Tel: 009710504716690;
Email: ammaraasif674@yahoo.com

Published By:

MedCrave Group LLC

February 20, 2018

Contents

1. Declaration	1
2. Certificate	2
3. Abstract	3
4. Introduction	4
5. Defining and Conceptualizing Trust	4
5.1. The Importance of trust	5
6. Marital Satisfaction	5
7. Relationship between Trust and Marital Satisfaction	5
7.1. Marital quality and satisfaction	6
7.2. Effect of trust on marital satisfaction	6
7.3. The role of employment status	7
7.4. Dual-career marriage	8
7.5. Types of dual-career marriages	8
7.6. Marital and lifestyle satisfaction variables	8
7.7. Expanding the conceptualization of trust	8
8. Literature Review	9
8.1. Dual-career marriage	9
8.2. Types of dual-career marriages	9
8.3. Marital and lifestyle satisfaction variables	9
8.4. The study of trust	9
8.5. Expanding the conceptualization of trust	10
8.6. Need for the study	10
9. Rationale	10
10. Objective	10
11. Hypotheses	10
12. Method	10
13. Instruments	11
14. Results	11
15. Discussion	12
16. Limitations of the Study	12
17. Suggestion for Future Research	12
18. Acknowledgement	12
19. References	12

Declaration

Ammara Asif, Registration No. CP02-MPA-1, A Clinical Psychologist of My Psychologist Association. Dubai UAE, hereby solemnly declare that the thesis entitled, **“Trust and Marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples”**. Submitted in partial fulfillment of the community monthly research paper program for check the ratio of different areas of countries in base to cure different community individuals for their issues, this is my original work, except where otherwise acknowledged in the text, and has not been submitted or published earlier and shall not, in future, be submitted by me for any job requirement or any other university or institution.

(Ammara Asif)

Certificate

Certified that research paper titled “**Trust and Marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples**” by Dr. Ammara Asif, Registration No. CP02-MPA-1 is accepted for submission to the Psychology Department My Psychologist Association, Dubai UAE.

Dr. St Saim
Research Supervisor

Abstract

The present study examined the role of trust in marital satisfaction in a sample of 50 couples including 25 single & 25 dual-career couples. Moreover, gender differences were also studied. Enrich Marital Satisfaction Scale [1], and Trust Scale [2] were used to measure the constructs. The age of the sample ranged from 18 to 55 years .Multiple regression analysis demonstrated trust as significant predictor of marital satisfaction for single career couples, dual-career couples and for the whole sample respectively. Significant gender differences were found in trust for both single and dual-career couples. Implications of results as well as directions for future empirical research are discussed.

Introduction

In interpersonal relationships specifically in marital life there are, among others, two vital variables namely trust and marital satisfaction. In actuality no real relationship can be strengthened or enhanced without watering the trust. Marital satisfaction is the phenomenon that is strictly supposed to be related with trust among couples. Broadly, the topic is trust in couple relationships, particularly marital relationships. The purpose of this research is to explore the possibility and desirability of expanding the way in which trust in close, committed relationships is conceptualized. In this chapter a new perspective on trust in couple relationships, not previously explored, will be presented. Finally, the variables of interest and the research questions that form the basis for this research will be identified. Trust and marital satisfaction are two principal variables of interest that are intended to be examined in this study. Present study will primarily focus on finding out the relationship pattern between the both along with demographic exploration in study variables.

Defining and Conceptualizing Trust

Trust has been described as a belief, an expectancy, and a feeling [3]. Lewicki et al. [4] defined trust as “an individual’s belief in, and willingness to act on the basis of, the words, actions, and decisions of another” (p. 440). Concepts such as faith and confidence are often used as synonyms for trust [5], though some scholars (e.g. Levin, 1998) argued that faith and trust are not equivalent concepts. Though related to the past, trust is invariably linked to the future [6] and involves risk [7] The notion of risk is prominent in the definition of trust offered by Schlenker et al. [8] “Interpersonal trust may be defined as a reliance upon information received from another Person about uncertain environmental states and their accompanying outcomes in a risky Situation”. Vulnerability can be particularly great in close, intimate relationships where there is significant investment of self and dependence upon the other [9]. The more important the relationship is, and the greater the degree of dependency that exists in it, the more critical trust is to the health, satisfaction, and longevity of that relationship. Within our culture and society, marital relationships are generally considered to be among the most important of close relationships. Marital partners’ investments in the relationship are many and they are often intense, adding to the degree of risk and underscoring the necessity for trust.

An important issue regarding the conceptualization of trust is whether it is an intra-individual phenomenon or an interpersonal one. Personality theorists [10] tend to think of trust as a personality trait that an individual possesses and then manifests in interpersonal contexts. Many proponents of attachment theory [11,12] also seem to think that trust resides first and foremost within the individual. Other theorists [2-14] prefer to conceptualize trust as something that is created and determined by the interpersonal interactions of two or more people who are in the process of

developing a relationship with one another. Trust in specific areas of a relationship is a key variable in this study. As noted earlier, trust itself has been conceptualized and defined in a number of ways. For this study, the definition offered by Lewicki et al. [4] will be used. They defined trust as “an individual’s belief in, and willingness to act on the basis of, the words, actions, and decisions of another” (p. 440). An assumption that underlies this study is that a person’s level of trust as defined above varies not only in accordance why the person who serves as the object of that trust, but also with respect to specific areas of their relationship. A person may trust the words, actions, and decisions of another person in one area (e.g., money and finances), but not in another (e.g., relationships with extended family). It is assumed further that trust in specific areas of a relationship is a continuous variable rather than a dichotomous variable. There are degrees of trust in each specific area rather than simply trust or distrust. Interpersonal trust itself has implications for understanding the marital relationship. Evidence presented by Rotter [15] suggests that low trust individuals are more suspicious and behave more competitively than do high trust individuals. High trust persons, in contrast, are characterized in some studies as pleasant and conventional. A fiduciary relationship between a trust or and trustee for the benefit of a surviving spouse and the married couple’s heirs. Also called an “A” trust, a marital trust goes into effect when the first spouse dies. Assets are moved into the trust upon death and the income generated by the assets goes to the surviving spouse. Under some arrangements, the surviving spouse can also receive principal payments. When the second spouse dies, the trust passes to its designated heirs.

Trust has been found to be subdivided into categories. Trust is defined as a person’s willingness to share personal information with another person. Johnson-George & Swap [16] studied the validity of the Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale (SITS). The study included 435 participants and required them to take a survey compiled by a board of researchers. The trust factors that emerged the most from the SITS were those of general trust, emotional trust, reliability, dependability, and physical trust. The factors common to both men and women were those of emotional trust and reliability. Examining the depth of the correlation between trust and reliability and the aspects of emotional trust, they hypothesized that the reason that reliability seemed to play a bigger role was because reliability might be a preliminary trust factor within relationships whereas emotional trust might be a factor further removed in the development of relationships, showing that the rate of development of the relationship is a potential determining factor

Trust is a dynamic process. Even after a solid foundation of trust has been established, feelings of confidence continue to respond to changes and transitions in the relationship. Just as trust has been built up, it can also wear down. The impact that different levels of trust have on the nature of a close relationship has only recently become the subject of study, and much still remains to be learned. However, from the evidence that already exists, it is clear

that the relationships of people with higher levels of trust are categorically different from relationships where trust levels are lower. In an important set of longitudinal studies of commitment and trust, Jennifer Wieselquist (1999) have provided evidence that changes in trust are related to the perception of a partner's positive actions. Individuals come to trust their partners when they are committed to them and when they perceive that their partners have acted in positive ways. Additionally, it has been shown that changes in trust must ultimately reflect changes in attributions to the partner's motives. People must not only notice their partner's behavior, they must interpret it differently from how they have in the past. In this respect, trust can act as a "filter" through which new events and experiences are interpreted.

The Importance of trust

Trust is vital to healthy personalities and healthy, satisfying relationships [7-17]. Regarding the importance of trust, Deutsch [18] wrote, "Past preoccupations and current concerns make it apparent that the concept of 'trust' and its related concepts are vital to the understanding both of social life and of personality development" (p. 265). Echoing that sentiment, Webb & Worchel [3] stated that "Life without trust would be unthinkable, turning us into a society of paranoids, suspicious of the friends we turn to for companionship, fearful of the specialists we must depend upon for vital services and information" (p. 21).

Marital Satisfaction

A second important variable in this study is marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction is conceptualized as the extent to which an individual has a positive attitude about, or positive feelings toward, the marriage partner and relationship. Although it may be based upon objective criteria (e.g., how frequently the partner says, "I love you"), marital satisfaction is a subjective evaluation of the partner and relationship (Sabatelli, 1988). Marital satisfaction is a mental state that reflects the perceived benefits and costs of marriage to a particular person. The more costs a marriage partner inflicts on a person, the less satisfied one generally is with the marriage and with the marriage partner. Similarly, the greater the perceived benefits are, the more satisfied one is with the marriage and with the marriage partner [20]. According to Schoen, Astone, Rothert, Standish, and Kim [20] marital satisfaction is a global evaluation of the state of one's marriage and a reflection of marital happiness and functioning. From an evolutionary perspective, marital satisfaction can be viewed as a psychological state of regulated mechanisms that monitor the benefits and costs of marriage to a particular person [21]. Marital satisfaction affects many other areas of human life as well such as physical and emotional health and relationship between couples, parents, and children as well [22]. Marital satisfaction is a key element of perceived happiness, and a growing number of empirical studies are attempting to identify its determinants. For instance, in their comprehensive survey of determinants

of marital satisfaction, Cottrell, Neuberg & Li [23] found trustworthiness, cooperativeness, agreeableness, extraversion, attractiveness, intelligence, humor and wealth as important predictors of marital interpersonal relations. Heller (2000) discussed that trust believes that the person who is trusted will do what is expected.

Human race has evolved roles that males and females play. These roles have become less fixed and less clearly defined with the passage of time [24]. The roles that men and women have in their relationship determine the extent of the bond or connection they experience in their relationship. Of all the relationships between men and women marriage is the most vital. Marriage is the basic structure of life and family system and it plays a vital role in maintaining an individual's psychological well-being [20]. Both partners perform multiple tasks like job and family along with their efforts to maintain a balance between them. Without achieving equilibrium in relation it is not possible to have a satisfied marital life.

The present study is an empirical attempt at examining the relationship between couple's trust in each other and their marital satisfaction. The uniqueness of this study lies in the fact that it compares the relationship between trust and marital satisfaction across single and dual-career couples. In matrimonial life trust has been recognized as an important determinant of mutual relationship [23-25], whereas betrayal has been found negatively related with marital satisfaction [26] Atkins, Baucom, Jacobson 2001, but there is dearth of studies which examined the direct relation between trust and marital satisfaction itself.

Relationship between Trust and Marital Satisfaction

Trust has been recognized as an important factor in interpersonal relationships [15-25]. In couples, discrepancies in reported levels of trust are linked to lower levels of marital satisfaction [27]. Despite the potentially significant role of trust as determinant of marital satisfaction, there is a dearth of studies pertaining to the relationship between trust and marital satisfaction in Pakistan. The present study is an empirical endeavor in the same direction and hypothesizes that trust would be a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.

Marriage and established family life are the unique qualities of human being, which makes them to be an integral element of social life. Marriage as an institution has a crucial role in helping two individuals to have personal growth and enrichment from established family life. According to Fowers [1], Love and marriage is the primary source of individual happiness and meaning in life. These fulfillment, happiness and positive development will be possible only when the relationship between couples is coherent and satisfactory. Marital satisfaction refers to an individual's subjective evaluation of the marital relationship [28]. It is the quality of relationship, in which both of the partners can enjoy life from the companionship characterized by lack of stress and unhappiness. Marital satisfaction is a complex process that has over time been thought to be influenced

by many factors, including education, socio-economic status, love, commitment, marital communication, conflict, gender, length of marriage, the presence of children, sexual relations and the division of labor [29]. The structural change on gender roles and attitudinal alterations made women's to access and accumulate employment in any field. Women's role as an employee and breadwinner is a positive change on the gender equity and participation but simultaneously it's having implications on family life, especially in a society like India. Women, who are employed, have to face the problems of dual role and it has influence on marital and family life. Professionals like nurses are much prone to have dissatisfaction from marital relationship, as they are engaged in a stressful job which has complications in regard with shifts, long hours of duty and low payment. This segment has been considering as professionals but the benefits in the form of kind and consideration has low, especially nurses who are employed in private hospitals.

Marriage is a bond between two individuals in the ground of psychological and social coherence rather than a legal tie up. It's a union in which two individuals from different background and personality traits interact and cohabit together for cause of establishing a family. As it's an interaction and mutual understanding between two unique personalities, there are chances of having conflict and adjustment problems. Moves toward more gender equality have impacted on marital expectations. Both men and women enter marriage with higher expectations of interpersonal communication, intimacy and sexual satisfaction [30]. Couples are striving for fulfilling the needs and unmet needs are resulted in stress and dissatisfaction. Education and income have also been linked to marital satisfaction and marital conflict, with greater levels of education and income predicting greater marital satisfaction and less conflict. Economic stress has a negative effect on marital satisfaction and a positive influence on relationship dissolution [31]. The presence of children has both negative and positive relation on marital satisfaction. In addition, studies have shown that there is a relationship between number of children, particularly preschool children, and marital satisfaction [32]. Being an important element of marital life, marital relationship and satisfaction derived from it has significant relation to have a warm and sustaining relationship between spouses. Husbands' and wives' ratings of satisfaction with their sexual relationship were significantly related to the overall satisfaction with their marital relationship [33]. The gap in communication between the couples results in the failure to understand the aspirations and taste of the spouse, furthermore consequence will be negative. Gottman [34] states that positive interaction and friendship is the key to marital satisfaction and the prediction of marital stability over time.

Marital quality and satisfaction

Early scholarly research referred to marital quality as the happiness, contentment, quality, and satisfaction within the marriage [35]. More specifically, marital quality

was considered the health, well-being, and stability of the marriage [35]. According to Perrone & Worthington [36], marital quality has significant impacts on the overall health and happiness of any individual committed to a life-long partner. More recently, scholarly researchers have used the term "marital satisfaction" instead of "marital quality" in the research literature [29-37]. Conceptualized marital satisfaction as "people's global subjective evaluation about the quality of their marriage" (pg. 246). The term "marital satisfaction" is preferred to "marital quality" because it focuses on the subjective nature of this concept [37]. As Li & Fung [37] asserted, marital satisfaction is a broader definition because it focuses on satisfaction, quality of alternatives, investment, and commitment level in the current relationship. Commitment level can be considered the most significant determinant of marital stability, and consistently correlates highly with marital satisfaction [37]. Dedication commitment, which is the personal willingness to maintain the ongoing relationship, maintains the highest correlation with marital satisfaction [37].

Effect of trust on marital satisfaction

Due to the perceived great importance of trust for marital relationships, the phenomenon has been much researched and written about. Worche [38] identified three principal views of trust promoted by three groups of researchers: the views of personality theorists, who focus on individual personality differences in the readiness to trust; the views of sociologists and economists, who focus on trust as an institutional phenomenon; and the views of social psychologists, who focus on the interpersonal transactions between individuals that create or damage trust at the level of the relationship.

Early research studies examined generalized trust, often employing a tool called the "Prisoner's Dilemma (PD)" game [39]. How participants functioned in the PD game was used to infer, define, and measure trust and suspicion. Perceived inadequacies with the PD game led to the development of personality scales to assess one's general ability to trust others (e.g. [15-40]). More recently, research in the area of trust in interpersonal relationships has focused on specific relationships, particularly close, intimate relationships such as dating relationships and committed relationships. The substantial increase in the divorce rate [41] has prompted researchers to devote themselves to seek answers to important questions regarding the development and maintenance of trust in close personal relationships. Numerous studies have been conducted to better understand how trust develops, grows, endures, and, in some cases, declines.

An important area of development in the study of trust has been the consumption of new instruments to measure trust. As noted previously, the inadequacies of the PD game led to the development of new measures of interpersonal trust. Scales developed by Rotter [15] and Wrightsman [40] addressed those inadequacies, but subsequently were found also to be inadequate for predicting behavior in

close relationship contexts [42]. In light of that shortcoming, Larzelere & Huston [42] developed the 8-item "Dyadic Trust Scale." Holmes and Rempel [2] argued that in close relationships, trust originates in the dialectic between the hopes and fears people have as those relationships develop. If the relationship is to develop and endure, partners must succeed in reducing uncertainty. Rempel, Holmes & Zanna [14] proposed a typology for characterizing the types of information people use to achieve uncertainty reduction, then developed a trust scale to measure the extent to which partners possessed each type of information. The three types of information are predictability in the face of ambiguity, dependability of the partner, and strength and quality of the attachment.

Much of the recent study on trust in close relationships has been based in attachment theory [11-43]. Various researchers and authors (e.g., [44]) have hypothesized that a person's "attachment style" is a major factor determining the strength and quality of the trust that he or she develops with regard to an intimate partner. In order to conduct research to test that hypothesis, various measures of attachment style have been developed (e.g., Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Subjects who appear to have a secure attachment style are then compared with those having insecure attachment styles on a variety of dependent variables, including depth of trust.

Heller (2000) discussed that trust believes that the person who is trusted will do what is expected. Trust has been recognized as an important factor in interpersonal relationships [15-25]. In couples, discrepancies in reported levels of trust are linked to lower levels of marital satisfaction [27]. Despite the potentially significant role of trust as determinant of marital satisfaction, there is a dearth of studies pertaining to the relationship between trust and marital satisfaction in Pakistan. The present study is an empirical endeavor in the same direction and hypothesizes that trust would be a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.

The beliefs of high-trust people are anchored both by positive conclusions about their partner's motives drawn from past evidence and by faith in what the future holds. They expect their partner to act in ways that are motivated by a desire to improve the relationship. Even when faced with events that could potentially challenge their convictions, such as a conflict or disagreement, people in high-trust relationships are unlikely to call their partner's motives into question. Rather, as much as possible, negative events are seen as less significant when compared against the large accumulation of positive experiences. Negative incidents are likely to be explained in less harmful ways, treated as isolated events, or understood to reflect an unfortunate, but less significant component of the relationship. This is not to say that trusting people are unaware of or naïvely ignore the negative events that occur in their relationship. However, unless an incident truly merits suspicion, they tend to place some limits on the negative implications the

event could have for their relationship. Thus, a high-trust relationship is one in which partners share openly with each other and give each other the benefit of the doubt. For many couples, a trusting relationship remains an elusive goal. For some, past experiences with parents or former partners have left them unable to completely set their doubts aside and confidently relinquish control to an intimate partner. Others, who started out with high levels of trust, may have run out of convincing charitable explanations for their partner's negative behaviors. Worn down from the accumulated weight of evidence, they increasingly entertain doubts and concerns about their partner's caring motives. Whatever the cause, people in medium-trust relationships are uncertain about their partner's intentions and they are alert for signs that indicate further risk. They still have hope for their relationship and they may long to achieve the elusive sense of security. Yet, ironically, despite a desire for positive convictions, people in medium-trust relationships appear to place greater emphasis on negative events in their relationship. Thus, it seems that medium-trust individuals are hesitant to dismiss warning signs that signal the potential for disappointment. Thus, medium-trust couples may, paradoxically, overemphasize the diagnostic importance of negative events and underestimate the importance of events that could advance their hopes.

The role of employment status

Employment status as single or dual-career couples is another relevant factor to the topic of the present study. In dual career couples, typical gender roles are compromised since both the partners are earners. This in turn may have a direct bearing on the dynamics of trust in marital relationship. In order to have a satisfied matrimonial relationship, male spouse in a dual career couple may have to be more egalitarian and trusting towards his wife since she has to be amongst many male colleagues at her work place in contrast with a housewife who has minimal contact with males outside of her family. Furthermore, issues like division of labor at home, child rearing, work hours, work-family conflict, and nature of job could strain the marital relation. The relationship of interactional patterns to the marital satisfaction of single and dual-career couples depends most likely upon certain factors e.g. equality and reciprocity in the relationships, mutual give and take, spousal support, to be involved in each other's careers, having equal commitment to the relationship, and to practice equal decision making. Research has documented that sharing non-traditional sex-role attitudes and the husbands' approving of their wives' careers were related to higher marital satisfaction [45]. During recent years the trend of dual-career couples has become increasingly common in urban culture of Pakistan, so the present study is a valuable empirical endeavor at examining the factors that might contribute to their marital satisfaction.

Previous research has found that wives' trust is predictive of husbands' levels of marital satisfaction and adjustment [46,47]. Existing literature illustrates mixed findings in trust and marital satisfaction regarding gender. Mahfuz (2011)

revealed that there are no significant gender differences in interpersonal trust, however, German (2008) found that trust and marital satisfaction is significantly higher among women than men.

Dual-career marriage

Although dual-career and dual-earner marriages have several similarities, the concept of “dual-career marriage” is distinguished by the academic preparation, motivation to have a fulltime career, and level of career devotion of both spouses [48]. Between the 1950’s to 1980’s, the American society saw a significant increase in both the number of dual-earner and dual-career marriages [49,50]. This rise in dual-career marriages was largely due to the proportion of married women in the workforce more than doubling from 1950 to 1980 (21.6 percent to 50.2 percent) [48]. In recent years, families with two heads of household, in which both spouses pursue fulltime careers, has become the most common family unit in the American society [36].

The role expectations and boundaries between family and career are not always congruent, developing conflicts and issues between work and family life [51]. In fact, the spillover of family and work demands is bidirectional, meaning that family demands can spill over and negatively impact work life, and work demands can spill over and negatively affect family life [52]. While dual-career marriages have mixed implications in the research literature, Thomas et al. [48] claimed that a two-professional marriage is one with a high level of risk. The marriage of two highly educated individuals with distinct professional and personal goals, strong achievement needs, rigorous work schedules, and several role responsibilities, demands considerable skills in addressing conflicts and negotiating compromises. If parenting roles and responsibilities are added, further complications can negatively impact the overall quality and satisfaction of the marriage [48].

Types of dual-career marriages

Cherpas’s [50] study identified four primary types of dual-career couples: accommodators, adversaries, allies, and acrobats. First, in an accommodator dual-career marriage, one spouse is generally high in career involvement and low in family home involvement, and the other spouse is low in career involvement and high in family home involvement [50]. Secondly, for adversary spouses, both partners are usually highly involved in their careers, and not very involved with family, home, or partner support roles [50]. Thirdly, in an ally marriage relationship, both partners are generally involved with either career or family and home roles, but not highly involved with both roles simultaneously [50]. Fourthly, for acrobat spouses, both partners are highly involved in family and work roles [50]. These mothers and fathers typically believe that their relationship and family roles are of the same importance to their career lives [50].

Marital and lifestyle satisfaction variables

In Thomas et al. [48] thorough examination of the determinants of marital quality and satisfaction, these

scholars found several lifestyle satisfaction variables that directly contributed to marital quality and satisfaction. First, socioeconomic adequacy of the family’s situation correlated positively with the predicted marital quality between the spouses [48]. The second lifestyle satisfaction variable included the husband’s satisfaction with the wife having a full-time professional career when children are part of the household [48]. As of the early 1980’s, the divorce rate for women with five or more years of college exceeded that for women at every other educational level except for those women who had not earned a high school degree [48]. Thirdly, when the household arrangement of roles and responsibilities is perceived as ideal for both spouses, the marital quality is generally higher [48]. Dual-career couples in higher quality marriages normally had older children including teenagers or young adults, while dual-career couples in lower quality marriages typically had younger children [48]. Lastly, when the couple is most extensively immersed and active in the local community, the marital quality significantly increased [48].

Gottman [34], Notarius & Markman [53] propose that actions and interactions that occur between a couples appear to go into an overall summation of the relationship quality, rather than each interaction making a separate contribution to marital quality. Therefore, an overall view of marital quality is what evolves over time. This study relies on stress and coping theory to provide a conceptual frame for individual and dyadic interactions relevant to evaluations of marital quality. The purpose of this research is to expand understanding of how perceptions of role overload and engagement of individual coping strategies and relational coping resources are linked to judgments about marital quality in dual-career marriages.

Expanding the conceptualization of trust

Although much important research has been conducted concerning the phenomenon of trust in marital relationships, it seems that trust always has been conceptualized as a global, uni-dimensional construct. Consistent with that conceptualization, only the depth of a person’s global trust in an intimate partner has been considered and measured. Even when trust is conceptualized to include various types of information, as it is in the typology of Rempel et al. [2] trust is still basically thought of as having only the single dimension of depth.

Lewicki et al. [54] noted that the level of trust one person has in another may vary depending upon the context. They gave as an example the person who might trust a friend to babysit his child, but would refrain from loaning the friend money due to a distrust of his willingness to pay it back [54] stated further that “most people are able to be quite specific in describing both the trust and distrust elements in their relationship” (p. 91). Lewicki and Wiethoff did not suggest, however, that research might be conducted to explore how trust (or distrust) in specific areas affects close, committed relationships. Once again, the breadth of trust seems to be overlooked as a possibly valid construct or conceptualization.

Literature Review

Dual-career marriage

Although dual-career and dual-earner marriages have several similarities, the concept of “dual-career marriage” is distinguished by the academic preparation, motivation to have a fulltime career, and level of career devotion of both spouses [48]. Between the 1950’s to 1980’s, the American society saw a significant increase in both the number of dual-earner and dual-career marriages [49,50]. This rise in dual-career marriages was largely due to the proportion of married women in the workforce more than doubling from 1950 to 1980 (21.6 percent to 50.2 percent) [48]. In recent years, families with two heads of household, in which both spouses pursue fulltime careers, has become the most common family unit in the American society [36].

Dual-career marriage

The role expectations and boundaries between family and career are not always congruent, developing conflicts and issues between work and family life [51]. In fact, the spillover of family and work demands is bidirectional, meaning that family demands can spill over and negatively impact work life, and work demands can spill over and negatively affect family life [52]. While dual-career marriages have mixed implications in the research literature, Thomas et al. [48] claimed that a two-professional marriage is one with a high level of risk. The marriage of two highly educated individuals with distinct professional and personal goals, strong achievement needs, rigorous work schedules, and several role responsibilities, demands considerable skills in addressing conflicts and negotiating compromises. If parenting roles and responsibilities are added, further complications can negatively impact the overall quality and satisfaction of the marriage [48].

Types of dual-career marriages

Cherpas’s [50] study identified four primary types of dual-career couples: accommodators, adversaries, allies, and acrobats. First, in an accommodator dual-career marriage, one spouse is generally high in career involvement and low in family home involvement, and the other spouse is low in career involvement and high in family home involvement [50]. Secondly, for adversary spouses, both partners are usually highly involved in their careers, and not very involved with family, home, or partner support roles [50]. Thirdly, in an ally marriage relationship, both partners are generally involved with either career or family and home roles, but not highly involved with both roles simultaneously [50]. Fourthly, for acrobat spouses, both partners are highly involved in family and work roles [50]. These mothers and fathers typically believe that their relationship and family roles are of the same importance to their career lives [50].

Marital and lifestyle satisfaction variables

In Thomas et al.’s [48] thorough examination of the determinants of marital quality and satisfaction, these scholars found several lifestyle satisfaction variables that

directly contributed to marital quality and satisfaction. First, socioeconomic adequacy of the family’s situation correlated positively with the predicted marital quality between the spouses [48]. The second lifestyle satisfaction variable included the husband’s satisfaction with the wife having a full-time professional career when children are part of the household [48].

As of the early 1980’s, the divorce rate for women with five or more years of college exceeded that for women at every other educational level except for those women who had not earned a high school degree [48]. Thirdly, when the household arrangement of roles and responsibilities is perceived as ideal for both spouses, the marital quality is generally higher [48]. Dual-career couples in higher quality marriages normally had older children including teenagers or young adults, while dual-career couples in lower quality marriages typically had younger children [48]. Lastly, when the couple is most extensively immersed and active in the local community, the marital quality significantly increased [48].

Gottman [34], Notarius & Markman [53] propose that actions and interactions that occur between a couple appear to go into an overall summation of the relationship quality, rather than each interaction making a separate contribution to marital quality. Therefore, an overall view of marital quality is what evolves over time. This study relies on stress and coping theory to provide a conceptual frame for individual and dyadic interactions relevant to evaluations of marital quality. The purpose of this research is to expand understanding of how perceptions of role overload and engagement of individual coping strategies and relational coping resources are linked to judgments about marital quality in dual-career marriages.

The study of trust

Due to the perceived great importance of trust for marital relationships, the phenomenon has been much researched and written about Worchel [55] identified three principal views of trust promoted by three groups of researchers: the views of personality theorists, who focus on individual personality differences in the readiness to trust; the views of sociologists and economists, who focus on trust as an institutional phenomenon; and the views of social psychologists, who focus on the interpersonal transactions between individuals that create or damage trust at the level of the relationship.

Early research studies examined generalized trust, often employing a tool called the “Prisoner’s Dilemma (PD)” game [5]. How participants functioned in the PD game was used to infer, define, and measure trust and suspicion. Perceived inadequacies with the PD game led to the development of personality scales to assess one’s general ability to trust others [15-40]. More recently, research in the area of trust in interpersonal relationships has focused on specific relationships, particularly close, intimate relationships such as dating relationships and committed relationships. The substantial increase in the divorce rate

[41] has prompted researchers to devote themselves to seek answers to important questions regarding the development and maintenance of trust in close personal relationships. Numerous studies have been conducted to better understand how trust develops, grows, endures, and, in some cases, declines.

An important area of development in the study of trust has been the consumption of new instruments to measure trust. As noted previously, the inadequacies of the PD game led to the development of new measures of interpersonal trust. Scales developed by Rotter[15] & Wrightsman [40] addressed those inadequacies, but subsequently were found also to be inadequate for predicting behavior in close relationship contexts [42]. In light of that shortcoming, Larzelere & Huston [42] developed the 8-item “Dyadic Trust Scale.”

Holmes & Rempel [2] argued that in close relationships, trust originates in the dialectic between the hopes and fears people have as those relationships develop. If the relationship is to develop and endure, partners must succeed in reducing uncertainty. Rempel et al. [2] proposed a typology for characterizing the types of information people use to achieve uncertainty reduction, then developed a trust scale to measure the extent to which partners possessed each type of information.

The three types of information are predictability in the face of ambiguity, dependability of the partner, and strength and quality of the attachment. Much of the recent study on trust in close relationships has been based in attachment theory (Ainsworth, 1982; Bowlby, 1969, 1988). Various researchers and authors (e.g., [44]) have hypothesized that a person’s “attachment style” is a major factor determining the strength and quality of the trust that he or she develops with regard to an intimate partner. In order to conduct research to test that hypothesis, various measures of attachment style have been developed e.g., [11-43]. Subjects who appear to have a secure attachment style are then compared with those having insecure attachment styles on a variety of dependent variables, including depth of trust.

Expanding the conceptualization of trust

Although much important research has been conducted concerning the phenomenon of trust in marital relationships, it seems that trust always has been conceptualized as a global, uni-dimensional construct. Consistent with that conceptualization, only the depth of a person’s global trust in an intimate partner has been considered and measured. Even when trust is conceptualized to include various types of information, as it is in the typology of Rempel et al. [2], trust is still basically thought of as having only the single dimension of depth. Lewicki and Wiethoff (2000) noted that the level of trust one person has in another may vary depending upon the context. They gave as an example the person who might trust a friend to babysit his child, but would refrain from loaning the friend money due to a distrust of his willingness to pay it back. Lewicki and Wiethoff (2000) stated further that “most people are able to be quite specific

in describing both the trust and distrust elements in their relationship” (p. 91). did not suggest, however, that research might be conducted to explore how trust (or distrust) in specific areas affects close, committed relationships. Once again, the breadth of trust seems to be overlooked as a possibly valid construct or conceptualization.

Need for the study

Given the major role that trust plays in interpersonal relationships [3-7], especially close relationships where individuals depend upon one another and others depend upon them [13-14], any study that has the potential to contribute to our understanding of trust in such relationships is an important and worthwhile study. This study has the added value of exploring an area that seemingly has not received previous attention, namely, the phenomenon of trust across various domains of a close, committed relationship. If it can be shown that trust in specific areas is a valid and usefully contact, propositions can be developed and additional research can be conducted to test those propositions.

Rationale

Given the major role that trust plays in interpersonal relationships [3-7], especially close relationships where individuals depend upon one another and others depend upon them [13-14], any study that has the potential to contribute to our understanding of trust in such relationships is an important and worthwhile study. This study would add the value of exploring an area that seemingly has not received previous attention, namely, the phenomenon of trust across various domains of a close, committed relationship. If it can be shown that trust in specific areas is a valid and usefully contact, propositions can be developed and additional research can be conducted to test those propositions.

Objective

1. To find out that Trust to be significant predictor of marital satisfaction when regressed on total sample containing both single and dual-career couples.
2. To explore the effect of marital satisfaction in males and females.

Hypotheses

- H1.** Trust will positively predict marital satisfaction among dual career couples.
- H2.** Trust will be positive predictor of marital satisfaction in single career couples.
- H3.** Females will score higher on marital satisfaction than males.

Method

Both single and dual career couples were contacted personally. They were briefed about the topic of the study. Informed consent was ensured from them. Instructions

about scales along with testing booklets were given to them and they were briefed about the purpose of the study. They were asked to response to all questionnaires according to their true feelings. All of the participants were assured about the confidentiality and privacy of the information taken from them. Questionnaires were distributed to male/female partners, so that they could return them after completion by their spouses. These forms were collected after three or four days of distribution depending upon when all the forms, duly completed by both partners. They were also thanked for participating in the study.

Sample

The researchers approached both single and dual career couples. The participants were explained that their participation in this study was absolutely voluntary and they could quit the study at any stage. They were also assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. The participants of this study included 50 married individuals, 25 of those who identified themselves in a working career and 25 of single career couples. The age of participants ranged from 18-55 years and older, with the greatest number of respondents categorized between 25-34 years of age. The sample was 50 percent female and 50 percent male.

Instruments

Demographic form

A demographic form was filled by the couples which included information about name (optional), gender, age, profession, number of children, and family structure. The constructs of the present study were measured through psychometrically sound self-report measures. The details are as follows:

Enrich marital satisfaction scale

To measure marital satisfaction of couples Enrich Marital Satisfaction Scale [1] was used in current study. Its concurrent validity is .73 with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. Construct validity with Family Satisfaction Scale, thoughts of divorce, and demographic correlations of other satisfaction scales, suggesting non-redundancy among the scales. Cronbach's alpha revealed an internal reliability of .86 and test re-test reliability coefficient is .86

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics, Alpha Reliability Coefficients and Pearson Correlation among Study Variables (N = 100).

Descriptive Statistics, Alpha Reliability Coefficients and Pearson Correlation among Study Variables (N = 100)					
Variables	M	SD	α	1	2
1-Trust	2.86	1.155	0.557	-	0.145
2-Marital satisfaction	4.36	1.03	0.17		-

Table 4: Mean, Standard Deviation and t-values for Male and Female Individuals on Study Variables.

Mean, Standard Deviation and t-values for Male and Female Individuals on Study Variables									
Variables	Male (n = 50)		Female (n = 50)			95% CI		Cohen's d	
	M	SD	M	SD	t(98)	P	LL		UL
Trust	2.81	1.197	2.9	1.125	-.393		-.552	0.367	
Marital satisfaction	4.44	0.965	4.29	1.091	0.721		-.261	0.559	

over time [1]. It has Likert type 5 point rating response format ranging from 1 = completely disagree to 5 = completely agree.

Trust scale

Trust scale [2] was used, which is composed of 3 sub scales i.e. Predictability, Dependability and Faith. The total Trust measure is the sum of the 3 sub scales total. Items are anchored on 7 point Likert type response format. Alpha reliabilities reported by the authors were .80, .72, .70, and .81 for faith, dependability, predictability and overall scale respectively.

Results

The current study was aimed to find out the relationship of trust and marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples. For this purpose data was analyzed through the statistical package of social sciences (SPSS) 17V. Various statistical techniques were used such as Pearson correlation to find out the relationship and t-test to find out the effect variable gender that indicates the following results (Tables 1-5):

Table 1: Reliability Analysis of Measures (N =100).

Reliability Analysis of Measures (N =100)		
Scale	No. of Items	A
Trust	6	0.557
Marital satisfaction	15	0.17

Source: Table 1 reveals reliability of total trust and marital satisfaction scale that was highly satisfactory ($\alpha=.557, .170$).

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Study Variables (N =100).

Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Study Variables (N =100)			
Gender	M	F	%
Male	2.86	50	100
Female	4.36	50	100

Source: Table 2 indicated the mean and standard deviation, frequency and percentages of sample.

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Trust on Marital Satisfaction among Single and Dual Career Couples (N = 100).

Multiple Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Trust on Marital Satisfaction among Single and Dual Career Couples (N = 100)				
Variables	β	R ²	ΔR^2	F
Trust	0.145	0.021	0.011	2.096
Marital satisfaction	-	-	-	-

Discussion

The present study was design to find out the relationship between Trust and Marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples. Furthermore the study was also intended to find the gender effect on Trust and Marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples. To measure marital satisfaction of couples Enrich Marital Satisfaction Scale [1] was used in current study. The reliability of this scale is .55 for trust and .17 for marital satisfaction. The current study was aimed to find out the relationship of trust and marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples, which was taken through convenient sampling technique. The participants ranged in age between 18 and 55 years. It was drawn from Chakwal, Pakistan. Survey research design will be used. All of the participants were assured about the confidentiality and privacy of the information taken from them. Questionnaires were distributed to male/female partners, so that they could return them after completion by their spouses. These forms were collected after three or four days of distribution depending upon when all the forms, duly completed by both partners. They were also thanked for participating in the study.

Limitations of the Study

1. The sample of the present study was selected from limited locale and to small representative sample of 50 couples (N=100) therefore the findings cannot be generalized beyond the specific settings.
2. Additionally in Pakistani culture women are not as much expressive as men are about the sexual aspects of marital satisfactions. The researchers have found that many women were hesitant to answer about sexuality items which may have biased the results.
3. Furthermore, certain demographic variables like birth order, socio economic status, participant's academic records have not been controlled in the present study which might have been relevant to the constructs of the present study.

Suggestion for Future Research

1. The findings of the present study can be externally validated if future studies on marital satisfaction among single and dual career couples incorporate broad range of occupations in the sample for norms and generalization of the findings.
2. The sampling technique in the present was convenience sampling that was not fully representative of the

population; therefore a method of probability sampling should be used.

3. Role of Depression and Marital Adjustment should also be examined in relation to marital satisfaction among dual career couples in comparison with single career couples.
4. Finally, demographic variables such as socio economic status, family system, duration of marriage, and type of marriage (love marriage versus arranged marriage) should also be explored in relation to trust and marital satisfaction of couples [55-66].

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I would like to recognize my ALLAH, who makes all things possible for putting the enthusiasm in my heart, inspiration and encouragement in my mind, and determination in my soul to complete this research work.

Although words cannot fully express my gratitude to my adviser Dr. St Saim, I would first like to thank him, for offering his precious time and allowing me to dive into this research project and continuously guided this work through all its steps. He has been a relentless driving force providing me with opportunities, advice, and amazing support. I perceive the opportunity to work with him as a privilege. His contribution to this work and to my personal growth was invaluable. Therefore, He is my utmost respect and truly my model as a research adviser forever I would like to express my deepest love and appreciation to my family specially my father Asif Mehmood and mother Azmat Noor and My sister Tayyaba Asif, and friend, saba jawed, for their undying and unconditional love, endless support and encouragement. Despite of they are living in economic restrictions the cost they paid for my education and now for my position here in this community is really great and without their support accomplishment of this work is unthinkable.

References

1. Fowers BJ, Olson DH (1993) Enrich marital satisfaction scale: A brief research and clinical tool. *Journal of Family Psychology* 7(2): 176-185.
2. Rempel JK, Holmes JG, Zanna MP (1985) Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49: 95-112.
3. Webb WM, Worchel P (1986) Trust and distrust. Austin WG & Worchel S (Eds) *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago, pp. 213-228.
4. Lewicki RJ, McAllister DJ, Bies RJ (1998) Trust and distrust:

- New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 438-458.
5. Kee HW, Knox RE (1970) Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust and suspicion. *J Conflict Res* 14(3): 357-366.
 6. Bierhoff HW (1992) Trust and trustworthiness. In: Montada L, et al. (Eds.), *Life crises and experiences of loss in adulthood*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, USA, pp. 411-433.
 7. Deutsch M (1958) Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2(4): 265-279.
 8. Schlenker RB, Helm B, Tedeschi JT (1973) The effects of personality and situational variables on behavioral trust. *J Pers Soc Psycho* 25(3): 419-427.
 9. Johnson SM, Makinen JA, Millikin JW (2001) Attachment injuries in couple relationships: A new perspective on impasses in couples therapy. *J Marital Fam The* 27(2): 145-155.
 10. Erikson EH (1968) *Identity, youth, and crisis*. Norton, New York, USA, pp. 154-159.
 11. Bowlby J (1969) *Attachment and loss (Vol. 1)*. Basic Books, New York, USA.
 12. Bowlby J (1988a) *A secure base: Parent-child attachments and healthy human development*. Basic Books, New York, USA, pp. 224.
 13. Boon SD (1994) *Dispelling doubt and uncertainty: Trust and romantic relationships*. Duck S(Ed), *Dynamics of relationships*. Thousand Oaks, Sage, USA, pp. 86-111.
 14. Holmes JG, Rempel JK (1989) Trust in close relationships. In: Hendrick C (Ed.), *Review of Personality and social relationships*. Sage, Newbury Park, USA, pp. 187-219.
 15. Rotter JB (1967) A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *J Pers* 35(4): 651-655.
 16. Johnson George C, Swap WC (1982) Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *J Personality and Social Psychology* 43(6): 1306-1317.
 17. Gmnebaum J, Gmnebaum H (1980) Beyond the superego. *Am J Psychiatry* 137(7): 817-819.
 18. Deutsch M (1958) Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2(4): 265-279.
 19. Stone E, Shackelford T (2007) Marital satisfaction. Baumeister RF & Vohs KD (Eds), USA, pp. 1-8.
 20. Kim HK, McKenry PC (2002) The relationship between marriage and psychological well-being: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Issues* 23(8): 885-911.
 21. Schakelford TK, Buss DM (2000) Marital satisfaction and spousal cost-infliction. *Personality and Individual Differences* 28: 917-928.
 22. Fincham FD, Beach SR (1999) Conflict in marriage: Implications for working with couples. *Annu Rev Psychol* 50: 47-77.
 23. Cottrell CA, Neuberg SL, Li NP (2007) What do people desire in others? A sociofunctional perspective on the importance of different valued characteristics. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 92(2): 208-231.
 24. Amato P, Booth A (1995) Changes in gender role attitudes and perceived marital quality. *American Sociological Review* 60(1): 58-66.
 25. Gutman MB (1992) Trust, distrust, and interpersonal problems A circumplex analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 62(7): 1002-1005.
 26. Atkins DC, Vi J, Bauco DH, Christensen A (2005) Infidelity in couples seeking marital therapy. *J Fam Psychol* 19(3): 470-473.
 27. Kelley DL, Burgoon JK (1991) Understanding marital satisfaction and couple type as functions of relational expectations. *Human Communication Research* 18(1): 40-69.
 28. Taylor SE, Peplau LA, Sears DO (1997) *Social Psychology*. (9th edn), Prentice Hall, USA.
 29. Hendrick S, Hendrick C (1992) *Liking, loving and relating*. Brooks/Cole, Pacific Grove, USA, pp. 273-293.
 30. Furstenberg FF (1996) The future of marriage. *American Demographics* 18(6): 34-40.
 31. Johnson DR, Booth A (1990) Rural economic decline and marital quality: A panel study on farm marriages. *Family Relations, AGRIS* 39: 159-165.
 32. Stevenson (2001) *The place of attachment in human behavior*. Hmde (Ed), USA, pp. 1-352.
 33. Young M, Luquis R (1998) Correlates of sexual satisfaction in marriage. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality* 7(2): 115-127.69.
 34. Gottman JM (1994) What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 62(6): 989-1002.
 35. Knoblach LK (2008) The content of relational uncertainty within marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 25: 467-495.
 36. Perrone KM, Worthington EL (2001) Factors influencing ratings of marital quality by Individuals within dual-career marriages: A conceptual model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 48(1): 3-9.
 37. Li T, Fung HH (2011) The dynamic goal theory of marital satisfaction. *Review of General Psychology* 15(3): 246-254.
 38. Worchel P (1979) Trust and distrust. In: Austin WG & Worchel S (Eds), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. USA, pp. 229-232.
 39. Belmont CA, Wadsworth Kee HW, Knox RE (1970) Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 14(3): 357-366.
 40. Wrightsman LS (1972) *Social psychology in the seventies*. Brooks/Cole, Monterey, USA, pp. 1-311.
 41. Norton AJ, Moorman AE (1987) Current trends in marriage and divorce among American women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49: 3-14.
 42. Larzelere RE, Huston TL (1980) The Dyadic Trust Scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 42: 595-604.
 43. Ainsworth MDS (1982) Attachment: Retrospect and prospect. In: Parkes CM & Stevenson Hmde J (Eds.), *The place of*

- attachment in human behavior. Basic Books, New York, USA, p. 1-30.
44. Hazan C, Shaver P (1987) Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 52(3): 511-524.
 45. Sprunt E, Howes S (2011) Results of dual-career couples survey. *Journal of Petroleum Engineers* 63(10): 60-62.
 46. Johnson SM, Talitman E (1997) Predictors of success in emotionally focused marital therapy. *J Marital Fam Ther* 23(2): 135-152.
 47. Quinn WH, Odell M (1998) Predictors of marital adjustment during the first two years. *Marriage and Family Review* 27(1-2): 113-130.
 48. Thomas S, Albrecht K, White P (1984) Determinants of marital quality in dual-career couples. *Family Relations* 33: 513-521.
 49. Bedeian AG, Burke BG, Moffett RG (1988) Outcomes of work-family conflict among married male and female professionals. *Journal of Management* 14(3): 475-491.
 50. Cherpas CC (1985) Dual-career families: Terminology, typologies, and work and family issues. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 63(10): 616-620.
 51. Netemeyer RG, McMurrian R, Boles JS (1996) Development and validation of Work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81(4): 400-410.
 52. Galvin KM, Byland CL, Brommel BJ (2011) *Family communication: Cohesion and Change*. (8th edn), Scott Foresman, Glenview, USA, pp. 1-416.
 53. Notarius C, Markman H (1993) *We can work it out: Making sense of marital conflict*. G.P. Putnam's Sons Park, Sage, USA.
 54. Lewicki RJ, McAllister DJ, Bies RJ (1998) Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 438-458.
 55. Worchel P (1979) Trust and distrust. In: Austin WG & Worchel S (Eds), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. USA, pp. 229-232.
 56. Bierhoff HW (1992) Trust and trustworthiness. In: Montada L, et al. (Eds.), *Life crises and experiences of loss in adulthood*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, USA, pp. 411-433.
 57. Couch LL, Adams JM, Jones WH (1996) The assessment of trust orientation. *J Pers Assess* 67(2): 305-323.
 58. Doherty WJ (1980) Divorce and belief in internal versus external control of one's life: Data from a national probability sample. *Journal of Divorce* 3(4): 391-401.
 59. Gmnebaum J, Gmnebaum H (1980) Beyond the superego. *Am J Psychiatry* 137(7): 817-819.
 60. Hendrick SS, Hendick C (1997) Love and satisfaction. In: Sternberg RJ & Hojjat M (Eds), *Satisfaction in close relationships*. USA, pp. 56-78.
 61. Kee HW, Knox RE (1970) Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust and suspicion. *J Conflict Res* 14(3): 357-366.
 62. Lewis SC, Cooper CL (1987) Stress in two-earner couples and stage in the life cycle. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 18: 477-486.
 63. Perrone KM, Worthington EL (2001) Factors influencing ratings of marital quality by Individuals within dual-career marriages: A conceptual model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 48(1): 3-9.
 64. Ross EC (2009) *Psychology of family*. Warner Books, Inc, Canada.
 65. Rotter JB (1975) Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 43(1): 56-67.
 66. Schlenker RB, Helm B, Tedeschi JT (1973) The effects of personality and situational variables on behavioral trust. *J Pers Soc Psycho* 25(3): 419-427.