

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Marriage can be described as an ageless contract designed by God for the purpose of unification of man and woman. For this reason, over the years, it has been acclaimed a sacred and venerable institution. It is also believed to be the fundamental aspect of the society since the family that emerges through marriage processes is a microcosm of the society (Iffih & Ezeah, 2004). The value of marriage differs from culture to culture, from ethnic group to ethnic group, depending on the way each group perceives marriage. To some people marriage is life-long union, while some see it as a contract which gets broken when spouses get tired. But the purpose of establishing the institution of marriage is for life-long union. This is why Jesus told the Pharisees in the book of Mathew 19:3-5 that God created the male and female, and for this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh (NKJV, Bible). In line with this, Odemenlam, Justin and Igbanusi (2003) submitted that most Africans see marriage as a lasting agreement between a man and a woman who have consented to live a life of devotion and sharing with each other for the purpose of promoting their mutual growth and welfare as persons in their journey through life.

This is however contrary to what happens in some countries like Western Europe, United States of America and Australia where they practice same sex marriage which is the practice of marriage between two men or two women. Although same sex marriage has being regularized through law in those countries, the legal and social responses have ranged from celebration in one hand to criminalization on the other hand. Nigeria for example, recognizes neither same sex marriage nor civil unions for same sex couples. On January 18th, 2007 the Federal Executive Council approved a law, same sex marriage (Prohibition) Act 2014,

prohibiting same sex marriages. The proposed bill call for five years imprisonment for anyone who undergoes, performs, witness, aids or abets a same sex marriage. In the view of the above, the researcher is not interested in same sex marriage but in marriage between a man and woman which is the first marriage ordained by God.

Marriage is a socially legitimized sexual union, a life and death struggle maintained through the forces of law, companionship, friendship and romantic love. It is also maintained by bonding relationship which develops as the couple share day to day routines such as feeding, bathing and taking responsibility of their children (Charlin, 2005). Marriage is like a partnership contract without escape clause. This means that marriage connotes a lifelong arrangement where couples should permanently survive a multitude of demanding situations such as illness and financial constraints among others.

The primary aim of this union is to love, protect, cherish, understand, compliment and help each other. According to Undyaunde and Uga (2006) marriage also involves sexual intercourse for procreation, training of children born out of the marriage for future companionship. Marriage is a blending of two lives and union of two natures, it is like an egg in the hands of husband and wife which must be carefully cared for and nurtured to avoid breakage. It involves understanding, love, peace, patience, perseverance, trust, cordial relationship, free communication and forgiveness among others.

The truth is that when a man and woman come together in marriage, they come from different background and with different mind sets and benefits built up based on their background experience. The expectation is that they would, in the course of living together adjust to each other and grow into deeper love and oneness thereby increasing the stability of their marital relationship. Often this expectation is not realized in many marriages and consequently instead of the marriage relationships becoming stronger, more cohesive and more stable, it becomes weak and drifting apart sets in. It is very unfortunate to note that this

condition set in for some couples soon after their honey moon, they begin to drift apart, loosing cohesiveness, becoming selfish and self centered, unfaithful, impatience and disrespectful to each other. Their trust for each other reduces they become progressively cold towards each other, this is an indicatoion that marital dysfunction is creeping into the marriage.

Agha and Obika (2007), affirmed that marital dysfunction is marriage that lacks some or all the qualities expected to be in marriage such qualities as love, peace, understanding, tolerance, patience and trust. George (2002) also saw marital dysfunction as marriage where the rate of mutual exchanges and benefits are lower than the mutual punishment. In other words, George saw marital dysfunction as marriage where the level of understanding, sharing of love, kindness and selflessness is lower than the level of selfishness and self centeredness exhibited in the marriage by spouse.

Kolo (2010), submitted that marital dysfunction is marriage that exist with elusion, shallow understanding of challenges of marital life, disrespect for each other, negative perceptions and selfish tendencies. Marital dysfunction in the context of this study is marital disharmony as a result of lack of love, care, trust, protection, free communication among others. Marital dysfunction could come from different ways or sources. These sources of marital dysfunction are refers to as risk factor of marital dysfunction. These risk factors are potential sources that bring about and aggravate marital relationship and are potential causes of marital dysfunction. These include; lack of intimacy, poor/selfish attitude, irresponsibilities, financial tussles (selfish attitude towards finance) hardship and other challenges. When these deficiencies persist and spouses begin to work and walk as two separate individuals living together but just for their own personal goals, then dysfunction has set in. Marital dysfunction manifests itself in a number of different ways and is very often

marked by deficits in commitment to the relationship, low level of mutual caring behaviours between the partners, problems with communication and corrosive conflict resolution skills. All these depend on the level of or degrees at which they operate in marriage or the degree at which the spouses are experiencing them. If the degree at which they experience it is mild then the dysfunction will be mild, but if the degree at which they experience it is high then there is danger and in that case something must be done to save the marriage from the myriad of problems. In the context of this work marital risk factors are categorized into five main groups namely lack of intimacy, poor attitude, irresponsibilities, financial tussle, hardship/challenges. These are on the researchers' adapted instrument of Omoluabi (1994).

According to Dada and Idowu (2006), so many variables which have affected the institution of marriage include age at marriage, educational levels of spouses, religious affiliation, income, fertility status, divorce, crime and delinquency, frustration, type of job done by the spouse and others. Continuing Idowu and Adeyemi said that couples who marry at old age may have problems later in the marriage especially when the issue of infertility creeps in. Infertility brings emotional stress into marriage and when it is too much, it affects the marriage bond. Also inferiority complex may come in when there is much difference in the educational background of the spouses resulting to communication gap and withdrawal on the part of one of the spouses depending on who is involved. Religious affiliation may contribute much in marital dysfunction depending on couples. Some couples with different religious background argue on which church to attend after the marriage and if they are not careful, it may affect the marriage; the result could be power tussle, involvement of other members of the larger family to decide on the matter as the case may be.

Apart from the aforementioned variable, many married people have rather large amount of stress on their shoulders due to the prevailing conditions in the country today. Stress from work place, extended family issues, maintenance of children, school run, house

chores, social commitments and religious commitments all tend to increase stress in many marriages, especially among public servants who already have numerous official activities they are engaged in. Sometimes their work may take them away from home. This absence from home, when frequent, might cause problems because being away from home means absence of physical closeness. If this continues for a long time, an open door for dysfunction is created and danger is on the way. 2011 Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria, defined public servants are those civil servants who work in the ministerial departments, like ministry of justice and statutory co-operations or parastatals which may include ports authorities educational institutions which include primary schools, secondary and tertiary institutions, and banks which are wholly or principally owned or controlled by government at Federal, State or local government level. In the context of this study, public servants operationally refer to persons that work in government health institutions like doctors and nurses in the Government hospitals, and those that work in the Educational institutions.

These groups of public servants were chosen because they stay in their different offices working for several hours. Sometimes they sleep in their work place especially doctors and nurses. Supporting this, Nutter (2010) submitted that hours of travelling outside home and spending long hours in the office bring about tight schedule for spouses, creating little or no time for them to be together. Also some working class women who have important roles to play in their offices often get tired after the hustle in the office and as a result their home and family responsibility tend to be neglected.

Family responsibilities demand a lot of attention and time. If these responsibilities are not attended to, it would most likely have impact on their marriage. Commenting in this direction, Ordu and Igrude (2006), opined that some working class women are very busy with their jobs that they don't have time to attend to their husbands and children and where the error is not corrected it might lead to stress in marriage. One of the greatest determinants

of dysfunctioning in marriage is long-hours jobs. According to Fellie (2010), some spouses carry the stress from work place back to their homes which cause them to exchange words or else take it out on their partners which may culminate in distancing and quarrelling.

Distancing among spouses due to work schedule among public servants could contribute much to marital dysfunction. Confirming this, Fellie (2010) submitted that distance does not always make heart grow fonder. Some spouses may be away from home as a result of transfer to another location or due to work shift. This, sometimes causes them to spend one or two months or even one year away from their partners. This separation might affect the bond existing between them. Extra marital affair can spring up and bring about marital dysfunction. Some spouses sometimes have affair with their secretary in the office; this trend is common with men. Women sometimes also have affairs with their boss or directors in the office. When this happens, it leads to misunderstanding, or neglect of the spouse culminating in serious marital dysfunction. Supporting this, Agha and Obika (2007) affirmed that extra marital affair reduces trust and love in marriage, which is against culture.

It is very unfortunate that culture in igbo land contributes to some behaviours which could increase marital dysfunction. This was evidenced in some of the problems handled during the researcher's internship in 2015, precisely in the Social Welfare Department. There were some behaviours exhibited by men which were not taken serious compared with when women exhibited the same behaviours. For example, nothing is said about a man who sleeps outside with his lover, drinks and becomes intoxicated, begets children with another woman. He gets away with all these but where a woman does the same, it could lead to her being sent back to her father's house, that is, out of the marriage. Public servants could fall victims to this because they sometimes work or run shift while some work permanently at night. Some of them who cannot control their emotions fall in love with their secretary, boss and other co-workers. This invariably is often as a result of being together always at work place with the

opposite sex and sometimes as a result of going out always for, lunch together, as such outside relationship grows deeper, the marital bond reduces. The couple gradually loose their regards for each other. They begin to see each other as another person instead of "oneness" as the bible says in Gen 2:24. They begin to find faults and magnify these faults here and there. The couple may pretend to live together in the same roof, but the critical variables that hold marriage together have disappeared, they are only living as co-tenants or roommates. When this continues for a long period, bonding of the spouses may loosen drastically leading to suspicion and mistrust and eventually destruction of the marriage. When couples are apart from each other, perhaps due to work demands, children from the marriage are also affected by the negative effects accruing therein. When husband and wife do not have time to discuss family affairs, it affects every aspect of the marriage; their finance, social status, as well as their spiritual life. When marriage bonding is weak, then the foundation for the marriage to collapse is laid. For these gender related differences that exist in our culture; 'gender' is a variable of interest in this study, to find out views of male and female respondents on marital dysfunction and adjustment strategies.

Among the factors associated with marital dysfunction also is financial issue. Some public servants do not discuss their salary with spouse, because they want to shy away from their responsibilities. Some women feel that it is not their responsibility to contribute towards house keeping, while some men spend their money on women outside their home. Some also drink excessively. When these things happen in the family, it is obvious that family is not in order because it brings about abdication of family responsibilities, children are neglected and left to suffer. Idialive (2003), also submit other variables such as change in growth and development, bad habits among spouses, parental attitudes and individual differences are potential causes of marital dysfunction among public servants.

Bad habits like excessive drinking by the husband or wife can cause so much damage to marriage. The fact that husband or wife is addicted to drinking or smoking or both may lead to termination of marriage. When this happens the children from the marriage are adversely affected psychologically, socially, economically and physically. Psychologically, the children would be ashamed of mentioning who their parents are. They will not be proud of their parents. Socially, they will be withdrawn from the society since they are always conscious of the shameful labels caused by their parents. Some of them may even copy the bad habits from their parents and be addicts themselves.

Physically, these children may not grow well and may look sickly since their parents may not have time to feed them well. Orji (2013), observed that children from dysfunctional family/marriage sometimes become wayward, disobedient, school dropout, cultist, arm robbers, among others. Since the bond holding the family is weak, the spouses rarely sit together to discuss and plan for the progress of the family. Each person is on his/her own way and the children suffer the consequences of it all as they lack parental love, guidance and personal attention. Children from dysfunctional homes sometimes develop bitterness and hatred. As opined by Orji (2013), this may lead them to prostitution, armed robbery or even street fight. Orji also observed that children from dysfunctioned family/marriage sometimes imitate the vices of either their mothers or father. Also the unresolved issues between their parents still affect them. Today, there are many girls, boys and adults roaming about the street, as delinquents, school drop outs, vandals and touts because of marital dysfunction in their homes.

Marital dysfunction is said to be a social problem. It affects a significant number of people in the world today. Therefore, it demands urgent attention considering the bad effects it has on the society in general and the public servants in particular.

Ordu and Igbrodu (2006), opined that the journey towards marital stability required understanding, tolerance, forgiveness, respect and love. These authors added that these variables bring happiness and satisfaction in marriage. However, where these variables are lacking then adjustment becomes imperative, for the marriage to thrive.

Adjustment according to Momojugba (2008) is an individual's general adaptation to his/her environment and demands of life. Marital adjustment connotes modification of such behaviours in consonance with the prevailing environmental demands on an individual. Taiwo, Okon and Eze (2006) observed that it involves spouse accepting one another, having tolerance for each other. In our present day environment, the demands of marriage are tremendous and adjustment will include the series of methods, ways and techniques spouses use to cope with the diverse pressure that come upon marriage relationships and their attempts to understand each other and prevent dysfunctional behaviours. If spouses, ignore the need for adjustment, the result will heighten marital stress, destroy physical and psychological well being, all of which may result to high risk of marital dysfunction (Amalu, 2004).

Adjustment strategies according to Aamodt (2007) referred to ways of improving a situation, dealing with problems, conflicts, blocks, anxiety, misunderstanding in reaching expectation and accepting what one cannot change to maintain peace and harmony in one's environment. Also adjustment strategies are ways by which an individual reduces tensions or problems, anxiety, fears, worries and disturbances in order to maintain harmonious living. It includes any habitual method of overcoming problems, reaching goals, satisfying motives, relieving frustrations and maintain equilibrium in his environment. Adjustment strategies can also be seen as means of appealing small changes to improve something to make it better. It is a change that makes people to do better or work better in a new situation. It is also a process of altering behaviour to reach a harmonious relationship with people, neighbours and

environment. For the purpose of this study adjustment strategies operationally refer to an individual's habitual means of coping with the issues and challenges in marriage so that there will be cordial relationship and coherence between the person and the spouse. It is the individual's ways or methods of making amendments, changes in some ways in order to improve, overcome the demands and problems and to achieve new development in life and environment.

A number of researchers, predominantly outside the area of the present study, have found some adjustment strategies useful in harmonizing ailing marriages. One of these researchers is D'Souza (2011) who opined that healthy arguments are good in settling marital misunderstandings but warned that it should not end up in calling neighbours. Other authors like Abdul and Yusuf (2013) suggested strategies like effective communication, resourcefulness by family members, and marital counselling as appropriate strategies for resolving marital problems and disharmony. Abdul and Yusuf highlighted the importance of open communication. They recommended that spouses should try to open up to their partners, lay the complaints in appropriate manner so that both partners will discuss it calmly and rationally.

On financial issues, Taiwo, Okon and Eze (2006) recommended funds management techniques which they said should be taught to help spouses develop positive trust towards each other in terms of how to manage funds objectively and fairly. Taiwo, et al, also suggested that spouses should not hide their income from each other rather they should plan, cooperatively and thoroughly on how to spend the money on the projects they wish to embark on, what amount should be set apart for relations and friends. They further recommended that spouses should control how they involve the extended family members in their marital matters. They opined that couples should learn to settle family cases alone bearing in mind their individual differences and weakness, pointing out that it is by so doing that they will

discover their mistakes and make amendments. Where marital dysfunction exists, the consequences on the family members are enormous and may include maladaptive behaviours, frustrations, bitterness, complaints, sleepless night, loneliness, backwardness on the part of the children and poverty among other. Where marital dysfunction is high and if it is not well managed, it may lead to divorce, separation or even death of one of the spouses. It is against this background that the researcher decided to identify the marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State.

Statement of the Problem

Marriage is a relationship between two persons in this context, male and female, with an obligation to love, care and promote each other development, emotionally, socially, psychologically and spiritually. One major objective of marriage is for the couple to be united, work together to raise Godly children by ensuring that they instill moral values into them for the benefit of the family and the society. However, these days, marriage has largely deviated from the biblical injunctions and societal expectations, apparently because of the present day hardships and pressure of work which cause some parents to be largely unavailable at home to maintain functional marriage. Spouses appear to be very committed to their jobs for security reasons and to make ends met. This situation apparently has adverse effects on the spouses' inter-personal relationship and bonding in the marriage which inevitably result in high risk of marital dysfunction. Many female workers return from office work tired and exhausted, unable to fulfill the roles expected of them by the culture to serve their husbands. Where this continues for long, the foundation for conflict and marital dysfunction will be created. This could be the reason some Church denominations introduced three months and six months premarital counselling for would-be couples to ensure better adjustment. Women groups for example, General Home and Abroad Women Meeting that hold in Anambra State in August in various towns, have all taken it upon themselves to bring

in experts to give talks and expand on how to keep marriages stable and harmonious. Also a number of authors and researchers such as Ibe, Obidua and Uzoechina conducted research on marital disharmony, causes and resolution strategies among couples in Enugu State and Onwuasoanya and Okeke (2004) on family counselling for management skills and marital stability among literate couples in Awka South Local Government Area.

Despite all these efforts by churches, and other stakeholders in education, marital dysfunction risk factors apparently persists in Anambra State. This is confirmed by the researcher's observation during her internship in 2015 in Awka South Local Government Area, precisely at the Social Welfare Department. She observed that almost all the cases handled were matters of marital dysfunction which range from marital misunderstanding, abuses, quarrels and fights to actual divorce. This implies that high risk of marital dysfunction persist in the state. This, however, needs to be empirically ascertained. The appropriateness of the adjustment strategies spouses actually use in dealing with marital challenges also need to be ascertained in order that proper and adequate remedial actions can be taken to curtail social problems that occurs from marital dysfunctions such as family instability, divorce, single parenting among others.

The problem of this study therefore, is the dimensions of marital risk factors that precipitate dysfunctions in the families of public servants in Anambra State. Put into question format, the problem of this study can be summarized thus: what are the Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors and Adjustment Strategies of Public Servants in Anambra State?

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to determine empirically the marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State. Specifically, the study determined the;

1. The scores of public servants in Anambra State on lack of intimacy as a marital dysfunction risk factor.
2. The scores of public servants in Anambra State on poor attitude/habits as a marital dysfunction risk factor.
3. The scores of public servants in Anambra State on irresponsibility as a marital dysfunction risk factor.
4. The scores of public servants in Anambra State on financial tussle/issues as a marital dysfunction risk factor.
5. The scores of public servants in Anambra State on challenges/difficulties as a marital dysfunction risk factor.
6. The difference in the mean response of male and female public servants marital dysfunction risk factors.
7. The mean responses of public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors based on their professions.
8. The mean response of public servants in Anambra State on the marital dysfunction risk factors based on their place of work.
9. The marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State.
10. The difference in the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by male and female public servants in Anambra State.
11. The difference in the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their profession.
12. The difference in the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their place of work.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be beneficial to families, guidance counsellors, social workers, churches, public servants, general public and future researchers.

The findings of this study will provide extensive information on marital dysfunction, marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies to cope with marital problems. This will help counsellors in counselling their clients with marital problems and help them also to direct their clients on the right adjustment to cope with their problems. Also it will expose counsellors to the knowledge of marital dysfunction risk factors.

The findings if published will be educative to family members especially the public servants by highlighting the factors that could threaten family cohesiveness and effective strategies that can help minimize dysfunctional behaviours among couples. When dysfunctional habits and behaviours became minimized, home environmental atmosphere will become more loving resulting to reduction in the risk factors of marital dysfunction in the family and the bad effect they experienced will also reduce. Reduction of marital dysfunction will create an enabling environment where peace, love and development will come to stay.

The social welfare officers will also gain new knowledge of the findings of marital adjustment strategies to the one they know before. The findings from this study will be of immense help to social welfare officers (social workers) in their day to day engagements with their clients especially public servants as it will expose them to the risks factors of marital dysfunction thereby educating them on how to help their clients with their marital problems. Public servants will also benefit from this study as it will enlighten them on the right adjustment strategies to use when they are faced with marital problem and challenges.

One of the major problems that Churches handle is the issue of marital conflicts or dysfunction. The findings of this study will help the marriage course teachers in churches, by

giving them insight and empirical data on factors that heighten marital dysfunction. This will become the bases and tools for them to give newly married couples pre-information on the marital dysfunction risk factors so that they will guide against such thereby reducing the level of marital dysfunction to minimal. Also extensive adjustment strategies will be unveiled for people experiencing high level of marital dysfunction which if they adopt, could bring about reduction in marital dysfunctional behaviours amongst couples in the home.

Public servants will also learn their lessons from the findings of this study, as it exposes them to the factors that heighten marital problems some of which they may not have been aware of before, it may also ignite in them new sense of responsibilities to check their personal actions which could be negatively interpreted by their spouses and can cause conflicts in their homes. Public servants will also learn new adjustment strategies to cope with their marital problems.

The findings ultimately will contribute towards restoring peace and harmony to the general public as some deviant behaviours among children, which often emanate from marital dysfunction, will reduce. This is because when spouses live in love as one indivisible entity, they will create a conducive home atmosphere where children will be well nurtured. When this is done, children's deviancy will curtail, armed robbery, school dropout among others will reduce drastically. All these will follow when the data and findings of this research are made public and perhaps used during PTA meetings as a resource material to charge parents on the importance of peace and harmony in the home as an important means to advance the welfare and academic achievement of their children in the school.

Findings of this study will benefit future researchers as it will add to existing literature on marital dysfunction, marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants in tertiary educational and health institutions. It will also pave way for further studies on the marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public

servants in Anambra State. It also provides baseline information for future researchers in this area of study.

Scope of the Study

The study focused on married public servants who work in the four tertiary educational institutions and government health institutions (doctors and nurses) in Anambra State. The study determined their marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies they use to cope in their marital problems. Marital dysfunction risk factors covered in this study refer to the potential source that aggravate discord and disharmony in marital relationships. They are grouped into five categories namely; lack of intimacy, poor attitude, irresponsibilities, financial tussles/issues and challenges/difficulties as identified by Omolumbi and adapted by the researcher in this study.

Marital adjustment strategies covered in this work refer to individual respondents habitual ways of coping in the issues and challenges in marriage so as to maintain stability in the home. They are grouped into five main categories namely; active cognitive strategies, emotion focus strategies, accepting responsibilities strategies, active behavioural problems solving strategies and avoidance strategies. Another variable of interest in this study is gender of the respondents.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study;

1. What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on lack of intimacy as a marital dysfunction risk factors?
2. What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on poor attitude/habits as a marital dysfunction risk factors?
3. What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on irresponsibility as a marital dysfunction risk factor?

4. What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on financial tussles/issues as a marital dysfunction risk factor?
5. What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on challenges/difficulties as a marital dysfunction risk factor?
6. What are the marital dysfunction adjustment used by public servants in Anambra State?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses guided the study

1. There is no significant difference on the mean response of male and female public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factor.
2. There is no significant difference on the mean response of public servants in Anambra State on the marital dysfunction risk factors based on their profession.
3. There is no significant difference on the mean response of public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factor based on their place of work.
4. There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies of male and female public servants in Anambra State.
5. There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their profession.
6. There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their place of work.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literatures that are relevant to the study. They are reviewed under the following sub-headings.

Conceptual Framework

Marital Dysfunction

Risk Factors

Adjustment

Strategies

Public Servants

Theoretical Framework

Role Model Theory by Mangus 1957

Marital Communication Theory Model Bateson 1956

Adjustment/Coping Theory by Lazarus 1991

Theoretical Studies

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors based on Gender

Consequences of Marital Dysfunction

Types of Adjustment Strategies

Empirical Studies

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors

Marital Dysfunction Adjustment Strategies

Marital Dysfunction based on Gender

Marital Adjustment Strategies based on Gender

Summary of the Reviewed Literature

Conceptual Framework

Marital Dysfunction

Marital means marriage. The term dysfunction connotes something that is not working satisfactorily, not normal or that which has some deficiencies. Marital dysfunction is, therefore, marriage that is not functioning well. Marriage that deviates from what normal marriage should be. This means that the marriage does not operate the way marriage is supposed to operate. That is marriage that has deficiency of harmony. According to O'Rourke and Cappeliz (2003), cited by Onwusasanya and Okeke (2004) marital dysfunction exist in a marriage that lacks love, positive communication, care, proper management and honesty. Marriage where there is chaos, pride, irrational thinking. To Anyanwu (2012), marital dysfunction refers to that marriage that is not working satisfactorily.

Yahaya, Esere, Ogunarimi and Onye (2008), describing marital dysfunction see it as a form of relationship/association or interaction between spouses which indicate that the couple do not care enough about their relationship, instead they fight. According to them, as long as conflicts exists, the parties at least have relationship, no matter how bad it is. To Ibeh, Obidoa, and Uzoechina (2013), marital dysfunction connotes strain in marriage interaction between couples who are living together. In this study marital dysfunction refers to a marriage that has deficiencies in aspects of love, peace, understanding, positive communication, role play, cohesiveness among others.

Risk Factors

A risk factor is any attribute, characteristic or exposure of an individual that increases the likelihood of developing dysfunction, injury or even disease. Risk factors are conditions or variables associated with lower likelihood of positive outcomes and higher likelihood of negative or socially undesirable outcomes (WHO, 2004). According to Alzheimer Society

(2015) risk factors are characteristics of a person, lifestyle, environment and genetic background that contribute to the likelihood of experiencing difficulties, problems, unpleasant situation and diseases. However, risk factors on their own are not causes of difficulties, negative outcome or disease but represent an increase chance, but not a certainty that they will develop. Similarly, having little or no exposure to known risk factors does not necessarily protect a person from developing undesirable outcomes. Also according to Alzheimer Society (2015) some risk factors are modifiable, which mean they can be changes (e.g. smoking, high blood pressure) others are non-modifiable, which means they cannot be changes (e.g. age, genetic makeup).

Risk factors, in the context of this study, are those behaviours, characteristics, attitude, actions or inactions that contribute, increase or aggravate marital dysfunction among spouses. These factors include marriage at young age, cohabiting prior to marriage, having no children from current marriage, not having the same religion as one's spouse, when the husband is unemployed to mention but a few.

Marital Stability

The word marital connotes marriage while stability is the stat of being firm, no change, being emotional balance. Marital stability is therefore seen as remaining legally married without divorce, physical separation or legal separation. Marital stability is a marital success or satisfaction. Nwosu (2012) defined marital stability as state in which expected life and activities of the family is not altered so as to ensure effective and efficient physiological and psychological functioning of the family. It is marriage that is not likely to change or move. Corey (2001) sees marital stability as successful and stabilized marriage that are largely anchored on these key ingredients which make the chemistry that enables the spouses overcome emotional challenges that are threatening marital stability. Examples are tolerance,

protection, love, care, acceptance among others. Marital stability is a successful marriage built on mutual understanding, love, trust and belief in conditional unity. Marital stability in the context of this study is marriage which stands firm, rooted in love, understanding, tolerance, perseverance, patience among others.

Public Servants

Public servants according to Junaidu and Aminu (2015) are those working in the operational arm of government establishments. Their services are usually sufficiently complex to warrant their establishment as separate bodies outside the normal operations of the government departments. Examples are those working in the ministerial departments like ministry of justice and statutory cooperation or parastatals which may include educational institutions, banks which are owned or principally control by government among others. Therefore married public servants are those married people working in the operational arm of government establishments as separate bodies outside the normal operations of the government departments. Due to the nature of their service they are guaranteed some autonomy. This autonomy is subject to government general direction of their operations to ensure the achievement of desired objectives.

Adjustment Strategies

Many scholars have been using the word adjustment strategies in different ways depending on their own perspectives. For instance, Anyanwu and Ofordile (2012) see marital adjustment strategies as short term response by married people which are adequate for them to manage many marital problems, transition and demands. Hinshow (2006) defined adjustment strategies as an integration of harmonious co-operation of various levels of personality. To Oniye (2000) it is, an individual's coping strategies, behaviours, which are consciously used by an individual to handle or control the effects of anticipated or

experienced stressful situations. Olayinka in Oraegbunam (2000) described adjustment strategies as the process and behaviours that satisfy a person's internal needs that enable the person to cope with environmental, social and cultural demands. To Wilson (2002) and Omojugbe (2008) adjustment strategies refer to an individual's general adaptation to his environment and the demands of life. Akuezulo (2012) defined adjustment as individual's attempt to cope with his environmental and challenges of life.

Folkman (1984) identified adjustment strategies as any attempt or effort to manage a situation that is potentially harmful or distressful. Demarco (2000) noted that adjustment is embedded in daily living processes, and that adjustment represents the entire life as it unfolds day after day. Kanu (2006) definition of adjustment strategies embodies the series of ways one uses to respond to changes within or outside his/her environment. Egwim and Iwuama (2014) opined that adjustment strategies is ability of an individual to deal successfully or unsuccessfully with life problems. Adjustment strategies, in the context of this work, is an individual's habitual manner or ways of dealing with issues, challenges and problems that exist in their marital relationship in order to maintain coherence and harmony.

Theoretical Framework

Role Theory

Role theory was compounded by Mangus in 1957. The Role theory model believes that the essential factor in any situation of marital crisis is the phenomenon of role conflicts, which is said to arise where there exists incompatible role expectations between the spouses in the marriage. In advancing explanations as how conflict is a central phenomenon in marital crisis, he assumes that;

Each partner in marriage usually enters the marriage not only with some ideas or perceptions as to how he or she should behave but also with certain expectations as to how the other should behave.

- i. Each partner in a marriage harbours not only expectations as to what should be done by the other in the marriage but also how the role expected of the other should be executed.
- ii. Problems in marital adjustment usually arise when these inter-partner role expectations conflict or disagree
- iii. Each partner in marriage usually harbours expectations not only as to what and how the other should behave but also as to how the other person ought to be while in the relationship.

According to Role theory, couples have roles in marriage which neglect can lead to conflict or crisis. Before a man and woman eventually join in marriage as husband wife, they have some expectations from each other which includes love protection, ring, provision, companionship and among others. When these role expectations are not met in marriage it could result to conflicts, nagging, crying and quarreling. It is believed that spouse negligence of duties contribute to marital dysfunction.

Role theory model also assumes that human interactions in general move along in smooth lines only where the following five conditions are fulfilled;

1. The parties in interaction agree clearly on their norms and on what to expect from each other in marriage;
2. Husband and wife discuss together and agree on each other's responsibilities in the family;
3. They discuss what is expected of each other and contributions expected from each other for well being of the union;
4. When these are done, the spouses ensure they play their roles well
5. When any development or reason comes up why one cannot play his/her role, explanations are given amicably.

Mangus the propounder of this theory also believes that where the parties involved decide between themselves the role definitions and expectations from each other, that in itself reduces conflicts to a minimal level. He further said that spouses should use positive lions on regular basis to reward or encourage his/her partner on the role he/she played. Partners should appreciate each other especially when expected role is performed. This ayes marriage conditions. On the contrary, if partners don't appreciate the role played by partners, their partner might not be happy to continue playing the role and as such there be conflict or misunderstanding. According to Role theory, sanctions in married life are the rewards or punishments which a partner administers to the other according to the degree to which the erring partner meets or fails to meet the expectations in their relationship. When tier cannot meet the expectations of the other partner he/she may apply negative behaviours like crying, quarrelling, nagging or withdrawal of affection or protest against the person. For instance, when the husband's role performance deviates from the wife's expectation, she may protest by applying negative behaviours like crying, quarreling, nagging withdrawal of affection among others. However, role theory model believes that if rid and wife play their roles well, there will be harmony in their marriage. This theory not recognize the importance of effective communication in marriage hence communication model theory is reviewed.

Marital Communication Theory Model

Marital communication theory model was developed by Bateson in 1956. The theory holds that inappropriate communication is essentially the problem in troubled marriages. Problem arises in marriage as a result of lack of clarity or confusion in communication exchange. According to this theory, communication is the vital issue in marriage. It is what gives expression to ones self esteem and is greatly influenced by the struggle for control and as such one is always communicating. Since it is impossible for one not to communicate. Spouses, he says should sieve their words during communication to avoid confusion or

provocation towards the partner, they should make their communication with each other clear and avoid use of negative communication as it brings about nagging, misunderstanding and quarrel. Positive communication is what adds to life in marriage and what cements the relationship of spouses, he asserted.

According to this theory, inappropriate communication is essentially a major problem in troubled marriages. Partners should try and avoid negative words during communication. Husband and wife should create more understanding and interaction in their relationship. Good communication in marriage is in two ways; while effective, respectful talking is essential in good communication, effective listening is also vital. Partners should endeavour to listen to each other while communication is in progress as this will create orderliness during communication. When partners do not have enough patience to listen to each other it could cause misunderstanding which would bring communication gap and disharmony in the relationship. Communication theory dwells on good communication which help to enhance good marital relationship but did not threat ways of adjusting in order to get on with marital challenges hence coping theory was introduce to fill the gap.

Adjustment Theory

Coping Theory of Lazarus 1991

In 1991, Lazarus delineated eight categories of coping strategies under his State Oriented theory. These are; confrontation coping, distancing coping, self controlling coping, seeking social support coping, accepting responsibility coping, escape/avoidance coping, painful problem solving coping and positive reappraisal coping.

Confrontation Coping - involves facing the problem squarely and solving it once and for all. When a problem is solved in this way the problem and stress that come with it disappear. Likewise when a perceived problem between spouses are tackled squarely it will clear off and disappear.

Distancing Coping - In distancing coping, individuals experiencing stress keep distance from the stressor, that, is avoid the source of the stress. Married public servants could keep late night or stay away from home because of the trouble they experience in their home. Some stay away from home to shy away from their responsibilities.

Self Controlling Coping - This is a way of maintaining some degree of discipline or restraint in handling situation or sensitive matters that can create problems. Married public servants could adopt this particular coping in order to maintain peace in their marriage.

Seeking Social Support Coping - This involves seeking for help or encouragement from others. Married public servants depending on the marital problems could seek help from other people to help restore peace in their marriage.

Accepting Responsibility - This is a state of accepting reality, accepting the truth. The moment one accepts the truth, the problem is solved. If married public servants accept their faults and try to make amends their marriage will become functional and stable.

Escape/Avoidance Coping - Individuals avoid source of stress in order to reduce stress. For example, one may decide to avoid someone who gives him stress by going to places that do not cause stress for him. In like manner, a married public servants might decide to stay away from home or avoid his/her spouse because of the trouble he/she receives from him/her. They could also decide to come late to avoid any discussion,

Painful Problem Solving Coping - This is an act of identifying and seeking solutions to problems. The first step is to identify the problems. Once problems are indentified, they are half solved. When one knows the source of his/her problem, he/she can easily solve it. If Married public servants can identify the source of their marital problems, their problems are half solved. It is easier to solve a problem when the cause of the problem is known than when it is not known.

Positive Reappraisal Coping - This means reassessment of one's initial perception of a situation. This strategy depends on one's ability to weigh a situation and ability to convert a negative appraisal into positive. Sometimes married public servants may perceive a situation negatively, but as time goes on, they may change their negative perception into positive ones during the process of re-appraisal.

Theoretical Studies

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors

There are series of risk factors intricately connected to marital dysfunction. Some of the risk factors are unsatisfied sexual need, lack of care of partners, infertility and adultery (Wienland, 2005). Some partners don't satisfy their partners sexually and as such they seek for satisfaction elsewhere leading to adultery. Some partners in the process of trying to get children in the marriage might have extra marital affair or take a second wife. When this occurs the first wife may become angry and create problem in the home. Supporting this Ibeh, Obidoa and Uzoechina (2013) listed variables like breach of trust, age at marriage, sexual deprivation, conflict in marital roles and finances, infertility and infidelity, in-laws and external influences as risk factors of marital dysfunction. Iheagwu (2001), Ugwuadu, Ugonna and Nwachukwu (2014) affirmed that betrayal of trust, conflicts in marital roles and influence of wrong models are among the variables that bring about marital dysfunction risk factors. There is an adage that says that evil communication corrupts good manners and where spouses keep bad friends that advise them wrongly and negatively, these would cause problems in their relationship. Some partners also neglect their duties and when this happens there could be abandonment of children, hunger in the family, hatred, nagging among others. This could cause unhealthy atmosphere in the family.

Ugwumadu et al (2014) opined that good communication is most needed in marital relationship. When members are unable to communicate their emotions there is tension,

suspicion, less feeling of closeness, less intimacy, among others. Studies by Onwuasoanya (2006), Oyedepo (2001), Awok (2003) and Meyer (2003) reported similarly that age at marriage, education level of couples, religious affiliation, income, type of marriage, contracts, fertility status and types of family contribute to marital dysfunction. In their various works they enumerated risk factors that can have direct bearing on marital dysfunction. These include types of communication existing between partners, cultural background, sexual incompatibility and problem of in-laws.

Oyedepo (2001) as well as Awok (2003) maintained that the unresolved issues in marriage are caused by marital expectations of partners. Before marriage, spouses have so many expectations which are not met it could bring contempt, nagging, unhappiness and dissatisfaction. Meyer (2011) discussed extensively probable risk factor of marital dysfunction as including finance, parenting issues, disciplining of children, home management issues, personality conflict and habits. Another probable risk factor of marital dysfunction identified in literature is immaturity in marriage (Ugumadu et al, 2014) immaturity brings a lot of heated argument and disagreement among husband and wife which can degenerate into bitterness and negative emotions, culminating into marital dysfunction. Individual differences with regard to partners values, interests, preferences where they exist and not handle with maturity may lead to marital dysfunction. Being in a haste to get married could be another factor. Some people especially female often get worried, because of their age, hardship or frustration, and so rush into marriage without making the necessary enquires and courtship. Marriage entered in this form most of the time has problems as some of the hidden characters, habits and individual differences begin to unfold and the partner begin to see faults in each other (Danso, 2008). Other factors identified that could cause marital dysfunction include; incompatibility among husband and wife, selfishness among partners and not laying the foundation of the marriage in Christ.

Having examined the probable risk factor of marital dysfunction, one could see that the challenging and problems that could bring about it exist in virtually all marriages because two distinct personalities man (husband) and woman (wife) from two difference environment have come together to unite and live together as one entity in love. What is therefore most important in marriage is the ability and necessary adjustment strategies which partners employ or need to employ to effectively handle the myriads of issues/factors that potentially could lead to marital dysfunction if not well handled.

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors Based on Gender

Although marriage is between a man and a woman, but their perspectives might differ. The reason is because they are two different beings. According to Ime (2006), the major causes of conflict among couples as perceived by husbands are sleeping outside the home without the knowledge of your spouse, poor housekeeping, disobedience, poor communication, lack of trust, poverty, unfaithfulness, lack of sexual satisfaction, hearing negative things about their spouse always and ingratitude. Also Unidiynde and Ugal (2006) discovered that the disparity in the levels between the male and female spouses often breeds this conflicts and the inability to handle it becomes a concomitant. But Dada and Idowu (2006) reported that both male and female perceive factors that enhance marital stability in the same way. This is also in line with Agbana and Odewumu (2001) in the factors likely to ensure marriage stability. They also added that in Nigerian culture male child is put on a slightly higher premium over female child and when couples give birth to female children only pressure may be put on the husband to marry another wife who will produce a son to perpetuate the family name.

Consequences of Marital Dysfunction

Marital dysfunction has become a thing of concern in the contemporary society and this is associated with myriads of consequences like waywardness among the children from

dysfunctioned marriage. Children who are raised in homes where conflicts and abuse abound will suffer from emotional complexes (Onah, 2014). Continuing, he opined that medically, children raised in such adverse environment suffer from debilitating stress, severe headaches, rashes and ulcers. Academically, they are always backward when compared with others who have stable upbringing (Agha and Obika, 2010). Such children are prone to joining bad gangs and become bad eggs.

According to Njoku (2013), research has shown that children raised in dysfunctioned and violence-ridden homes are likely to have low self esteem and during adolescence these children are at a higher risk of drug abuse, alcoholism and sexual promiscuity. The degeneration in morality which leads to increase in crime rate, violence, and unwanted behaviours in the society are the consequences of marital dysfunction. Most youths nowadays prefer quick means to success and short cut to wealth rather than hard work. They prefer easy life of comfort to daring new possibilities, youths who take risks in negative rather than positive values might fell victim of unwanted pregnancy, abortion and divorce (Onah, 2014). Obineli (2007) as well as Kanu (2006) opined that marital dissatisfaction could lead to emotional and psychological unavailability, lack of responsiveness as well as decrease in parent-child attachment. Studies have also found that marital dissatisfaction could have adverse effects on parents in playing their role in the family, family finances and general functioning of the family (Cason, 2003; Gandu; 2010; Jambo, 2006). Also oyinloye and Obasoro (2011) supported that where there is stress in marriage, the two partners might not perform well in their married life responsibilities, children could be abandoned, while the spouse would not care for each other, no happiness between them, have disorderliness in the family. This prolonged unhappiness might lead to high blood pressure, stroke, poverty, depression, and sleepless night, divorce and eventual separation/divorce (Kanu, 2006).

Anyanwu (2012) opined that studies of families of emotionally disturbed children have shown that unsatisfactory relationship between husband and wife could have detrimental effects on children. She asserted that sometimes a child from such a home is used as an escape goat. For example, such parents blame or even physically abuse the child in order to cover up their own difficulties and as such, the child may develop antisocial habits which could lead to deviant behaviours later in life. According to her, the cycle may be repeated if the child grows, marries and begin to have children and treats them in the same manner. This may account for the so called hereditary nature or inheritance of unaccepted behaviours such as rape, theft, murder among others. Supporting this Malum and Onwuanuma (2001) are of the opinion that home atmosphere that is full of stress, dislike, malice, boredom and desperation, unhappiness lead to delinquency of school children. She further said that among the number of ill-bred children in the society, about three quarters of those with unaccepted behaviours (like drug addicted, hemp-smoking, truants, dupers, and sex maniacs) are children from dysfunctional families. The children are affected by the environment they live in. Number of ill-bred children in the society, -about three quarters of those with unaccepted behaviours (like drug addicted, hemp-smoking, truants, dupers, and sex maniacs) are children from dysfunctional families. The children are affected by the environment they live in.

Additionally, Ifediora (2007) noted that a child's personality develops in continuous process of interaction with his family environment. In this regard, dysfunctional home may lead to poor academic performance and may affect a child's vocational choice, since nobody is interested to guide him/her. Moreover Kalan (2000) confirmed that children from dysfunctional families have lower academic performance, they are antisocial, less interested in academic work, more stress-prone and less happy. According to Kalan, children from dysfunctional families are mostly the ring leaders of indiscipline and disrespect in school.

Marital dysfunction brings about temporary decrease in personality and quality of life and puts some on a downward trajectory from which they might never fully recover from. It also brings about label on individuals from such family especially the children, people outside look at them with dismay. Pagan and Churchill (2012) opined that marital dysfunction consumes social and human capital. It substantially increases cost to the tax payer, while diminishing the paying portion of the society. According to them, it diminishes children's future competence in all five aspects of the society's major institutions such as family, school, religion, market place and government. They also asserted that marital dysfunction weakens the family and relationship between the children and parents resulting to destructive conflict management methods, diminished social competence and for children, the early loss of virginity as well as diminished sense of masculinity or femininity for young adults. It also results in more trouble with dating, and a decreased desire to have children. They summarized by saying that marital dysfunction leads to disruption in parent-child relationship, aggravates discord between spouses decrease emotional support, heightens economic hardship and leads to an increase in the number of negative life events. They enumerated other ways that marital dysfunction could have detrimental impact on individuals and religious practice. Such as diminishing the frequency of worship of God and recouring to Him in prayer.

The effect of marital dysfunction on children and spouses range from mild to severe, from seemingly small to observably significant, from long term to short term. The issue of interest is not only to identify the marital dysfunction risk factors and extent to which marital dysfunction exists among couples but also find solutions to help minimize its existence in families bearing in mind the terrible consequences it produces.

Types of Adjustment Strategies

The word adjustment focuses on understanding one's environment, understanding others, living in harmony with ourselves and with our neighbours. Life is a continuous process of adjustment. Each day people make countless adjustments, most of them apparently insignificant and many of them carried out more or less automatically without thought and often without awareness. Adjustment can be made in different areas of life such as marriage, career, education and so on depending on what one wants, to achieve in life or one's expectations. In marriage, when one's expectations in marriage are tampered with or they are not actualized, the solution is better adjustment strategies. According to Ogunboyade, Dada, Saidu and Oyetayo (2014), the process of adjustment entails gaining robust strategies to manage a stressful demands, therefore marital adjustment can be referred to as the process of managing challenges demands that arise in marital life. The demands may be financial, physiological, physical, social or emotional demands, these demands can also be conflicts which tax or exceed the person's resources. Etele (2014) opined that several cognitive appraisals processes are involved in determining the final adjusting strategies an individual uses in line with this, Waite (2006) opined that adjustment strategies utilize those objects that are valued by the individual. These objects include food, water, shelter, transportation, personal resources and emotions such as self esteem, self efficacy, love and affection that are thought to aid in resistance within dysfunctioning situation.

Cherry (2013) summed all these combinations to two types of adjustment strategies (problem focused adjustment and emotion focused). There are highlighted as follows;

Problem-Focused Adjustment Strategies - Problem focused-solving strategies include active problem solving strategies like seeking social support, making efforts to change a situation or behaviours of others, considering one's attitudes, and developing new skills and response towards the situation. According to Boss (2002) problem-focused adjustment efforts

are specifications taken by an individual in a situation to reduce the problem, for example, one taking actions like fully appraising the problem, expressing or inhibiting emotions beginning a new activity, asking for help or refusing to think about the situation at all. Further, Bur and Kleen (2004) identified two major types of problem focused adjustment by the nature of their functions.

1. Responding or taking actions that change the problem, for example negotiation in marriage.
2. activity, asking for help or refusing to think about the situation at all.

Further, Bur and Kleen (2004) identified two major types of problem focused adjustment by the nature of their functions.

1. Responding or taking actions that change the problem, for example negotiation in marriage.
2. Responding or taking actions that control the meaning of spouse marital problem before and after the problem starts, for example making comparism and ignoring.

Mckenry and Price (2000) from their own perspective stated that there are three types of problem-focused strategies which individuals can employ. These are

1. Direct action which include acquiring resources, learning new skills that would equip the individual to deal with the problem at hand.
2. Intrapsychic forms of adjustment which include reframing the problem, denial and detachment.
3. Becoming aware and controlling emotions produced by marital dysfunction. Example, using professional counselling, keeping diary, social support and use of alcohol.

In problem-focused adjustment strategies, people are aware of the experiences they cannot control, so they base on the ones they can control. Automatically, this fits closely with

Hassin, Uleman and Bargh (2005) who submitted that people can manage disturbances with their awareness.

Problem - Focused adjustment strategies involve talking about the situation, seeking help from others, engaging in interesting activities, making more positive decisions, giving up some situation or activities considered contributory to the problems and making plans to solve the problem (Cherry, 2013), Valender (2010) listed eight problem-focused strategies. These he termed reappraising or reconsidering the relevance of the situation; arguing about the cause of the problem; being patient while studying the course of the problem; reading up what needs to be done; calmly discussing the situation; putting off other matters; working harder and using self-initiated actions. On their part, Oldenhinkel, Hartman, Ferdinand, Verlulst and Ormel (2007) suggested that effortful control could be used as problem-focused strategies. They described effortful control as one's ability to hold oneself from displaying emotions.

Emotion-Focused Adjustment - Emotion-focused adjustment refers to the ways individuals alter their perceptions of their problems or marital problems. According to Neff and Broady (2013) emotion focused adjustments include efforts to manage emotional problems by controlling one's feelings, blaming oneself for the situation, wishing the problem would go away, denying, detaching or withdrawing oneself from the problem/situation. Item, Supple, Su, Rodaguaz, Cavanaugh and Hengstebach (2014) cited examples of emotion-focused adjustment styles as withdrawal, denial, optimistic comparisons, selective unattention, restricted expectations, being active or reactive, blaming oneself or somebody else.

Apart from problem focused and emotions focused adjustment; Ukavbe (2008) suggested that one can unconsciously make use of defense mechanism of Sigmund Freud as

means of reducing unpleasant feelings and negative thoughts. Based on this, he listed denial, regression, rationalization, intellectualization, use of selective drugs, music therapy and reappraisal as means of reducing dysfunctions or problems of marriage. According to Okoye in Akuezuilo (2012) prayer therapy reduces marital dysfunction to minimum level. Ekpo (2002) in line with this opined that marital dysfunction requires spiritual steps to include reading and knowing the Word of God, praying together, and forgiving each other as effective strategies in solving marital dysfunction.

Empirical Studies

Related Studies on Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors

Marital dysfunction has been a global problem that has attracted much attention and research effort which had yielded different findings.

Arowolo (2014) who-conducted a research titled, "Correlates of marital stability among married couples in Ise-Orun Local Government Area of Ekiti State". The purpose of the study was to find out the factors that aid marital stability. The design used for the study was descriptive survey design. Questionnaire was used to elicit information from the respondents. Three hypotheses guided the study. Purposive and random sampling techniques were used to select one hundred and fifty (150) married men and women from Ise-Orun Local Government Area of Ekiti State. The findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between marital stability and the level of communication among married couples. It was also found that there is significant relationship between the length of courtship and marital satisfaction and there is also significant relationship between sexual satisfaction and marital stability.

This study was carried out in Ekiti State not in Anambra State, It was a co-relational study that focused specifically on marital stability among couples. The present study on the contrary, focused specifically on marital dysfunction risk factors and coping strategies that public servants utilize. The present study used descriptive research design while this used co-

relational research design. The relationship between this study and the present study is that both of them are talking about marriage.

Another study was carried out in Anambra State by Umezurike in 2014 on counselling interventions for family security. The purpose of the study is to investigate areas of counselling intervention for family security. Survey design was adopted. The population involved all parents of schooling adolescents in Anambra State. The sample of the study was six hundred (600) parents of families in Anambra State; three hundred (300) females and three hundred (300) males. One hypothesis guided the study. The findings of the study showed that unstable income, lack of love and incompatibility between couples, childlessness, financial difficulties, communication gap among the family members, constitute threats to family functioning and security. Though this study was done in Anambra State, it was on family security and the people studied were parents of schooling adolescents in Anambra State but the present study is on marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants. The relationship between two of them is that they used the same design, both of them were done in Anambra State. They focused on marriage, while this work sought to the areas of counselling intervention, the present study is on risk factors of marital dysfunction and adjustment strategies used by public servants.

Ime (2006) carried out a study on counselling for family stability in Uyo. The design of the study was survey and the sample size was 220 subjects made up of, one hundred and ten (110) wives and one hundred and ten, (110) husbands respectively. The data obtained were analysed with the aid of descriptive statistics of frequency, percentage and ranking. The findings revealed that sleeping outside the home without spouse's knowledge, lack of trust, lack of sexual satisfaction were considered as the powerful indicators of marital conflicts while ingratitude, refusing to take care of the children's needs, poor management of feeding money were also identified as powerful indicators of marital conflicts.

This study called for counselling for family stability in Uyo State. The present study determined the risk factors of marital dysfunction and adjustment strategies among public servants. The relationship is that they use the same research design while the difference is that the study used mean, standard deviation and t-test while this study used descriptive statistics frequency, percentage and ranking as their statistical instrument.

Another study was done by Undiyaundeye and Ugal in (2006) at Obudu in Cross River State on effect of conflict management skills on marital stability among literate couples in Obudu Local Government Area. The purpose of this study is to identify the effect of conflict management on marital stability. Descriptive survey design was adopted. Three hypotheses guided the study. Sample size was fifty (50) respondents. The findings of study indicated that variations in educational attainment and marital expectations between the spouses affected their effectiveness in handling conflict situations in their marriages. The relationship between this study and the present study is that they used the same research design and are talking on marriage. While the present study used both research questions and hypotheses, this study used only hypotheses, also they studies were carried out in different location.

Oyafunke, Falola and Salau (2014) carried out a study on effect of marital instability on children in Abeokuta Metropolis in Ogun State. Descriptive research design was adopted for the study with a sample of two hundred and fifty-one (251) respondents, using stratified and systematic sampling techniques. Two hypotheses guided the study. The findings established that children who grow in a separated home are prone to drug addiction, armed robbery, commercial sex and other forms of criminal activities. Also children from marital instable home tend to become wayward, naughty, unruly and rebellious. The study further found out that children from single parents' family are more likely to be used for trafficking, rituals and house helps than the children who grow up in intact family. This study looked for

the effect of marital instability on children while the present study determined the marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State. Also this study was carried out in Ogun State while the present study took place in Anambra State. Although the design used was the same but the sampling techniques differs. While this study used stratified and systematic sampling techniques, the present study used proportionate stratified random sampling techniques.

Onongha (2014) investigated the impact of financial issues, unrealistic expectations and presence of children in Bonue families in Osun State. Descriptive survey design was employed. 200 couples were randomly selected from the Bonue's families in eight Local Government Areas in Cross-River State. Two valid and reliable instruments were used to measure financial issues, unrealistic expectations, the presence of children and spousal wellbeing. Bivariate regression and multiple regression statistics were used to analyse the data. The three independent variables jointly impacted significantly on spousal wellbeing. The variables also made relative significant impact on the criterion measure. Although the design used by the researcher is the same with the present study, but the variables investigated are different also the area where the research was done is different.

Another study titled self-esteem, gender, family communication style and parental neglect as a predictor of aggressive tendencies among secondary school adolescence was carried out by Imhonde in (2014). The study examined the role of self-esteem, gender, family communication style and parental neglect on aggressive tendencies among secondary school adolescents in Esan West Local Government Area of Edo State. A total of two hundred and forty (240) secondary school adolescents drawn from nine private and three public schools in Esan West Local Government Area participated in the study, made up of 140 males and 100 females. A questionnaire was used to collect the data, the questionnaire was comprised of five sections; namely demographic variables; family communication style; parental neglect;

self esteem and aggressive tendencies. The result of the multiple regression analysis revealed that only self-esteem independently predicted aggressive tendencies, family communication style. Gender and parental neglect were not found to independently predict aggressive tendencies. However, self-esteem, gender, family communication, parental neglect jointly predicted aggressive tendencies among secondary school adolescents. Although this study and the present one used the same method of data collection and research design but they investigated different variables. Moreover, the two studies were carried out in different locations. Also they use different statistical tools, while this study used multiple regression analysis, the present study used mean and t-test to analyze the data.

Modo, Nyarks and Ugbe (2014) investigated the influence of communication in the marital homes of secondary school teachers on their work performance in Akwa-Ibom State. One research question and one hypothesis guided the study. Ex-post factor research design was used in the study. 1056 respondents were selected using stratified random sampling technique from a population of 5,277 married teachers in public secondary schools in Akwa-Ibom State. The study was carried out using validated questionnaire patterned on a four point scale. The questionnaire was titled Marital Problems and Work Performance Questionnaire (MPWPQ). The data obtained were analysed using mean responses to answer the research question and t-test was used to test the hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. The result of the investigation showed that lack of communication in married homes influences secondary school teachers' work performance in Akwa-Ibom State. Although the statistical tools used in this study is the same with the present study, but their method of sampling and research design are difference. While the present study used ex-post-factor research design and simple random sampling technique. The present study used stratified random sampling techniques to draw the sample.

A similar study was carried out by Olagoke, Ogundokum and Oluranti in (2014). The study was titled emotional intelligence and marital communication as determinants of family well-being among young couples in Ibadan. Descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. 200 young couples were selected and used for the study. Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) by Hall and Dornheim (1998) were used to collect data. Multiple regression analysis and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used for data analysis. The result showed that the contribution of marital communication to the prediction of family well-being was high while emotional intelligence and marital communication jointly contributed to the prediction of family well-being. The present study and this study relate in the type of research design used, but they differ from the statistical instrument used and the location.

Onwuasonya and Okeke (2004) investigated the management, communication, social and sex-related skills which enhance marital stability. 150 couples (300 respondents) were drawn using stratified random sampling techniques. A descriptive survey design was adopted. The instrument used was researchers developed questionnaire. Two research questions and one hypothesis which was tested at 0.05 level of significant were used. Mean scores and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while t-test statistics was used to test the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. The result of the study showed management, communication, social and sex related skills enhance marital stability and that location does not influence the, couples' perception of skills which enhance marital stability. The relationship between this study and the present study is that they adopted the same research design, sampling technique and statistical instrument. They investigated different variables and they are also conducted in different locations.

Modo in (2009) conducted another research titled counselling and marriage conflict resolution; the list syndrome in Uyo metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State. A sample size of 185

respondents was purposely selected and used to collect data. Also three persons were interviewed. Purposive sampling technique was employed. The data were analyzed using frequency counts and simple percentages. The findings revealed among others that most of the conflicts experienced by couples in Uyo metropolis stemmed from the difficulty providing the required items. Also it was observed that many young men are not interested in discussing marriage issues for fear of the list from the brides' family. Although these studies used the same type of research design, sampling technique and the statistical tools used by them were not done in the same state.

Dada, Ajayi, Adetutu and Boda (2014) carried out a study on sources of marital stress experienced by married people as perceived by lecturers in Adeyemi College of Education in Ondo State. The respondents were stratified into different strata of gender, age group, educational qualification and number of children. Simple random sampling technique was used for selecting 20 respondents from each of the five schools in the college, i.e. School of Education, Arts and Social Sciences, Sciences, Vocational Technology and Languages. Altogether, 42 males and 85 females making a total of 127 respondents constituted the sample of the study. Sources of Marital Stress Experienced by Married People Questionnaire (SMSEMPQ) was used to collect data, t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to test the hypotheses. The result showed a significant differences. Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) statistics was used as a post-hoc test to determine the groups that contributed to the significant difference. All null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The findings showed that the major source of marital stress is child rearing with a mean score of 12.88 and ranked 1st while least source is social with a mean score of 11.68 and ranked 8th. Also the findings showed that there were no significant differences existing based on age, educational qualification or number of children. While this study used simple random sampling techniques, the present study used proportionate random sampling. The present

study differ in analyzing tools. This study used t-test and analysis of variance, the present study used mean and t-test. Also they were not done in the same area. The relationship is that the studies were based on marital problems.

Studies on Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors based on Gender

So many research works pointed out that perceptions differ based on gender. Some of the studies are; Dada and Idowu (2006) conducted a study on the factors enhancing marital stability as perceived by educated spouses in Ilorin Metropolis. Simple random sampling technique was adopted to select 300 respondents. The research design was descriptive survey. Five research questions and four hypotheses guided the study. Researchers' constructed questionnaire titled "Factors Enhancing Marital Stability Questionnaire (FEMSQ) was used to collect data. The result showed that social factor was the major influence for marital stability. Aspects of this factors include effective communication between spouses and love which promotes longevity and stability at home while the least influencing factor was finance. The t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistics were used to test the hypotheses. The findings showed that there were no significant difference among the respondents in their perception based on gender, religious affiliation, educational level and length of marriage years.

Although the design of this study is the same with the design of the present study. This study was on marital stability but the present study was on marital dysfunction risk factor and adjustment strategies. Also this study was done in Ilorin Metropolis while the present study was in Anambra State. This study made use of t-test and analysis of variance while the present study used mean and standard deviation and t-test.

Another research conducted by Undyandeye and Ugal in (2006), on the effects of conflict management skills on marital stability among literate couples in Obudu Local Government Area of Cross River. Simple random sampling technique was used to select 50

respondents from the whole population. Three hypotheses were tested at 0.05 degree. The instrument used was Marital Adjustment Scale (MAS). The data gathered was analysed by means of t-test and chi-square for the three hypotheses. The findings showed that couples who were equipped with marital management skills had better way of handling problems in marriage situation also educational level of couples affect the ability of couples to handle marital problems. Meaning that the disparity in levels of education between the male and female couples often breeds conflicts which they are unable to manage.

This study sought to find the effect of management skills (adjustment strategies) on marital stability among couples in Obudu Local Government Area while the present study sought to determine the risk factors of marital dysfunction among public servants in Anambra State. This work differ from the present study in the method of sampling technique and data analysis.

Related Studies on Marital Adjustment Strategies based on Gender

A study by Ime (2006) on counselling for family stability in University of Uyo. Twenty one (21) factors were identified as the major causes of family conflicts. Two hundred and ten (210) (110 wives and 100 husbands) were used as responds from different churches in Uyo Metropolis. Mean age for the wives was 30 years while that of husbands was 38 years. Two research questions guided the study. The design of the study was survey design and descriptive statistics of frequency, percentage and ranking were used to analyse the data. The result shows that the ten major causes of conflict as perceived by the husbands were sleeping outside the home without the knowledge of your spouse, poor house keeping, disobedience, poor communication, lack of trust, poverty, unfaithfulness and lack of sexual satisfaction. Those of wives were sleeping outside the home without information, lack of trust, poor communication, Simple random sampling was used to select 20 respondents from

each school. Altogether were 100 lecturers consisting of 44 male and 56 females who participated in the study. Four hypotheses guided the study and were tested using t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The result showed that the most coping strategy which was ranked first by the respondents was "over looking my spouse mistake" with a mean score of 3.36 while the least used coping strategy was "taking humour as a way out" with a mean score of 2.91 and ranked 15th. The study also showed that there was no significant difference in the report of lecturers based on gender while there was difference based on age, educational qualification and number of children. The study relates to the present study because it looked at coping strategies couples use to cope with marital stress which is related to adjustment strategies that the present study looked into. However, it differed from the present study because the present study used mean and t-test as statistical tools, while this study used frequency, percentage, ranking, t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) as statistical tools. Moreover, the studies were done in different locations.

Benegergee and Basu (2014) conducted a study on personality factors, attachment styles and coping strategies in couples with good and poor marital quality. Data was collected from 90 couples from initial screening. Finally 20 couples with poor marital quality were selected based on scores of marital quality scale. The tools used for screening were marital Quality Scale and General Health Questionnaire other tools were Neo-five factor inventory and coping check list. Analysis revealed that the husbands with poor marital quality had higher neuroticism, less problem focused coping, acceptance and greater denial than those with good marital quality. Wives with poor marital quality were significantly different from the wives with good marital quality in terms of religious coping and social support. The researchers recommended that the findings be utilized for advising marital distressed couples to enhance their coping resources and utilize their attachment potentials for the furtherance of

equality of their married life. The present study and this study differ by design while this one is experimental, the present study is survey design.

Summary of the Reviewed Literature

The review examined the following concepts that are in the title of the work namely; marital dysfunction risk factors, public servants and adjustment strategies. These were explained under the conceptual framework. Under the theoretical framework, three theories; System Theory, Role model theory by Mangus in 1957. Marital communication model by Batson 1956 and Adjustment theory by Lazarus 1991 were reviewed to establish the anchors and bases for the research work. In the theoretical studies, marital dysfunction risk factors were highlighted from the perspective of various researchers; consequences of marital dysfunction were discussed and two major categories of adjustment strategies (problems focused and emotional focused adjustment strategies) were explained. Related empirical studies on marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies as well as gender dimensions of these variables were reviewed. Majority of the studies reviewed revealed the risk factors of marital dysfunction and negative influence of lack of good communication between married people in enhancing dysfunctional behaviours and disharmony in the home. Also revealed in the literature are the importance of marriage counsellors and other strategies which help spouses achieve marital cohesiveness.

However, virtually all these works were done outside Anambra State except that of Umezurike (2014) which was done in Anambra State but in different area. Based on this the researcher decided to fill the gap. Also, none of the studies were on health and tertiary institution staff. Hence she embarked on the study, marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies among public servants in Anambra State.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter presents the procedure used in this study. It is discussed under research design, area of the study, population of the study, sample and sampling technique, validation of the instrument, reliability of the instrument, method of data collection and method of data analysis.

Research Design

The researcher adopted descriptive survey research design. According to Nworgu (2006), descriptive survey design is survey research which aims at collecting data on, and describing in a systematic manner, the characteristic feature or facts about a given population. Also Akuezilo and Agu (2015) submitted that descriptive survey research design is one in which a group of people or items are studied by collecting and analyzing data from only few people or items considered to be representative of the entire group. This design was considered for this study because it focused on obtaining information and analyzing data from a group of people considered as representative of public servants in Anambra State to determine the marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State.

Area of the Study

The study was carried out in Anambra State. Anambra State is located in the South-East of Nigeria with Awka as its capital. The people of the state speak Igbo as their indigenous language. The inhabitants are traders, farmers and public servants. Anambra State is bounded with Kogi on the north, Imo and Abia States in the south, Enugu State in the east and Delta State in the west.

The choice of Anambra State for this study was based on the fact that it has five tertiary educational institutions and 36 general hospitals with lot of married public servants. These categories of public servants were chosen because the nature of their work sometimes takes them away from home both day and night. Some attend workshops and conferences while others do shift and night duties with the result that a high degree of strains and stress seem to exist in their marriages. Also marriage institution in Anambra State is highly valued and regarded as long life relationship between a man and a woman with very strong ties. Moreover, the terrain and the population are familiar and accessible to the researcher, because the researcher hails from Anambra State, schooled in Anambra State and currently working in Anambra State.

Population of the Study

The population for this study is 8,129 public servants in five tertiary institutions in Anambra State. The institutions involved were Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Uli, Federal College of Education (Technical) Umunze, Nwafor Orizu College of Education Nsugbe and all the doctors and nurses in the government hospitals in Anambra State.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample for this study was 814 respondents (764 from Tertiary Institutions and 50 from Government Health Institutions) selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique. 10% was drawn from each stratum based on institution. The detail are as follows; Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka 367, Chukwuemeka Odimegwu Ojukwu University Uli 304, Federal College of Education Technical Umunze 81, Nwafor Orizu College of Education Nsugbe 60 and Government health institutions 50 making a total of 814 married public servants. See appendix C p. 89 for details written here.

Instrument for Data Collection

Two instruments were used for the study namely; Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors Inventory (MDRI) and Marital Dysfunction Adjustment Inventory (MDAI).

Instrument A – Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors Inventory (MDRI)

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors Inventory was constructed by Omoluabi in 1994 and was adapted by the researcher. It contains 40 items designed to determine the risk factors of marital dysfunction among public servants in Anambra State. The items were grouped into five clusters with eight items in each cluster, for example, Cluster A contains items on lack of intimacy, Cluster B contains items on poor attitudes, Cluster C contained items on irresponsibilities, Cluster D contains items on financial tussle/issues while Cluster E contains items on challenges/difficulties. The items were patterned on a 5 point scale of very severe effect (5points), severe effect (4 points), moderate effect (3 points), mild effect (2 points) and slightly mild effect (1 point). The respondents were asked to choose any of the options that describes experiences or problems they have in their marriage.

Instrument B – Marital Dysfunction Adjustment Inventory (MDAI)

Marital dysfunction adjustment inventory (MDAI) was constructed by the researcher based on the reviewed literature. It was made up of 25 items which are different adjustment/coping strategies. The items were grouped into five clusters. The clusters contains five items namely; Active Cognitive, Emotion Focused, Accepting Responsibility, Active Behavioural Solving and Avoidance Strategies. Each item was patterned on a five points rating scale of Always Use (5 points), Most Often Use (4 points), Sometimes Use (3 point), Rarely Use (2 points) and Never Use (1 point). The respondents were asked to indicate the coping strategies they use by ticking (✓) against the options on each item (see Appendix 1).

Validation of the Instrument

The content validation of the instruments were done by the three experts from Guidance and Counselling Department, another in Measurement and Evaluation from Faculty of Education and third from Science Education Department all in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. These experts were given the instruments; MDRI and MDAI with the research topic, the purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses. The validators were requested to scrutinize the items in terms of their appropriateness and adequacy to elicit required information for the research questions and hypotheses and also to check the language clarity for the participants. The experts restructured some of the sentences in the instruments example flirting by spouse was corrected to flirting around by spouse, spouse not knowing when his/her spouse is sick or weak was separated to spouse not knowing when one is sick and spouse not knowing when one is weak. Poor communication among spouses was changed to poor communication between spouse. Finally, the corrections made by the experts were duly effected and reflected in the final copies of the questionnaire produced which were presented at the proposal stage of the work.

Reliability of the Instruments

Cronbach Alpha statistics was employed to obtain the internal consistency of the two instruments namely MDRI and MDAI. These instruments were administered to 40 married people from different institutions outside the study area. The instruments were scored cluster by cluster. The values obtained from the clusters in instrument one are lack of intimacy – 0.89, poor attitudes/habits – 0.86, irresponsibility - 0.84, financial tussles/issues – 0.88 and challenges/difficulties – 0.85.

Instrument 2: Marital adjustment strategies was also designed in five clusters. The test items were scores cluster by cluster. The internal consistency of each cluster was obtained using Cronbach Alpha with the following values; Active cognitive strategies – 0.68,

Emotional focused strategy – 0.76, Accepting responsibility – 0.79, Active behavioural solving strategies – 0.66 and avoidance strategy – 0.70.

Method of Data Collection

The researcher obtained permission from the authorities of the institutions involve before the instruments MDRI and MDASI were administered. The two instruments were attached together meaning that they were administered at the same time. Two research assistants were used in each school making them eight research assistants and they were briefed on the modality of the exercise. The institutions were visited one after the other to administer the instrument. The researcher and the research assistants administered 814 copies questionnaire and 814 were well completed and use for the analysis. This exercise lasted for one month (4 weeks).

Method of Data Analysis

The researcher employed range of scores, frequency and percentages to answer the research questions while ANOVA and Chi Square were used to test the hypotheses as 0.05 level of significance. Range of scores were used to answer the research question 1- 5 while frequency and percentages were used to answer research question 6. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 while Chi square was used to test hypotheses 4, 5 and 6. All hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

The base line for the first instrument is scores ranging from 8 – 24.5 and below are low risk factor while scores from 25.40 and above are high risk factor. Regarding the second instrument from 40% and above is used while below 40% is not used.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the data collected from the field for this study were analysed and the summaries were presented in tables to highlight the findings. The presentation was sequentially done starting with the answers to the research questions and then to the testing of hypotheses.

Research Question 1

What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on lack of intimacy as a marital dysfunction risk factor?

Table 1: Range of scores on lack of intimacy as a marital dysfunction risk factor

Range of scores	N	%	Remarks
8-24.5	140	17.2	No risk factor
25-40	674	82.8	Risk factor

Table 1 shows that 674(82.8%) of the respondents with the scores ranging from 25 to 40 indicated that lack of intimacy is a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants, while 140(17.2%) of the respondents whose score ranged between 8 and 24.5 indicated that lack of intimacy is not a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in Anambra State.

Research Question 2

What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on poor attitude/habits as a marital dysfunction risk factor?

Table 2: Range of scores on poor attitude/habits as a marital dysfunction risk factor

Range of scores	N	%	Remarks
8-24.5	169	20.8	No risk factor
25-40	645	79.2	Risk factor

Table 2 shows that 645 (79.2%) of the respondents with the scores ranging from 25 to 40 indicated that poor attitude/habits is a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in Anambra State, while 169(20.8%) of the respondents whose score ranged between 8 and 24.5 indicated that poor attitude/habits is not a marital dysfunction risk factor of the public servants.

Research Question 3

What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on irresponsibility as a marital dysfunction risk factor?

Table 3: Range of scores on irresponsibility as a marital dysfunction risk factor

Range of scores	N	%	Remarks
8-24.5	210	25.8	No risk factor
25-40	604	74.2	Risk factor

Table 3 reveals that 604(74.2%) of the respondents with scores ranging from 25 to 40 indicated that irresponsibility is a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in Anambra State, while 210(25.8%) of the respondents whose scores ranged between 8 and 24.5 indicated that irresponsibility is not a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in the State.

Research Question 4

What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on financial tussle/issues as a marital dysfunction risk factor?

Table 4: Range of scores on financial tussle/issues as a marital dysfunction risk factor

Range of scores	N	%	Remarks
8-24.5	290	35.6	No risk factor
25-40	524	64.4	Risk factor

Table 4 reveals that 524(64.4%) of the respondents whose scores ranged from 25 to 40 indicated that financial tussle/issues is a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in Anambra State, while 290(35.6%) of the respondents whose scores ranged between 8 and 24.5 indicated that financial tussle/issues is not a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in the State.

Research Question 5

What are the scores of public servants in Anambra State on challenges/difficulties as a marital dysfunction risk factor?

Table 5: Range of scores on challenges/difficulties as a marital dysfunction risk factor

Range of scores	N	%	Remarks
8-24.5	249	30.6	No risk factor
25-40	565	69.4	Risk factor

Table 5 reveals that 565(69.4%) of the respondents whose scores ranged from 25 to 40 indicated that challenges/difficulties is a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in Anambra State, while 249(30.6%) of the respondents whose scores ranged between 8 and 24.5 indicated that challenges/difficulties is not a marital dysfunction risk factor of public servants in the State.

Research Question 6: What are the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State?

Table 6: Frequency and percentages on the strategies used by public servants in Anambra State

Marital Adjustment Strategies	Being Used		Not Being Used	
	N	%	N	%
Active Cognitive	649	79.7	165	20.3
Emotion Focused	684	84.0	130	16.0
Accepting Responsibility	788	96.8	26	3.2
Active Behavioural Solving	757	93.0	57	7.0
Avoidance	376	46.2	438	53.8

The table above indicates that 788(96.8%) of the married public servants specified that the predominantly used marital adjustment strategy is accepting responsibility where 757(93.0%), 684(84.0%) and 649(79.7%) of them pointed out that Active behavioural, Emotion focused and Active cognitive are the predominantly used marital adjustment strategies of married public servants in Anambra State. On the other hand, 438 (53.8) indicated that Avoidance strategy is not a predominantly used marital adjustment strategy.

Testing the Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference on the mean responses of male and female public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors

Table 7: ANOVA on the mean responses of male and female public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors

		SS	df	MS	F	P-value	Remark
Lack of Intimacy	Between Groups	471.355	1	471.355	9.935	.002	S
	Within Groups	38526.245	812	47.446			
	Total	38997.600	813				
Poor Attitude/Habits	Between Groups	106.954	1	106.954	2.313	.129	NS
	Within Groups	37542.621	812	46.235			
	Total	37649.574	813				
Irresponsibility	Between Groups	122.335	1	122.335	2.464	.117	NS
	Within Groups	40321.665	812	49.657			
	Total	40444.000	813				
Financial Tussle/Issues	Between Groups	3.654	1	3.654	.088	.767	NS
	Within Groups	33773.152	812	41.593			
	Total	33776.806	813				
Challenges/Difficulties	Between Groups	244.119	1	244.119	5.117	.024	S
	Within Groups	38741.337	812	47.711			
	Total	38985.456	813				

Table 7 above reveals that at 0.05 level of significance 1df numerator and 812df denominator, the calculated $F(9.935)$ and $F(5.117)$ for lack of intimacy and challenges/difficulties has P-values of 0.002 and 0.024 which are less than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. This shows that the mean responses of male and female public servants in Anambra State differed significantly across the two groups. More so, the table further revealed that $F(2.313)$, $F(2.464)$ and $F(0.088)$ for poor attitude/habits, irresponsibility and financial tussle/issues has a P-values of 0.129, 0.117, 0.767 which are greater than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. This shows that the mean responses of male and female public servants in Anambra State did not differ significantly across the three groups.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference on the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors based on their profession

Table 8: ANOVA on the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors based on their professions

		SS	df	MS	F	Pvalue	Remark
Lack of Intimacy	Between Groups	361.934	3	120.645	2.529	.056	NS
	Within Groups	38635.667	810	47.698			
	Total	38997.600	813				
Poor Attitude/Habits	Between Groups	734.717	3	244.906	5.374	.001	S
	Within Groups	36914.857	810	45.574			
	Total	37649.574	813				
Irresponsibility	Between Groups	870.122	3	290.041	5.937	.001	S
	Within Groups	39573.878	810	48.857			
	Total	40444.000	813				
Financial Tussle/Issues	Between Groups	263.284	3	87.761	2.121	.096	NS
	Within Groups	33513.522	810	41.375			
	Total	33776.806	813				
Challenges/Difficulties	Between Groups	1450.469	3	483.490	10.434	.000	S
	Within Groups	37534.987	810	46.339			
	Total	38985.456	813				

Table 8 above reveals that at 0.05 level of significance 3df numerator and 810df denominator, the calculated F (5.374) and F (5.937) for Poor Attitude/Habits, irresponsibility and Challenges/Difficulties has P-values of 0.001, 0.01 and 0.000 which are less than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. This shows that the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State differed significantly across the three groups. More so, the table further revealed that F (2.529) and F (0.96) lack of intimacy and financial tussle/issues has a P-values of 0.056 and 0.096 which are greater than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. This shows that the mean responses of the public servants in Anambra State did not differ significantly across the three groups based on their professions.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference on the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors based on their place of work

Table 9: ANOVA on the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State on marital dysfunction risk factors based on their place of work

		SS	df	MS	F	P.value	Remark
Lack of Intimacy	Between Groups	616.559	2	308.279	6.514	.002	S
	Within Groups	38381.042	81	47.326			
	Total	38997.600	83				
Poor Attitude/Habits	Between Groups	719.963	2	359.981	7.905	.000	S
	Within Groups	36929.612	81	45.536			
	Total	37649.574	83				
Irresponsibility	Between Groups	827.254	2	413.627	8.467	.000	S
	Within Groups	39616.746	81	48.849			
	Total	40444.000	83				
Financial Tussle/Issues	Between Groups	257.265	2	128.632	3.112	.045	S
	Within Groups	33519.541	81	41.331			
	Total	33776.806	83				
Challenges/Difficulties	Between Groups	1459.746	2	729.873	15.774	.000	S
	Within Groups	37525.710	81	46.271			
	Total	38985.456	83				

Table 9 above reveals that at 0.05 level of significance 2df numerator and 811df denominator, the calculated F (6.514, 7.905, 8.467, 3.112 and 15.774) have P-values which are less than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. This shows that the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State differed significantly across the five groups based on their place of work.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by male and female public servants in Anambra State

Table 10: Chi square on the frequency and percentages of the strategies used by male (M) and female (F) public servants in Anambra State

Marital Adjustment Strategies	M(N=346)		F(N=468)		N	df	X ²	Pvalue	Remark
	Used	Not used	Used	Not used					
Active Cognitive	281	65	368	100	814	1	0.820	0.379	NS
Emotion Focused	216	130	468	0	814	1	209.25	0.001	S
Accepting Responsibility	346	0	442	26	814	1	19.856	0.001	S
Active Behavioural Solving	340	6	417	51	814	1	25.650	0.001	S
Avoidance	115	231	261	207	814	1	40.634	0.001	S
Total	1298	432	1956	384	814	5	296.21	0.383	NS

P>0.05

Table 10 shows that at 0.05 level of significance 5df, the calculated X²296.218 have P-value of 0.383 which is greater than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by male and female public servants in Anambra State.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their profession.

Table 11: Chi square on the frequency and percentages of the strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their profession.

Marital Adjustment Strategies	Nurse (37)		MD (13)		TS (321)		NTS(443)		N	Df	X ²	Pvalue	Remark
	Used	Not used	used	Not used	used	Not used	Used	Not used					
Active Cognitive	37	0	13	0	287	34	649	165	814	3	55.029	0.000	S
Emotion Focused	36	1	13	0	321	0	314	129	814	3	125.408	0.000	S
Accepting Responsibility	37	0	13	0	321	0	417	26	814	3	22.493	0.000	S
Active Behavioural Solving	37	0	13	0	321	0	386	57	814	3	51.330	0.000	S
Avoidance	9	28	12	1	196	125	159	284	814	3	65.698	0.000	S
Total	156	29	64	1	1446	159	1925	661		15	319.958	0.000	S

P<0.05

Table 11 shows that at 0.05 level of significance 15df, the calculated X^2 319.958 have Pvalue of 0.00 which is less than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their professions.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their place of work.

Table 12: Chi square on the frequency and percentages of the strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their place of work

Marital Adjustment Strategies	Hospital (50)		University (623)		COE (141)		N	df	X ²	Pvalue	Remark
	Used	Not used	used	Not used	used	Not used					
Active Cognitive Emotion Focused	50	0	489	134	110	31	814	2	13.560	0.001	S
Accepting Responsibility	49	1	543	80	92	49	814	2	48.879	0.000	S
Active Behavioural Solving	50	0	597	26	141	0	814	2	8.234	0.016	S
Avoidance	50	0	566	57	141	0	814	2	18.791	0.000	S
Total	21	29	299	324	56	85	814	2	3.546	0.170	S
	220	30	2494	621	540	165		10	93.01	0.187	NS

P>0.05

Table 12 shows that at 0.05 level of significance 10df, the calculated X²93.01 have P-value of 0.187 which is greater than the stipulated 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their place of work.

Summary of the Findings

Findings from the tables were summarized as follows;

1. Majority (82.8) of the public servants in Anambra State indicated that lack of intimacy is a marital dysfunction risk factor.
2. Most of the public servants in Anambra State revealed that poor attitude/habits is a marital dysfunction risk factor.
3. Most of the public servants in Anambra State 604 (74.2%) showed that irresponsibility is a marital dysfunction risk factor.

4. A large number of public servants in Anambra State 524 (64.4%) indicated that financial tussle/issues is a marital dysfunction risk factor.
5. A large number of public servants in Anambra State 565 (69.4%) indicated that challenges/difficulties is a marital dysfunction risk factor.
6. Majority of the married public servants in Anambra State indicated that their predominately used adjustment strategy is accepting responsibility.
7. There is no significant difference on the mean response of male and female married public servants in Anambra State on their marital dysfunction risk factor.
8. There is no significant difference on the mean responses of public servants in Anambra State on their marital dysfunction risk factors based on their profession.
9. There is a significant difference on the mean responses of married public servants in Anambra State on their marital dysfunction risk factors based on their place of work.
10. There is no significant difference on the marital adjustment strategies used by male and female public servants in Anambra State.
11. There is a significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by public servants in Anambra State based on their profession.
12. There is no significant difference on the marital dysfunction adjustment strategies used by married public servants in Anambra State based on their place of work.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with discussion of findings, their educational and counselling implications, recommendations, limitations and suggestions for further studies.

Discussion of the Findings

The discussion of findings is organized under the following subheadings;

1. Marital dysfunction risk factors of public servants
2. Adjustment strategies used by public servants
3. Marital dysfunction risk factor and adjustment strategies used by public servants based on gender.

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors of Public Servants

The result of the study revealed that greater number of public servants (82.8%) in tertiary educational and health institutions have lack of intimacy as a marital dysfunction risk factor. This implies that many of the spouses have low intimate relationship in their marriage. This could be as a result of not coming home from their work place, not caring for each other and not having sexual intercourse as well as not spending time together, among others. The implication of low intimacy in marriage is that dysfunction exists and this can manifest as divorce or other forms of separation. In marriage love, care and trust are the keywords in preventing dysfunction and promoting stability. This findings is in line with the findings of Arowolo (2014) who revealed that there is a relationship between sexual satisfaction and marital stability. The result also supported the findings of Umezulike and Olagoke (2014), Ogundokum and Olaranti (2014) who portrayed that communication gap, lack of love and incompatibility between couples are among the major factors that threaten

family security. The study also indicated that a large number of married public servants (79.2%) poor attitude or poor habits as their marital dysfunction risk factors. This means that a great number of public servants have some poor habits which affects their marriage. Some of such undesirable attitudes which spouses form that could affect their marriage adversely include such things as taking much alcohol, preference to eating outside, inability to control emotions, frequent nagging, going to native doctors to make charms or juju etc. These habits could affect the marriage and bring dysfunction in the marriage. This findings supports the findings of Meyer (2011) who revealed that undesirable and poor habits are among the variables that contribute to marital dysfunction risk factors.

The study also revealed that most married public servants (74.2%) in Anambra State regard irresponsibility as a marital dysfunction risk factor. This implies that most married public servants in Anambra State exhibit irresponsible behaviours which may include not caring for their children and spouse not cooking for their husband, using essential feeding money for other personal needs and perhaps extravagant expenditures etc. These irresponsible behaviours emanate, perhaps from the fact that the poor economic conditions prevailing in the country cause spouses to rush out of home on daily basis in pursuit of money hardly available in the home for each other to share, communication and love thereby threatening family wellbeing and security. This is in agreement with that of Dada, Ajayi, Adetutu and Bola (2014) who asserted firmly that stress in marital relationships lead to irresponsible behaviours that can affect child wellbeing.

The study also discovered financial tussle/issues as risk factor of marital dysfunction among married public servants in Anambra State. Majority of the public servants (64.4%) experience financial tussle/issues. Financial issues could stem from present economic depression in the country, or, unemployment, over demanding of money by a spouse or even

as a result of lack of agreement before embarking on a project; spouse not disclosing their income etc. These issues can affect the smooth running of the family and might also disturb the happiness and unity in the family. When such problems continue, it might lead to divorce, illness or separation. Again, this findings supports the findings of Unadiyawude and Ugi (2006) and Onongha (2014) who stated variously that unrealistic expectation and financial tussle affect family wellbeing.

Challenges/difficulties are also among dysfunction of risk factors of public servants in Anambra State. According to the findings, 69.4% of married public servants experience challenges/difficulties such as infertility, unemployment, interference from inlaws, spouse being sick always, spouse belonging to different religious demoniation etc. challenges and difficulties come from various sources such as difference in family background of the marriage partners, difference in the level of education and socioeconomic status of the couple. These affect family wellbeing and may even lead to divorce. Marriage without children could end up at anytime. Also where one of the spouse is sick for a long time, the happiness will not be complete. Some times marital problems and challenges could affect the job performance and other activities of the spouse. Similar views were expressed by Ugi and Onongha (2014) who stated that unrealist expectation and poor management and infertility contribute significantly to marital stress and disharmony.

The result of present study indicated no significant difference in the mean response of public servants on marital dysfunction based on their profession. The reason for this could be that both health workers and tertiary educational workers experience the variables in the same way. For example, some doctors are married to nurses while some tertiary educational institution workers also marry within their work place and since they work in the same environment the experince in this regard might be the same. Although some might marry

someone from another place of work, maybe those of them from another place of work are few and their mean response made no difference. Also it could be because both the husband and his wife might be facing similar challenges or hold similar views concerning their work and so do not perceive the difference.

The result also indicated that there is significant difference in the marital dysfunction risk factor mean response of married public servants in the tertiary educational institution and health institution based on their place of work. This implies that the place of work is a factor in their marital dysfunction risk factor. This reason could be because they are in different environment, have different work schedule and activities. It could also be because those of them in the health institution have tight work schedule than those of them in the tertiary educational institution.

Adjustment Strategies used by Public Servants

The result of the study indicated that married public servants made use of identified adjustment strategies in the following descending order; accepting responsibility (96.8%), active behavioural problem solving (93.0%), emotion focused (84.0%), active cognitive (79.7%), and avoidance (46.2%). This implies that public servants predominately made use of accepting responsibility, making amends when necessary, accepting their mistake, forgiving one another willingly and praying for God to help them improve in their weaknesses. This seems to be a good strategy which enhances family wellbeing and stability. When someone makes a mistake and accepts that he made a mistake, the matter will be closed where spouses choose to forgive each other willingly. Consequently, their marriage will be a harmonious one and there will be open communication. This finding is in line with the finding of Arowolo (2014) who found a significant relationship between marital stability and the level of communication among married couples.

Furthermore, it was also discovered that (93.0%) of married public servants made use of active behavioural problem solving strategy which include holding frank discussion among spouse, talking with friends, on the matter, talking to counsellors, clergies, family elders and other professionals about the problem, make plans of action and following it and also engaging in exercise. Again, this is a good strategy which agrees with Beinerge and Basu finding that asserted that social support is one of the best strategies. It also agrees with Ugwumadu et al (2014) finding that posited that good communication enhances family wellbeing.

The present result also shows active emotion focused strategy (84.0%) as one of the strategies being use by married public servants. Emotion focused strategies involves such things as: blaming oneself, crying, applying patience, withdrawal and seeking overdo attention/petting. This implies that they apparently not consistent in the adjustment strategies they use. Since it is based on how they feel at a point in time, it should be noted that while use of good adjustment strategies improve the situation, the inappropriate ones could also hinder or spoil what has been improved upon. This result is not in line with the findings of Oldenhinkel et al (2007) who suggested that effort should be made to hold oneself from displaying emotions because use of wrong emotions could worsen the problem. For example, where one is blaming himself or is often crying, a lot of things could go wrong and the atmosphere of the family will be unconducive. Another issue is that if a spouse is seeking overdue attention or withdrawing from his/her partner, there would be bottled up emotions and undisclosed issues which might cause problem in future.

Additionally, it was found that (76.7%) of public servant make use of active cognitive adjustment strategies to cope with their marital problems. This implies for example, that they reflect and appraise their actions, they think, take things at a time, prepare for the worst, draw

from past experience, before taking further actions. All these strategies depend on how and when they are used. If they are used in appropriate ways that would bring positive results but if misused, negative results will manifest. For example someone who prepared for the worse can fight his/her partner or do something bad because he/she is no more bordered about the consequences of his/her action. On the other hand one could get him/herself equipped to face the consequences so that things would not take him/her unawares.

It was also discovered that (46.2%) of the married public servants make use of avoidance adjustment strategies which involved such things as: keeping feeling, avoiding people, trying to reduce tension by taking drugs, trying to reduce tension by drinking alcohol, keeping silence etc. These are inappropriate strategies that could heighten marital dysfunction risk factors. It is obvious that the public servants are using both appropriate and inappropriate strategies which could be dangerous. It implies that they are trying to build and at the same time destroying. This might be a major factor precipitating marital dysfunction risk factor among the public servants. Also public servants seems to be ignorant of the appropriate and inappropriate adjustment strategies. They appear unable to distinguish between positive and negative strategies thus requiring that something be done to save their marriage. They need awareness workshops by counsellor assisted by government to educate them on dangers of high risk of marital dysfunction factors that are prevalent among them. They also need to be taught the differences between appropriate and inappropriate strategies.

Again the result also shows that there is no significant difference in the mean response of the public servants on adjustment strategies they use based on place of work but there is significant difference based on profession. The significant difference could be explained based on the type of work schedule and the time schedule: the respondents have. It could be because of the people they interact with, their education levels or the experiences they have in

their workplaces. This finding is in line with that of Ime (2006) which stated that there is significant difference on family stability based on educational qualification of spouses. Also Awok (2003) opines that the level of education of spouses affects their marital harmony and adjustments.

Marital Dysfunction Risk Factor and Adjustment Strategies of Public Servants based on Gender

The finding reveals that there is significant gender differences in the mean responses marital dysfunction risk factor of married public servants on the clusters of intimacy and challenges and difficulties faced but no gender differences in their mean response on poor attitude/habits, irresponsibility and financial tussle/issues. These findings could be explained by the societal expectations and cultural demands that demand women to be under the males and to take care of the home with children and whereas males are generally pardoned where they get involved in extra marital relationships, females are sent back to their homes, if they do that. Furthermore when the master of the home demands attention from the wife and the attention is not given to him, there will be problem. Also, the effect of office pressure sometime makes husband and wife tensed up when they come back home and so they begin to quarrel among themselves. This finding agrees with the findings of Dada and Idowu (2006) who noticed that there is no significant difference in the mean response of males and females on finance, religious affiliation as the factors that enhances marital stability. Although in his finding love and effective communication have significant difference on the mean response of male and female on the factors that enhances marital stability.

The present result shows that there is no significant difference in the adjustment strategies used by male and female public servants to cope with their marital dysfunction risk factors. This could be explained by the fact that both genders use appropriate and inappropriate

strategies to cope with the risk factor. Looking carefully at table 10, it is noticed that majority of women made use of active emotion strategies which is apparently inappropriate. For example, where female spouse cries always and also tries to be withdrawn and be on her own, there will be no effective communication in the marriage and this could heighten marital dysfunction risk factor.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the marital dysfunction risk factors of married public servants in Anambra State are diverse and include; lack of intimacy, poor attitude/habits, irresponsibility, financial tussle/issues and challenges and difficulties. As for adjustment strategies they are aware and make use of both appropriate and inappropriate. This implies that they are incapable of distinguishing between positive and negative strategies, so as to be able to use any positive ones.

Implications of the Study

The findings of this study which determined marital dysfunction risk factors and adjustment strategies used by public servants who work in tertiary educational and health institutions in Anambra State have implications for families in general and public servants in particular. Some of the implications include the following;

The diverse marital dysfunction risk factor existing in homes of married public servants in Anambra State suggests that instability is real threat to many families in the State. Where spouses have no intimacy, each partner pushing his/her own gender; where they have financial tussles and issues; are irresponsible ie not playing their roles to each other and to the children, then there is real danger. The family will break off in due course or at best the spouses would live together as co-tenants but not as husband and wife they

were meant to be. When there is no harmony in the home, the performance of the spouses in their offices will be adversely affected due to poor concentration, negative thoughts and feelings etc. In the home, the children would be neglected and this might cause them to become deviants. The spouses themselves could develop all kinds of psychosomatic diseases such as high blood pressure, diabetes, ulcer, depression etc. In some cases, spouses may even abandon the family without any communication about his or her whereabouts.

Another implication in the aspect of adjustment strategy is that by using inappropriate strategies in addition to appropriate ones, spouses unwillingly compound and aggravate dysfunctions in their homes which precipitate instability and eventual breakup of the home.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, these recommendations were made;

1. Marriage counsellors should carry out enlightenment programmes for public servants in particular through radio, television talks and panel discussions by experts they should educate these public servants on the dimension of dysfunctional risk factors that threaten their marriage cohesion and stability; which they need to address urgently by learning and using appropriate adjustment strategies so as to curtail dysfunction in their homes.
2. During such programmes and through workshop these counsellors can go further to help public servants understand the adverse consequences which marital dysfunctional behaviours among couples generate for children and society at large. Consequently, they can encourage them to play their fatherhood and motherhood

roles responsibly so as to produce godly children and not delinquents who become nuisance to the general public and heartache to parents in future.

3. Other stakeholders in education as well as in the life of the citizens, such as the church, the government and media can all be involved in this campaign against dysfunction and instilled supports the school through the P.T.A to educate parents on the importance of preventing dysfunctional attitude amongst spouses and using appropriate adjustment strategies at least for the sake of the children – the future generation.

Limitation of the Study

The scope of this study covered only tertiary educational and government health institutions in Anambra State thereby constraining wide generalization of the findings to other tertiary educational and government health institutions in Nigeria.

Suggestions for Further Studies

1. The study could be replicated in other states of the federation with a different category of public servants than the one used in the present study.
2. Comparison of the marital dysfunction risk factors among teaching staff and non-teaching staff in federal tertiary institutions in Anambra State.
3. Prevalent factors that trigger marital dysfunction among workers of state university.

REFERENCES

- Aamodt, M. G. (2007). *Industrial/organizational psychology; An applied approach*. Fifth Edition. Thomson Higher Education. USA.
- Abudul, A. H. & Yusuf, A. (2013). *Strategies for resolution of marital crisis towards achievement of marital stability in Nigeria*. A paper presented at the 4th Annual National Conference of Economics.
- Agbana, E. O. & Odewumi, S. O. (2001). Married people and stability at home. *Nigerian Journal of Gender and Development* 2(1); 149 - 153.
- Agha, N. E. & Obika, J. A. (2003). Marital stability as perceived by educated spouses in Onitsha urban of Anambra State. *Unpublished undergraduate project in the Department of Educational Foundations. University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- Akuezuilo, E. O. & Agu, N. (2015). *Research and Statistics in Education and Social Sciences; Methods and Application*. Nuel Centi Publishers, Nimo.
- Akuezuilo, J. A. (2012). Level of stress and adjustment patterns among working mothers in tertiary institutions in Anambra State. *Unpublished master degree project in the Department of Guidance and Counselling, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka*.
- Alzheimer Society (2015). *Risk factors*.
- Amalu, M. N. (2004). Marital stress and professional role performance effectiveness of human academic in tertiary institutions in Cross River State, Nigeria. Unpublished dissertation, *Faculty of Education, University of Calabar*.
- Anyanwu, J. & Ofodile, C. (2012). *Marriage and family: Issues, problems and counselling strategies*. Snapp Press Ltd, Snaap Drive, Independence Layout.
- Arowolo, D. O. (2014). Correlates of marital stability among married couples in Ise-Oru Local Government Area of Ekiti State. *The Counsellor* 33(1).
- Awok, I. K. (2003). *Marriage expectation, marriage encounters*. Lectures given at St Charles Parish Obudu Cross River State.
- Bateson, G. D., Jackson, J. Haley & Weakland (1956). Toward a theory of schizophrenia. *Behavioural Science*. 1; 25-264.
- Benerjee, S. & Basu, J. (2014). Personality factors, attachment styles and coping strategies in couples with good and poor marital quality. *Personality Psychology* 1:59-67.
- Boss, P. (2002). *Family stress managements*. Thousand Oaks CA: Cage.
- Bur, W. R. & Kleen, S. R. (2004). *Reexamining family stress: New theory and research* Thousand Oaks, CA: Cage.

- Cason, H. (2003). Common annoyances: A psychological study of every-day aversions and irritations. *Psychological Monographs*, 40(2), 182 – 188.
- Charlin, R. (2005). American marriage in the early twenty first century. *The Future of Children*, 15(2), 33-35.
- Cherry, D. B. (2013). Stress and coping with ill or disabled children: Application of model to pediatric therapy. *Physical and Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics* (2), 11-32.
- Corey, G. (2001). *The art of integrative counselling*. Belmont: Cengage Learning.
- D'Souza, U. (2011). Marital disharmony. Available at <http://Ezinneariclescoml> 17000 17 (Sept. 25, 2013).
- Dada, M. F. & Idowu, A. I. (2006), Factors enhancing marital stability as perceived by educated spouses in Ilorin Metropolis. *The Counsellor; Journal of Counselling Association of Nigeria*; 22; 127 - 139.
- Dada, M. F. & Idowu, A. I. (2006). Factors enhancing marital stability as perceived by educated spouses in Ilorin Metropolis. *The Counsellor*; 22.
- Dada, M. F., Ajayi, M. R., Adetutu, M. R., & Boda, M. O. (2014). Sources of marital stress experienced by married people as perceived by lecturers of Adeyemi College of Education. *The Counsellor* 33(1) 84 - 94.
- Demarco, R. (2000). Stress, coping and family health in V.H. Rice (ed). *Handbook of Stress, Coping and Health* (295-332). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denso, (2008). Marital instability; Causes and consequences on children. *Journal of Family* 2(1): 37-51.
- Egwim, G. & Iwuama, B. C. (2014). Preparing person with special needs for social and psychological adjustment through counselling. *The Counsellor* 33(1).
- Ekei, J. C. (2009). *Way to a happy marriage (marrying with sense of purpose)*. Afab-Anieh Nig. Ltd. NO 3 Okoyeukwu Close off Okpuno Road, Near INEC Office Awka, Nigeria.
- Etele, A. V. (2013). *Distress signs and adjustment strategies by married people*. (Unpublished master degree thesis) in the Department of Guidance and Counselling, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- Ezeh, C. A. (2002). *Marital problems and their social consequences in Nigeria*. The International Rate of Social Work Profession. Enugu: Otuson Press.
- Pagan, P. F. & Churchil, A. (2012). *The effects of divorce on children*. Retrieved June 2016.
- Felie, L. (2010). *Family stress management*. Lagos ABIC Publishers.

- Federal Republic of Nigeria, FRN (2011). *The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria* with amendment 2011. Retrieved April, 2017.
- Gandu, C. (2010). Effect of global economic meltdown on women in microenterprise and their health: The way forward. *Journal of Women in Colleges of Education* 14(2) 15-19.
- George, I. N. (2002). *Marital role adjustment and satisfaction among Ibibio workers in Akwa Ibom State*. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Faculty of Education, University of Calabar.
- Hassin, R., Uleman, J. S. & Bargh, J. A. (2005). *The new unconscious*. New York Oxford University Press.
- Helma, H. M., Supple, A. T., Rodriguez, Y., Cavanaugh, A. M. & Hengstebeck, D. (2014). Economic pressure, cultural adaptation stress and marital quality among Mexican origin couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*; 28(1) 77 - 87.
- Hinshow, (2006). The concept of adjustment and problems of norms. *A Psychological Review*. 49; 248-292. <http://www.alieydog.com/glossary/definition.php?term=Adjustment#ixzz4A9rXlccdw> (2016).
- Ibe, U. O. & Obidoa, M. A. & Uzoechina, G. O. (2013). Marital disharmony: Causes and resolution strategies among couples in Enugu State. *Research on Humanities Social Sciences*. Retrieved from www.iiste.org.
- Idialu, E.E. (2003). A study of management of crisis associated with family finances in Edo State. *Nigeria Journal of Contemporary Issues*. 1(2) 62-82.
- Ifediorah, P. U. (2007). Causes and effects of marital instability on children as perceived by married parents in Ekwusigo Local Government in Anambra State. (Unpublished 1st degree project) in the Department of Guidance and Counselling, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- Iffih & Ezeah (2004). *Sociology of the family*. John and Jacob Classic Publishers Limited; Enugu Nigeria.
- Iheagwu, A. W. (2001). *Educational theory*. Calabar. Calabar:Ushie Publishing Company.
- Ime, N. G. (2006). Counselling .for family stability. *The Counsellor; Journal of Counselling Association of Nigeria* 22; 99 - 117.
- Imhande, H. O. (2014). Self-esteem, gender, family communication styles and parental neglect as a predictor of aggressive tendencies among secondary school adolescents. *The Counsellor* 33(2); 151-162.
- Jambo, T. A. (2006). Relationship between marital role perception and selected marital adjustment indices among women in River State. *The Counsellor*, 22, 58-67.

- Junaidu, B. M. & Aminu, M. M. (2015). Public service in Nigeria - An over view of functions and code of conduct. *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research*. 3(1)61-69.
- Kalan, (2000). *Gender, roles and adjustment; A multidimensional approach*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Kanu, C. M. (2006). Distress signals in marriage and family life: Implication for guidance and counselling. *The Counsellor*. 22, 27-40.
- Kaya, B. I., Karadeniz, G. & Aktas, A. (2016). Relationship between marital adjustment, satisfaction and coping with stress; Stage of family cycle. www.academia.edu/893003. retrieved 13th August, 2016.
- Kolo, I. A. (2010). Key strategies for family stability counselling. *The Counsellor*. 26:1-6.
- Lazarus, R. S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Malun, C. & Onwuanuma, P. (2001). Marriage and home making in Nigeria. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 33; 553 - 574.
- Manugus, (2008). Role theory and marriage counselling. *Social Forces* 35; 200-209.
- Mckenry, P. C. & Price, S. J. (2000). *Families and change: Coping with stressful event and transitions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Meyer, C. (2011). *Causes of marital discord*. Available at <http://www.ezinnearticlescomm/1170017> (Sept. 25, 2013).
- Modo, F. N. (2009). Counselling and marriage conflict resolution; The list syndrome in Uyo metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria. Conference Proceeding; An official publication of the *Counselling Association of Nigeria (CASSON)* 49-57.
- Modo, F. N., Nyarks, I. A. & Ugbe, L. U. (2014). Communication in marital homes and work performance among secondary school teachers in Akwa-Ibom State; Implication for counselling. *The Counsellor* 33(1) 115-116.
- Neff, L. & Broady, F. (2011). Stress reliance in early marriage: Can practice make perfect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 22: 1-18. Doi:10.1037/190023809.
- Njoku, (2013). Marital instability and its impact on women and children. *Demography* 26(1); 37-52.
- Nutter, L. (2010). Family separation; causes, consequences and solution. *Journal of Family Psychology* 28(1) 72-89.

- Nwosu, N. G. (2012). Perception of school counsellors on strategies for sustaining family stability. *Proceeding of 37th Annual Conference of the Counselling Association of Nigeria*.
- O'Rourke, N. & Cappeliz, P. (2003). Intra-couple variability in marital aggrandizement idealization and satisfaction with enduring relationship. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 8(15), 12.
- Obineli, S. A (2007). The role of gender in marital aggression from the life-span: Perspective of young adults in tertiary institutions. *UNIZIK Orient Journal of Educational*, 118-128.
- Odemelam, A., Chima, I, Justin, J., Ikpeazu, V. & Igboanusi, V. (2003). *Reviewing the Joy of Marriage*, Owerri Joe Nwankpa Publisher.
- Ogulade, O. O., Ogundokun, M. A, & Oluranti, S. (2014). Emotional intelligence and marital communication as determinant of family well-being among young couples perspective in guidance and counselling (Ed). Adegoke and Aluede.
- Ogunboyede, M. O., Dada, M. F., Saide, R. F & Oyetetayo, M. O. (2014). Coping strategies for marital stress as reported by lecturers of Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo, Nigeria. *The Counsellor* 33(1) 71-83.
- Ogunboyede, M. O., Dada, M. F., Saidu, R. F. & Oyetayo, M. O. (2014). Coping strategies for marital stress as reported by lecturers of Adeyemi College of Education. *The Counsellor* 33(1) 71-83.
- Okeke, B. A. (2010). *Essentials of special education*. Afro-Orbis Publication Ltd.
- Oldenhinkel, A. J., Hartman, C., Ferdinand, R. F., Verhulst, F. C. & Ormel, J. (2007). Effort control as mediator of the association between negative emotionality and adults mental health problems. *Development and Psychopathology* 19: 529-539.
- Olyinlaye, O. & Obasoro, K. (2011). Guidance and counselling for emotional stability and improved learning outcomes and primary school pupils in Nigeria. *Journal of General Studies* 2(1) 132-138.
- Omojugh, O. (2008). *Fostering retirement adjustment through entrepreneurial training*. A paper presented at International Conference Organized by Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka,
- Onah, H. (2014). Crisis in marital love and family life in our world today. *Beyond Frontiers*. To the end of the earth. Human experiences and the crisis of faith. *A publication of Spiritan International School of Ideology* (Sist). Ahakwu, Enugu State Nigeria. June 2014 - June 2015.
- Oniye, P. C. (2000). *A cross ethnic study of stress level support system and adjustment strategies among widows in Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in the Department of Educational Foundations, Guidance and Counselling. University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

- Onongha, G. I. (2014). Impact of financial issues, unrealistic expectations and the presence of children on spousal well being in Bonu families. *The Counsellor* 33(2) 189-203.
- Onwuasoanya, P. N. (2006). Impact of premarital guidance on undergraduate attitude towards family stability. *The Counsellor* 22:75-81.
- Onwuasonya, P. N. & Okeke, N. U. (). Family counselling for management skills and marital stability among literate couples in Awka South Local Government Area of Anambra State. *Conference Proceedings for 34th Annual National Conference of the Counselling Association of Nigeria (CASSON)* 42-48.
- Oraegbunam, N. M. (2000). Psychological and social bases of occupational stress among civil servants in Anambra State. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Educational Foundations, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.*
- Ordu, S. N. & Igburde, M. A. (2006). Family stability of working class and non-working class women in Port Hartcourt Local Government of Rivers: Implication for counselling. *The Counsellor*, 22: 61-11.
- Orji, C. C. (2013). Family instability: Causes and consequences. *Doubleglist.com*. retrieved Sept 2015.
- Oyafunke, C. O., Falola, H. O. & Salau, O. P. (2014). Effect of marital instability on children in Abeokuta Metropolis. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 2(3) 68-77.
- Oyedepo, F. (2001). *Marriage covenant*. Kaduna: Dominion Books.
- Rosenberg, M. B. (2005). *Non-violent communication. A language of life*. California; Puddle Dancer.
- Same Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act (2014). www.lownigeria.com
- Sangeeta, B. & Jayant, B. (2014). Personality factors, attachment styles and coping strategies in couples with good and poor marital quality. *Psychology Study* 2014:59; (1) 59-67.
- Slatcher, R. & Trentacosta, C. (2012). Influence of parents and child negative emotionality on young children's everyday behaviours emotions. *American Psychological Association*. 12(5) 932-942.
- Taiwo, R. E., Okon, M.O. & Eze, J. E. (2006). Marital adjustment as an index of family stability. *The Counsellor* 22:120-126.
- The Holy Bible King James Version. *Thamos Nelson Bibles*. www.thomasnelsos.com
- Ugwuadu, E. C., Ugonna, C. E. & Nwachukwu, L. (2014). Resolution of family and marriage conflicts using some counselling strategies. A. Adegoke and Oyaziwo A. (ed.). *Perspective in Guidance and Counselling*. 149 - 156.

- Ukavbe, J. (2009). Stressors, level of stress and coping strategies among academic staff of University of Edo State, *unpublished masters degree thesis in the Department of Guidance and Counselling, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.*
- Umezuike, R. O. & Njumog, M. N. (2014). Counselling intervention for family security in anambra State. Adeyoke, A. A. and Oyaziwo (Ed.). *Perspective in Guidance and Counselling.*
- Unadiyawnde, F. A. & Ugai, D. B. (2006). The effect of conflict management skills on marital stability among literate couples in Obudu L.G.A. *Journal of Counselling Association of Nigeria.* 22; 91-98.
- Undiyaundeye, F. A. & Ugai, D. B. (2006). The effect of conflict management skills on marital stability among literate couples in Obudu Local Governemnt Area. *The Counsellor; Journal of Counselling Association of Nigeria* 22; 91 - 98.
- Valendar, G. O. (2010). Daily hassle and coping strategies of dual-earned and non-dual-earner women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 11, 359-366.
- Waite, L. J. (2006). Does marriage matter? *Demography* 32: 483-507.
- WHO (2004). Risk factors. Retrieved from www.WHO.int/topic/riskfactors/en/. Retrieved 19th July, 2018
- Wieland, F. (2005). Marriage, family relationship. Chicago: Kevan Books.
- Wilson, B. (2002). *Aging and retirements.* Boston, Stack Pole Book.
- Write, J. (1990). Problem solving appraisal and coping effort in distressed and non distressed couples. *Journal of Marital Therapy* 16(1) 89 - 97.
- Yahaya, I. A., Esere, M.O., Ogurisami, J. U. & Oniye, A. O. (2008). *Marriage, sex and family counselling.* Ilorin, Unilorin Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Dept. of Guidance and Counselling,
Faculty of Education,
Nnarndi Azikiwe University,
Awka.
13th January, 2017.

Dear Sir/Ma,

The researcher is a Ph.D. student from the above named institution. She is conducting a research on Marital Dysfunction Risk Factors and Adjustment Strategies among Married Public Servants in Anambra State. Please sincerely provide the information requested from you, I assure you that the information given will be kept secret. Please don't write your name.

Yours faithfully,

Akuezuiilo Juliana

(The Researcher)

MARITAL DYSFUNCTION RISK FACTORS INVENTORY

Instruction: Please you are requested to respond to the following questionnaire items. Your responses should reflect or express your experiences in marriage. All the information provided will be treated with the confidentiality it requires.

Thanks for your time and co-operation.

SECTION A

Personal Data

1. **Occupation of profession** (please indicate by ticking ✓)

Nurse Doctor Teaching Staff Non-Teaching

2. **Place of work:** Hospital University College of Education

3. **Gender:** Male Female

Instruction A: Marital Dysfunction Risk Factor Inventory

In the table below is a list of issues, problems and experiences which spouses encounter in marriage. The issues are potential sources of misunderstanding or conflict, quarrel and fighting in marriage numbered 1 – 40. Please indicate the extent to which each of them has disturbed the peace of your marriage and your peace of mind by ticking (✓) against options in front of each issues numbered

1 - Slightly Mild Effect

2 - Mild Effect

3 - Moderate Effect

4 - Severe Effect

5 - Very Severe Effect

S/N	Actions of spouses which disturb the peace of family/marriage	Slightly Mild Effect 1	Mild Effect 2	Moderate Effect 3	Severe Effect 4	Very Severe Effect 5
A	Lack of Intimacy					
1.	Sleeping outside without informing the spouse					
2.	Not spending time together with spouse					
3.	Spouse not yielding to advice					
4.	Lack of trust among spouse					
5.	Poor communication between spouse					
6.	Lack of love among spouse					
7.	Lack of sexual satisfaction Between spouse					
8.	Not caring when spouse is sick					
B	Poor Attitude/Habit					
9.	Flirting around by spouse					
10.	Consuming too much alcohol by spouse					
11.	Prefer to eat outside always by spouse					
12.	Accepting to wrong counsels by friends against spouse					
13.	Inability to control emotions by spouse					
14.	Being selfish by spouse					
15.	Engaging in making charms or "juju" by spouse					
16.	Frequent nagging by spouse					
C	Irresponsibility					
17.	Inability to take care of the children's needs by spouse					
18.	Spouse not cooking for her husband					

19.	Spouse not providing enough money for feedings					
20.	Spouse being lazy					
21.	Spouse using feeding money for other needs					
22.	Living above income by spouse					
23.	Being too pompous by spouse					
24.	Spending extravagantly by spouse					
D	Financial Tussle/Issues					
25.	Lack of agreement before embarking on project by spouse					
26.	Spouse not having enough money to maintain the family					
27.	Not disclosing income or expenditure to spouse					
28.	Giving money to relations without the consent of the spouse					
29.	Over spending on selfish interest by spouse					
30.	Refusing spouse from helping relations					
31.	Over demanding of money by spouse					
32.	Poor management of income by spouse					
E	Challenges/Difficulties					
33.	Infertility among spouse					
34.	Unemployment among spouse					
35.	Spouse living with many relations					
36.	Interference from in-laws					
37.	Power tussle among spouse					
38.	Spouse being sick frequently					
39.	Unforgiveness among spouse					
40.	Spouse belonging to different religion					

Instrument B: Marital Dysfunction Adjustment Strategies Inventory (MDAI)

Below are some of the ways to cope and adjust to marital problems and experiences which married people encounter. Please indicate by choosing from the options provided in the column to indicate how often you use any of the methods to adjust or cope with marital issues. The options are;

5. Always Use (AU)
4. Most often Use (MU)
3. Sometimes Use (SU)
2. Rarely Use (RU)
1. Never Use (NU)

S/N	Measures of Adjustment Strategies	Always Use 5	Most Often Use 4	Sometimes Use 3	Rarely Use 2	Never use 1
A	Active Cognitive					
1.	Having a rethink on the problem or reappraise					
2.	Taking things a one at a time					
3.	Prepared for the worst					
4.	Drawing from past experience					
5.	Speaking to myself (self thought)					
B	Active Emotion Focused					
6.	Blaming oneself					
7.	Crying					
8.	Applying patience					
9.	Withdrawal					

10	Seeking overdo attention/petting attention					
C	Accepting Responsibility					
11	Accepting one's self					
12.	Trying to make amends					
13.	Praying for God's help for improvement in the areas of weakness					
14.	Forgives one another willingly					
15.	Receives forgiveness willingly					
D	Active Behavioural Problem Solving Strategy					
16.	Holding frank discussion with spouse/family					
17.	Talk with friends about the problem					
18.	Talk to professionals e.g counsellors, clergy, family elders					
19.	Make plan of action and follows it					
20.	Try to reduce tension by exercising more					
E	Avoidance Strategies					
21	Keep my feeling to myself					
22	Avoid been with people					
23.	Try to reduce tension by drinking more alcohol					
24.	Try to reduce tension by taking more tranquilizing drugs					
25.	Keeping silence					

APPENDIX B: POPULATION OF THE STUDY

S/N	Institutions	Population	Gender		Sample Size	Sample Size	
			Male	Female		Male	Female
1	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, (NAU)	3, 671	1721	1950	367	172	195
2	Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, (COOU), Uli	2562	1092	1470	256	109	147
3	Federal College of Education (Technical) Umuze (COET)	805	340	465	81	34	47
4	Nwafor Orizu College of Education, Nsugbe (NOCE)	398	210	388	60	21	39
5	Government Health Institutions (GHI) (Doctors & Nurses	493	93	400	50	10	40
	Total	8129	3456	4673	814	346	468

Source: Personnel Office of all the Tertiary Institutions, 2015

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SIZE OF THE STUDY

S/N	Institutions	Sample	Gender	
			Male	Female
1	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, (NAU)	367	172	195
2	Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, (COOU), Uli	256	109	147
3	Federal College of Education (Technical) Umunze (COET)	81	34	47
4	Nwafor Orizu College of Education, Nsugbe (NOCE)	60	21	39
5	Government Health Institutions (GHI) (Doctors & Nurses	50	10	40
	Total	814	346	468

APPENDIX D: STATISTICAL OUTPUT

DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18
 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41
 Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60
 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES
 STRATEGIES MARITALDYSFUNCTION
 /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.

Descriptives

		Notes
Output Created		15-MAY-2017 07:35:21
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	793
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.
Syntax		DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES STRATEGIES MARITALDYSFUNCTION /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.09

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.87	1.324

NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.60	1.305
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	793	1	5	3.76	1.247
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.92	1.283
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.75	1.235
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.95	1.276
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.88	1.257
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	793	1	5	3.66	1.438
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.85	1.411
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	793	1	5	3.63	1.326
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.42	1.462
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.83	1.356
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.55	1.195
BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.66	1.220
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.97	1.440
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.62	1.284

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.72	1.315
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	793	1	5	3.77	1.321

SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	793	1	5	3.55	1.242
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	793	1	5	3.59	1.238
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	793	1	5	3.55	1.343
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.71	1.275
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.55	1.331
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.68	1.306
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.58	1.242
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	793	1	5	3.28	1.232
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.18	1.285
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.04	1.309
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.43	1.327
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM HELPING RELATIONS	793	1	5	3.39	1.293

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
OVER DEMANDING OF MONEY BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.42	1.227
POOR MANAGEEMENT OF INCOME BY SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.50	1.299
INFERTILITY AMONG SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.60	1.465
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.39	1.417
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY RELATIONS	793	1	5	3.44	1.326
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-LAWS	793	1	5	3.72	1.265
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.59	1.339
SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	793	1	5	3.11	1.357
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.84	1.378
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	793	1	5	3.34	1.479
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	793	1	5	3.65	1.525
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	793	1	5	3.55	1.435

SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	793	1	5	2.76	1.271
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	793	1	5	3.50	1.503
MAKING USE OF PRAYER THERAPY	793	1	5	3.55	1.538
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND RESPONSES TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION	793	1	5	3.41	1.443
HAVING A RETHINK OR REAPPRAISAL	793	1	5	3.27	1.382
DENIAL OF RIGHT	793	1	5	2.36	1.349

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE MECHANISM	793	1	5	2.48	1.272
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	793	1	5	3.53	1.467
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	793	1	5	3.52	1.577
QUARRELING ALWAYS	793	1	5	3.68	1.380
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	793	1	5	3.59	1.409
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	793	1	5	3.30	1.371
APPLYING PATIENCE	793	1	5	3.43	1.522
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	793	1	5	3.14	1.470
MAKING USE OF FAMILY COUNSELORS	793	1	5	2.91	1.368
LEARNING COMMUNICATION SKILLS	793	1	5	3.23	1.456
MAINTAINING OPEN COMMUNICATION	793	1	5	3.18	1.460
MAKING USE OF OTHER PEOPLES COUNSEL	793	1	5	2.59	1.263
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-LAW AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	793	1	5	2.36	1.347
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	793	1	5	3.59	1.389
CRYING ALWAYS	793	1	5	2.33	1.339
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	793	1	5	3.35	1.387
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	793	1	5	3.51	1.576
LACK OF INTIMACY HABITS	793	1.00	5.00	3.8227	.85797
IRRESPONSIBLE	793	1.00	5.00	3.6969	.84317
ISSUES	793	1.00	5.00	3.6408	.87727
CHALLENGES	793	1.00	5.00	3.3531	.80392
STRATEGIES	793	1.00	4.44	3.5039	.85855
MARITAL DYSFUNCTION	793	1.03	5.00	3.1915	.55802
Valid N (listwise)	793			3.6035	.69144

DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet2.

DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18
Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41

Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60
 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES
 STRATEGIES MARITALDYSFUNCTION
 /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.

Descriptives

Notes

Output Created		15-MAY-2017 07:36:36
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\TERTIARY INSTITUTION.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
Missing Value Handling	N of Rows in Working Data File	743
	Definition of Missing Cases Used	User defined missing values are treated as missing. All non-missing data are used.
Syntax		DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES STRATEGIES MARITALDYSFUNCTION /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.13

[DataSet2] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\TERTIARY INSTITUTION.sav

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.87	1.317
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.59	1.310
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	743	1	5	3.75	1.252
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.90	1.285
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.73	1.246

LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.93	1.283
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.86	1.260
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	743	1	5	3.65	1.450
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.87	1.396
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	743	1	5	3.63	1.322
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.40	1.469
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.84	1.348
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.57	1.190
BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.66	1.232
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.94	1.457
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.61	1.291

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.70	1.326
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	743	1	5	3.73	1.338
SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	743	1	5	3.55	1.240
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	743	1	5	3.60	1.235
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	743	1	5	3.54	1.350
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.70	1.284
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.57	1.329
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.69	1.305
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.58	1.251
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	743	1	5	3.32	1.219
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.17	1.291
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.06	1.311
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.43	1.331
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM HELPING RELATIONS	743	1	5	3.39	1.294

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
OVER DEMANDING OF MONEY BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.42	1.233
POOR MANAGEMENT OF INCOME BY SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.50	1.308
INFERTILITY AMONG SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.58	1.476
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.37	1.420
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY RELATIONS	743	1	5	3.45	1.329
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-LAWS	743	1	5	3.73	1.258
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.58	1.352
SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	743	1	5	3.13	1.359
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.80	1.397
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	743	1	5	3.31	1.481
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	743	1	5	3.62	1.533
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	743	1	5	3.55	1.436
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	743	1	5	2.78	1.271
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	743	1	5	3.50	1.493
MAKING USE OF PRAYER TERAPEY	743	1	5	3.55	1.537
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND RESPONSSSE TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION	743	1	5	3.41	1.444
HAVING A RETHINK OR REAPPRAISAL	743	1	5	3.25	1.388
DENIAL OF RIGHT	743	1	5	2.38	1.346

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE MECHANISM	743	1	5	2.50	1.277
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	743	1	5	3.52	1.466
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	743	1	5	3.51	1.571
QUARRELING ALWAYS	743	1	5	3.66	1.379
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	743	1	5	3.56	1.408
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	743	1	5	3.28	1.384
APPLYING PATIENCE	743	1	5	3.40	1.525
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	743	1	5	3.13	1.479
MAKING USE OF FAMILY COUNSELORS	743	1	5	2.90	1.373

LEARNING COMMUNICATION SKILLS	743	1	5	3.19	1.459
MAINTAINING OPEN COMMUNICATION	743	1	5	3.16	1.459
MAKING USE OF OTHER PEOPLES COUNSEL	743	1	5	2.61	1.267
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-LAW AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	743	1	5	2.37	1.343
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	743	1	5	3.56	1.386
CRYING ALWAYS	743	1	5	2.34	1.337
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	743	1	5	3.35	1.392
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	743	1	5	3.47	1.582
LACKINTIMACY HABITS	743	1.00	5.00	3.8293	.85725
IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES	743	1.00	5.00	3.7181	.83827
CHALLENGES STRATEGIES	743	1.00	5.00	3.6586	.87717
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	743	1.00	5.00	3.3546	.80508
Valid N (listwise)	743	1.00	4.44	3.5252	.85247
				3.2207	.54496
		1.03	5.00	3.6172	.69240

DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet3.

DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES ADJUSTMENTSTRATEGIE

/STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.

Descriptives

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 07:39:41
Comments	
Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\HEALTH 12.sav
Active Dataset	DataSet3
Filter	<none>
Weight	<none>
Split File	<none>
N of Rows in Working Data	50
File	
Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.

Syntax	DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES ADJUSTMENTSTRATEG /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.
Resources	Processor Time 00:00:00.05 Elapsed Time 00:00:00.08

[DataSet3] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\HEALTH 12.sav

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.88	1.438
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.64	1.241
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	50	1	5	3.84	1.184
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.22	1.234
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.06	1.018
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.14	1.161
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.14	1.195
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	50	1	5	3.82	1.257
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.60	1.604
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	50	1	5	3.72	1.400
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.68	1.347
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.76	1.479
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.38	1.276
BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.78	1.036
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.44	1.053
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.84	1.167

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.02	1.097
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	50	1	5	4.24	1.001
SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	50	1	5	3.52	1.282
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	50	1	5	3.40	1.278
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	50	1	5	3.66	1.239
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.82	1.137
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.24	1.333
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.54	1.328
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.60	1.107
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	50	1	5	2.70	1.282
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.34	1.189
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	50	1	5	2.74	1.259
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.52	1.282
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM HELPING RELATIONS	50	1	5	3.48	1.297

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
OVER DEMANDING OF MONEY BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.36	1.156
POOR MANAGEEMENT OF INCOME BY SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.58	1.162
INFERTILITY AMONG SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.96	1.245
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.70	1.344
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY RELATIONS	50	1	5	3.36	1.306
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-LAWS	50	1	5	3.62	1.369
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	50	1	5	3.68	1.133

SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	50	1	5	2.92	1.322
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.38	.901
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	50	1	5	3.82	1.380
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBLITY	50	1	5	4.08	1.353
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	50	1	5	3.66	1.423
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	50	1	5	2.52	1.249
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	50	1	5	3.64	1.651
MAKING USE OF PRAYER THERAPY	50	1	5	3.58	1.566
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND RESPONSSSE TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION	50	1	5	3.50	1.432
HAVING A RETHINK OR REAPPRAISAL	50	1	5	3.66	1.222
DENIAL OF RIGHT	50	1	5	2.08	1.383

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE MECHANISM	50	1	5	2.18	1.173
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	50	1	5	3.64	1.495
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	50	1	5	3.66	1.673
QUARRELING ALWAYS	50	1	5	4.00	1.370
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	50	1	5	4.08	1.338
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	50	1	5	3.68	1.115
APPLYING PATIENCE	50	1	5	3.84	1.419
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	50	1	5	3.24	1.333
MAKING USE OF FAMILY COUNSELORS	50	1	5	3.08	1.291
LEARNING COMMUNICATION SKILLS	50	1	5	3.76	1.318
MAINTAINING OPEN COMMUNICATION	50	1	5	3.38	1.483
MAKING USE OF OTHER PEOPLES COUNSEL	50	1	5	2.34	1.189
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-LAW AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	50	1	5	2.28	1.415
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	50	1	5	4.06	1.361
CRYING ALWAYS	50	1	5	2.18	1.380
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	50	1	5	3.28	1.325
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	50	1	5	4.06	1.391
LACKINTIMACY	50	2.13	5.00	3.9675	.70612
HABITS	50	2.00	5.00	3.7836	.69348
IRRESPONSIBLE	50	1.88	4.88	3.6800	.69306
ISSUES	50	2.13	4.75	3.2900	.76575
CHALLENGES	50	2.38	4.75	3.6800	.65522
ADJUSTMENTSTRATEGE	50	2.24	4.40	3.3384	.49752
Valid N (listwise)	50				

```

DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet1.
T-TEST GROUPS=GENDER(1 2)
  /MISSING=ANALYSIS
  /VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21
Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 Q44
Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61 Q62 Q63
Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES STRATEGIES
MARITALDYSFUNCTION
  /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
  
```

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 07:53:48
Comments	
Input	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav Active Dataset DataSet1 Filter <none> Weight <none> Split File <none> N of Rows in Working Data File 793 Definition of Missing User defined missing values are treated as missing.
Missing Value Handling	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis. Cases Used T-TEST GROUPS=GENDER(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 Q51 Q52 Q53 Q54 Q55 Q56 Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61 Q62 Q63 Q64 Q65 LACKINTIMACY HABITS IRRESPONSIBLE ISSUES CHALLENGES STRATEGIES MARITALDYSFUNCTION /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Syntax	
Resources	Processor Time 00:00:00.41 Elapsed Time 00:00:00.75

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT	MALE	325	3.74	1.374	.076
INFORMING THE SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.96	1.282	.059
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER	MALE	325	3.56	1.260	.070
WITH SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.62	1.336	.062
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	MALE	325	3.64	1.270	.070
	FEMALE	468	3.84	1.226	.057
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.82	1.314	.073
	FEMALE	468	3.99	1.258	.058
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN	MALE	325	3.74	1.231	.068
SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.77	1.238	.057
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.94	1.222	.068
	FEMALE	468	3.95	1.313	.061
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION	MALE	325	3.86	1.211	.067
BETWEEN SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.89	1.290	.060
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	MALE	325	3.58	1.430	.079
	FEMALE	468	3.71	1.442	.067
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.75	1.450	.080
	FEMALE	468	3.93	1.379	.064
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL	MALE	325	3.46	1.325	.073
BY SPOUSSE	FEMALE	468	3.75	1.316	.061
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS	MALE	325	3.32	1.466	.081
BY SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.49	1.457	.067
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS	MALE	325	3.69	1.369	.076
BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.93	1.339	.062
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS	MALE	325	3.50	1.172	.065
BY SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.60	1.211	.056
BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.58	1.164	.065
	FEMALE	468	3.72	1.255	.058
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR	MALE	325	3.85	1.453	.081
"JUJU" BY SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	4.06	1.425	.066
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.49	1.325	.074
	FEMALE	468	3.72	1.247	.058

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
INABILITY TO TAKE	MALE	325	3.67	1.297	.072
CARE OF THE					
CHILDREN'S NEED BY	FEMALE	468	3.76	1.327	.061
SPOUSE					
SPOUSE NOT COOKING	MALE	325	3.62	1.313	.073
FOR HER HUSBAND	FEMALE	468	3.86	1.320	.061

SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	MALE	325	3.43	1.219	.068
	FEMALE	468	3.63	1.253	.058
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	MALE	325	3.52	1.219	.068
	FEMALE	468	3.64	1.250	.058
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	MALE	325	3.49	1.307	.072
	FEMALE	468	3.59	1.368	.063
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.68	1.228	.068
	FEMALE	468	3.73	1.308	.060
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.50	1.328	.074
	FEMALE	468	3.59	1.333	.062
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.66	1.299	.072
	FEMALE	468	3.69	1.312	.061
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.47	1.256	.070
	FEMALE	468	3.66	1.227	.057
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	MALE	325	3.21	1.240	.069
	FEMALE	468	3.32	1.225	.057
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.11	1.283	.071
	FEMALE	468	3.23	1.285	.059
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.02	1.249	.069
	FEMALE	468	3.05	1.350	.062
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.36	1.289	.072
	FEMALE	468	3.49	1.351	.062
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM HELPING RELATIONS	MALE	325	3.28	1.253	.070
	FEMALE	468	3.47	1.316	.061

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OVER DEMANDING OF MONEY BY SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.27	1.224	.068
	FEMALE	468	3.52	1.220	.056
POOR MANAGEMENT OF INCOME BY	MALE	325	3.42	1.266	.070

SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.56	1.320	.061
	MALE	325	3.46	1.562	.087
INFERTILITY AMONG SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.70	1.387	.064
	MALE	325	3.34	1.397	.077
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.42	1.431	.066
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY	MALE	325	3.31	1.318	.073
RELATIONS	FEMALE	468	3.53	1.325	.061
	MALE	325	3.66	1.281	.071
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-LAWS	FEMALE	468	3.77	1.252	.058
	MALE	325	3.63	1.284	.071
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.56	1.377	.064
	MALE	325	3.00	1.364	.076
SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	FEMALE	468	3.19	1.348	.062
	MALE	325	3.69	1.401	.078
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	FEMALE	468	3.94	1.355	.063
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT	MALE	325	3.26	1.511	.084
RELIGION	FEMALE	468	3.40	1.455	.067
	MALE	325	3.74	1.466	.081
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBLITY	FEMALE	468	3.59	1.563	.072
	MALE	325	3.69	1.396	.077
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	FEMALE	468	3.46	1.455	.067
	MALE	325	2.80	1.260	.070
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	FEMALE	468	2.73	1.279	.059
	MALE	325	3.54	1.489	.083
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	FEMALE	468	3.48	1.513	.070
	MALE	325	3.56	1.466	.081
MAKING USE OF PRAYER TERAPY	FEMALE	468	3.55	1.588	.073
	MALE	325	3.43	1.358	.075
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND RESPONSSSE	FEMALE	468	3.40	1.500	.069
TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION	MALE	325	3.36	1.253	.069
HAVING A RETHINK OR REAPPRAISAL					

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HAVING A RETHINK OR	FEMALE	468	3.22	1.463	.068
REAPPRAISAL	MALE	325	2.37	1.321	.073
DENIAL OF RIGHT	FEMALE	468	2.35	1.370	.063
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE	MALE	325	2.64	1.339	.074
MECHANISM	FEMALE	468	2.38	1.214	.056
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	MALE	325	3.57	1.414	.078
	FEMALE	468	3.50	1.504	.070
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	MALE	325	3.54	1.526	.085

	FEMALE	468	3.51	1.613	.075
QUARRELING ALWAYS	MALE	325	3.68	1.327	.074
	FEMALE	468	3.69	1.418	.066
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	MALE	325	3.61	1.335	.074
	FEMALE	468	3.58	1.459	.067
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	MALE	325	3.29	1.398	.078
	FEMALE	468	3.31	1.354	.063
APPLYING PATIENCE	MALE	325	3.39	1.482	.082
	FEMALE	468	3.45	1.550	.072
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS	MALE	325	3.22	1.408	.078
WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	FEMALE	468	3.08	1.510	.070
MAKING USE OF FAMILY	MALE	325	2.91	1.416	.079
COUNSELORS	FEMALE	468	2.91	1.336	.062
LEARNING COMMUNICATION	MALE	325	3.08	1.418	.079
SKILLS	FEMALE	468	3.33	1.474	.068
MAINTAINING OPEN	MALE	325	3.22	1.444	.080
COMMUNICATION	FEMALE	468	3.15	1.473	.068
MAKING USE OF OTHER	MALE	325	2.65	1.218	.068
PEOPLES COUNSEL	FEMALE	468	2.56	1.294	.060
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-LAW	MALE	325	2.34	1.265	.070
AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	FEMALE	468	2.38	1.402	.065
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	MALE	325	3.66	1.351	.075
	FEMALE	468	3.55	1.414	.065
CRYING ALWAYS	MALE	325	2.22	1.349	.075
	FEMALE	468	2.41	1.328	.061
MAKING USE OF					
CONFRONTATION	MALE	325	3.41	1.377	.076

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	FEMALE	468	3.30	1.394	.064
	MALE	325	3.50	1.561	.087
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	FEMALE	468	3.52	1.589	.073
	MALE	325	3.7633	.85700	.04754
LACKINTIMACY	FEMALE	468	3.8639	.85713	.03962
	MALE	325	3.5815	.84217	.04671
HABITS	FEMALE	468	3.7771	.83542	.03862
	MALE	325	3.5765	.85524	.04744
IRRESPONSIBLE	FEMALE	468	3.6854	.89042	.04116
	MALE	325	3.2665	.83511	.04632
ISSUES	FEMALE	468	3.4132	.77676	.03591
	MALE	325	3.4165	.90102	.04998

STRATEGIES	FEMALE	468	3.5646	.82330	.03806
	MALE	325	3.2154	.55058	.03054
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	FEMALE	468	3.1749	.56312	.02603
	MALE	325	3.5209	.69845	.03874
	FEMALE	468	3.6608	.68139	.03150

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	7.262	.007	-2.275
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.247
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	1.996	.158	-.678
	Equal variances not assumed			-.686
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	Equal variances assumed	3.024	.082	-2.175
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.161
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	4.105	.043	-1.813
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.799
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.015	.903	-.356
	Equal variances not assumed			-.356
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.779	.378	-.078
	Equal variances not assumed			-.079
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.740	.390	-.325
	Equal variances not assumed			-.328
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	Equal variances assumed	.013	.910	-1.243
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.245
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	5.354	.021	-1.787
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.771

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.023	-.217
	Equal variances not assumed	665.321	.025	-.217
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.498	-.064
	Equal variances not assumed	722.242	.493	-.064

SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	Equal variances assumed	791	.030	-.195
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	681.134	.031	-.195
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.070	-.168
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	677.208	.072	-.168
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.722	-.032
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	Equal variances not assumed	699.383	.722	-.032
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.938	-.007
	Equal variances not assumed	727.289	.937	-.007
	Equal variances assumed	791	.746	-.029
	Equal variances not assumed	724.179	.743	-.029
	Equal variances assumed	791	.214	-.129
	Equal variances not assumed	700.730	.213	-.129
	Equal variances assumed	791	.074	-.182
	Equal variances not assumed	674.400	.077	-.182

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.095	-.404
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.097	-.406
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	Equal variances assumed	.094	-.249
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.093	-.247
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.090	-.372
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.090	-.373
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.093	-.349
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	Equal variances not assumed	.093	-.351
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.089	-.207
	Equal variances not assumed	.089	-.207
	Equal variances assumed	.092	-.188
	Equal variances not assumed	.091	-.186
	Equal variances assumed	.091	-.208
	Equal variances not assumed	.090	-.206
	Equal variances assumed	.104	-.333
	Equal variances not assumed	.104	-.333
	Equal variances assumed	.102	-.381
	Equal variances not assumed	.103	-.383

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
SLEEPING OUTSIDE WITHOUT INFORMING THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	-.030
NOT SPENDING TIME TOGETHER WITH SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	-.027
SPOUSE NOT YEILDING TO ADVICE	Equal variances assumed	.121
LACK OF TRUST AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.119
POOR COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	-.019
LACK OF LOVE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	-.018
LACK OF SEXUAL SATISFACTION BETWEEN SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.014
NOT CARING WHEN SPOUSE IS SICK	Equal variances not assumed	.015
FLIRTING AROUND BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.143
	Equal variances not assumed	.143
	Equal variances assumed	.174
	Equal variances not assumed	.171
	Equal variances assumed	.149
	Equal variances not assumed	.147
	Equal variances assumed	.075
	Equal variances not assumed	.074
	Equal variances assumed	.018
	Equal variances not assumed	.020

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	Equal variances assumed	1.018	.313	-2.973
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed			-2.969
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.043	.836	-1.605
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed			-1.603
	Equal variances assumed	2.105	.147	-2.462
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.452
	Equal variances assumed	.334	.564	-1.168
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.175

BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.971	.325	-1.633
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.656
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.348	.556	-2.060
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.053
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	3.424	.065	-2.508
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.481
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.217	.641	-.870
	Equal variances not assumed			-.873
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	Equal variances assumed	.202	.653	-2.510
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.512

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.003	-.283
	Equal variances not assumed	693.846	.003	-.283
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.109	-.169
	Equal variances not assumed	694.072	.109	-.169
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.014	-.240
	Equal variances not assumed	686.787	.014	-.240
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.243	-.101
	Equal variances not assumed	711.124	.241	-.101
BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.103	-.144
	Equal variances not assumed	728.737	.098	-.144
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.040	-.214
	Equal variances not assumed	688.233	.040	-.214
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.012	-.232
	Equal variances not assumed	669.477	.013	-.232
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.385	-.083
	Equal variances not assumed	706.861	.383	-.083
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	Equal variances assumed	791	.012	-.239
	Equal variances not assumed	699.407	.012	-.239

Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means
--	------------------------------

		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	Equal variances assumed	.095	-.470
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.105	-.376
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.106	-.377
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.098	-.432
BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.098	-.433
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.086	-.270
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.086	-.269
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.088	-.317
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	Equal variances not assumed	.087	-.314
	Equal variances assumed	.104	-.417
	Equal variances not assumed	.104	-.418
	Equal variances assumed	.092	-.413
	Equal variances not assumed	.093	-.415
	Equal variances assumed	.095	-.269
	Equal variances not assumed	.095	-.268
	Equal variances assumed	.095	-.425
	Equal variances not assumed	.095	-.425

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
CONSUMING TOO MUCH ALCOHOL BY SPOUSSE	Equal variances assumed	-.096
PREFER TO EAT OUTSIDE ALWAYS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	-.096
ACCEPTING TO WRONG COUNSELS BY FRIENDS AGAINST SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.038
INABILITY TO CONTROL EMOTIONS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.038
	Equal variances assumed	-.049
	Equal variances not assumed	-.048
	Equal variances assumed	.069
	Equal variances not assumed	.068

BEING SELFISH BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.029
	Equal variances not assumed	.027
ENGAAGING IN MAKING CHARMS OR "JUJU" BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	-.010
	Equal variances not assumed	-.009
FREQUENT NAGGING BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	-.050
	Equal variances not assumed	-.048
INABILITY TO TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN'S NEED BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.104
	Equal variances not assumed	.103
SPOUSE NOT COOKING FOR HER HUSBAND	Equal variances assumed	-.052
	Equal variances not assumed	-.052

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	Equal variances assumed	.047	.828	-2.254
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.265
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	Equal variances assumed	.412	.521	-1.365
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.371
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	Equal variances assumed	.821	.365	-.983
	Equal variances not assumed			-.991
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	1.244	.265	-.495
	Equal variances not assumed			-.500
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.001	.977	-.938
	Equal variances not assumed			-.938
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.008	.927	-.271
	Equal variances not assumed			-.271
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	1.689	.194	-2.094
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.085
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	Equal variances assumed	.015	.902	-1.265
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.262
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.368	.544	-1.350
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.351

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	Equal variances assumed	791	.024	-.202
	Equal variances not assumed	708.821	.024	-.202
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	Equal variances assumed	791	.173	-.122
	Equal variances not assumed	708.233	.171	-.122
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	Equal variances assumed	791	.326	-.095
	Equal variances not assumed	716.672	.322	-.095
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.621	-.046
	Equal variances not assumed	723.887	.617	-.046
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.349	-.090
	Equal variances not assumed	698.700	.348	-.090
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.787	-.026
	Equal variances not assumed	701.596	.786	-.026
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.037	-.187
	Equal variances not assumed	686.690	.037	-.187
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	Equal variances assumed	791	.206	-.112
	Equal variances not assumed	691.475	.207	-.112
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.177	-.125
	Equal variances not assumed	697.908	.177	-.125

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	Equal variances assumed	.089	-.377
	Equal variances not assumed	.089	-.377
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	Equal variances assumed	.089	-.297
	Equal variances not assumed	.089	-.297
SPOUSE USING FEEDING	Equal variances assumed	.097	-.286

MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	Equal variances not assumed	.096	-.284
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.092	-.226
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.091	-.224
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.096	-.279
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.096	-.279
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	Equal variances assumed	.094	-.211
NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.094	-.210
	Equal variances assumed	.089	-.363
	Equal variances not assumed	.090	-.364
	Equal variances assumed	.089	-.287
	Equal variances not assumed	.089	-.287
	Equal variances assumed	.093	-.307
	Equal variances not assumed	.093	-.307

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
SPOUSE NOT PROVIDING ENOUGH MONEY FOR FEEDING	Equal variances assumed	-.026
SPOUSE BEING LAZY	Equal variances not assumed	-.027
SPOUSE USING FEEDING MONEY FOR OTHER NEEDS	Equal variances assumed	.053
LIVING ABOVE INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.053
BEING TOO POMPOUS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.095
SPENDING EXTRAVAGANTLY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.094
LACK OF AGREEMENT BEFORE EMBARKING ON PROJECTS BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.135
SPOUSE NOT HAVING ENOUGH MONEY TO MAINTAIN THE FAMILY	Equal variances not assumed	.133
	Equal variances assumed	.099
	Equal variances not assumed	.098
	Equal variances assumed	.160
	Equal variances not assumed	.159
	Equal variances assumed	-.012
	Equal variances not assumed	-.011
	Equal variances assumed	.062
	Equal variances not assumed	.062

NOT DISCLOSING INCOME OR	Equal variances assumed	.057
EXPENDITURE BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.057

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	3.475	.063	-0.237
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.240
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	1.787	.182	-1.338
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.349
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM HELPING RELATIONS	Equal variances assumed	1.191	.275	-2.096
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.114
OVER DEMANDING OF MONEY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.034	.854	-2.900
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.898
POOR MANAGEMENT OF INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.509	.476	-1.564
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.576
INFERTILITY AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	14.031	.000	-2.239
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.192
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.676	.411	-.857
	Equal variances not assumed			-.861
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY RELATIONS	Equal variances assumed	.061	.806	-2.372
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.374
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-LAWS	Equal variances assumed	.839	.360	-1.271
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.266

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.813	-.022
	Equal variances not assumed	729.566	.810	-.022
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.181	-.128
	Equal variances not assumed	717.306	.178	-.128

REFUSING SPOUSE FROM	Equal variances assumed	791	.036	-.195
HELPING RELATIONS	Equal variances not assumed	717.947	.035	-.195
OVER DEMANDING OF	Equal variances assumed	791	.004	-.256
MONEY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	695.332	.004	-.256
POOR MANAGEEMENT	Equal variances assumed	791	.118	-.147
OF INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	715.123	.115	-.147
INFERTILITY AMONG	Equal variances assumed	791	.025	-.236
SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	642.172	.029	-.236
UNEMPLOYMENT	Equal variances assumed	791	.392	-.088
AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	707.500	.390	-.088
SPOUSE LIVING WITH	Equal variances assumed	791	.018	-.226
MANY RELATIONS	Equal variances not assumed	699.375	.018	-.226
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-	Equal variances assumed	791	.204	-.116
LAWS	Equal variances not assumed	687.035	.206	-.116

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
GIVING MONEY TO	Equal variances assumed	.095	-.208
RELATIONS WITHOUT THE	Equal variances not assumed	.093	-.205
CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.096	-.316
OVER SPENDING ON	Equal variances not assumed	.095	-.315
SELFISH INTEREST BY	Equal variances assumed	.093	-.378
SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.092	-.377
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM	Equal variances assumed	.088	-.429
HELPING RELATIONS	Equal variances not assumed	.088	-.429
OVER DEMANDING OF	Equal variances assumed	.094	-.331
MONEY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.093	-.329
POOR MANAGEEMENT OF	Equal variances assumed	.106	-.443
INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.108	-.448
INFERTILITY AMONG	Equal variances assumed	.102	-.289
SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.102	-.288
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG	Equal variances assumed	.095	-.414
SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed	.095	-.414
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY	Equal variances assumed	.091	-.295
RELATIONS	Equal variances not assumed	.092	-.296
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-	Equal variances assumed		
LAWS	Equal variances not assumed		

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Upper	
GIVING MONEY TO RELATIONS	Equal variances assumed		.163
WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed		.161
OVER SPENDING ON SELFISH INTEREST BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed		.060
REFUSING SPOUSE FROM HELPING RELATIONS	Equal variances not assumed		.058
OVER DEMANDING OF MONEY BY SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed		-.012
POOR MANAGEEMENT OF INCOME BY SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed		-.014
INFERTILITY AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed		-.083
UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances not assumed		-.083
SPOUSE LIVING WITH MANY RELATIONS	Equal variances assumed		.037
INTERFERENCE FROM IN-LAWS	Equal variances not assumed		.036
	Equal variances assumed		-.029
	Equal variances not assumed		-.025
	Equal variances assumed		.113
	Equal variances not assumed		.112
	Equal variances assumed		-.039
	Equal variances not assumed		-.039
	Equal variances assumed		.063
	Equal variances not assumed		.064

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	5.414	.020	.724
SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	Equal variances not assumed			.733
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.243	.623	-1.997
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	Equal variances not assumed			-1.993
	Equal variances assumed	2.179	.140	-2.508
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.493
	Equal variances assumed	1.161	.282	-1.351
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.342

ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances assumed	7.377	.007	1.390
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	Equal variances not assumed			1.406
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	Equal variances assumed	5.071	.025	2.224
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances not assumed			2.241
MAKING USE OF PRAYER THERAPY	Equal variances assumed	.334	.563	.731
	Equal variances not assumed			.733
	Equal variances assumed	.165	.684	.531
	Equal variances not assumed			.533
	Equal variances assumed	10.693	.001	.070
	Equal variances not assumed			.071

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.469	.070
SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	Equal variances not assumed	726.708	.464	.070
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.046	-.195
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	Equal variances not assumed	691.723	.047	-.195
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances assumed	791	.012	-.249
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	Equal variances not assumed	682.055	.013	-.249
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	Equal variances assumed	791	.177	-.144
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances not assumed	679.883	.180	-.144
MAKING USE OF PRAYER THERAPY	Equal variances assumed	791	.165	.153
	Equal variances not assumed	724.287	.160	.153
	Equal variances assumed	791	.026	.230
	Equal variances not assumed	714.789	.025	.230
	Equal variances assumed	791	.465	.067
	Equal variances not assumed	703.690	.464	.067
	Equal variances assumed	791	.595	.058
	Equal variances not assumed	703.894	.594	.058
	Equal variances assumed	791	.944	.008
	Equal variances not assumed	730.663	.943	.008

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.097	-.120
	Equal variances not assumed	.096	-.118

SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	Equal variances assumed	.098	-.387
	Equal variances not assumed	.098	-.388
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.099	-.444
	Equal variances not assumed	.100	-.445
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	Equal variances assumed	.107	-.354
	Equal variances not assumed	.107	-.355
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances assumed	.110	-.063
	Equal variances not assumed	.109	-.061
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	Equal variances assumed	.103	.027
	Equal variances not assumed	.103	.028
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	Equal variances assumed	.092	-.113
	Equal variances not assumed	.092	-.113
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances assumed	.109	-.155
	Equal variances not assumed	.108	-.155
MAKING USE OF PRAYER THERAPY	Equal variances assumed	.111	-.210
	Equal variances not assumed	.110	-.207

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
POWER TUSSLE AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.260
	Equal variances not assumed	.258
SPOUSE BEING SICK FREQUENTLY	Equal variances assumed	-.003
	Equal variances not assumed	-.003
UNFORGIVENESS AMONG SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	-.054
	Equal variances not assumed	-.053
SPOUSSE BELONGING TO DIFFERENT RELIGION	Equal variances assumed	.065
	Equal variances not assumed	.067
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances assumed	.369
	Equal variances not assumed	.367
ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM	Equal variances assumed	.433
	Equal variances not assumed	.431
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	Equal variances assumed	.247
	Equal variances not assumed	.247
AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY	Equal variances assumed	.271
	Equal variances not assumed	.270
MAKING USE OF PRAYER THERAPY	Equal variances assumed	.226
	Equal variances not assumed	.223

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND RESPONSSSE TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION	Equal variances assumed	7.460	.006	.299
	Equal variances not assumed			.305
HAVING A RETHINK OR REAPPRAISAL	Equal variances assumed	18.802	.000	1.415
	Equal variances not assumed			1.455
DENIAL OF RIGHT	Equal variances assumed	.854	.356	.193
	Equal variances not assumed			.194
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE MECHANISM	Equal variances assumed	5.149	.024	2.886
	Equal variances not assumed			2.836
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	Equal variances assumed	4.439	.035	.584
	Equal variances not assumed			.590
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	Equal variances assumed	4.783	.029	.217
	Equal variances not assumed			.219
QUARRELING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	2.482	.116	-.081
	Equal variances not assumed			-.082
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	7.053	.008	.266
	Equal variances not assumed			.270
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	Equal variances assumed	.946	.331	-.155
	Equal variances not assumed			-.154

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND RESPONSSSE TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION	Equal variances assumed	791	.765	.031
	Equal variances not assumed	737.899	.761	.031
HAVING A RETHINK OR REAPPRAISAL	Equal variances assumed	791	.157	.141
	Equal variances not assumed	757.062	.146	.141
DENIAL OF RIGHT	Equal variances assumed	791	.847	.019
	Equal variances not assumed	712.739	.846	.019
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE MECHANISM	Equal variances assumed	791	.004	.264
	Equal variances not assumed	651.923	.005	.264
APPLYING TOOTH FOR	Equal variances assumed	791	.560	.062

TART	Equal variances not assumed	723.446	.555	.062
FORGIVING ONE	Equal variances assumed	791	.828	.025
ANOTHER	Equal variances not assumed	720.671	.827	.025
QUARRELING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	791	.936	-.008
	Equal variances not assumed	725.016	.935	-.008
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	791	.790	.027
	Equal variances not assumed	733.972	.787	.027
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	Equal variances assumed	791	.877	-.015
	Equal variances not assumed	682.509	.877	-.015

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND	Equal variances assumed	.104	-.173
RESPONSSE TO IMPROVE	Equal variances not assumed	.102	-.170
THE SITUATION	Equal variances assumed	.100	-.055
HAVING A RETHINK OR	Equal variances not assumed	.097	-.049
REAPPRAISAL	Equal variances assumed	.097	-.173
DENIAL OF RIGHT	Equal variances not assumed	.097	-.171
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE	Equal variances assumed	.091	.084
MECHANISM	Equal variances not assumed	.093	.081
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	Equal variances assumed	.106	-.146
	Equal variances not assumed	.105	-.144
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	Equal variances assumed	.114	-.199
	Equal variances not assumed	.113	-.197
QUARRELING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	.100	-.204
	Equal variances not assumed	.099	-.202
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.102	-.173
	Equal variances not assumed	.100	-.170
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	Equal variances assumed	.099	-.210
	Equal variances not assumed	.100	-.211

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference

		Upper
DEVELOPING SKILLS AND	Equal variances assumed	.236
RESPONSSE TO IMPROVE THE	Equal variances not assumed	.232
SITUATION		
HAVING A RETHINK OR	Equal variances assumed	.337
REAPPRAISAL	Equal variances not assumed	.331
DENIAL OF RIGHT	Equal variances assumed	.210
	Equal variances not assumed	.209
MAKING USE OF DEFENSE	Equal variances assumed	.443
MECHANISM	Equal variances not assumed	.447
APPLYING TOOTH FOR TART	Equal variances assumed	.270
	Equal variances not assumed	.268
FORGIVING ONE ANOTHER	Equal variances assumed	.248
	Equal variances not assumed	.246
QUARRELING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	.188
	Equal variances not assumed	.185
AVOIDING YOUR SPOUSE	Equal variances assumed	.227
	Equal variances not assumed	.224
KEEPING OF YOUR SELF	Equal variances assumed	.179
	Equal variances not assumed	.180

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
APPLYING PATIENCE	Equal variances assumed	2.593	.108	-.519
	Equal variances not assumed			-.523
COMMUNICATING	Equal variances assumed	3.820	.051	1.363
FEELINGS WITHOUT	Equal variances not assumed			1.381
BOTTLING THEM				
MAKING USE OF	Equal variances assumed	1.466	.226	-.048
FAMILY COUNSELORS	Equal variances not assumed			-.047
LEARNING	Equal variances assumed	5.672	.017	-2.376
COMMUNICATION	Equal variances not assumed			-2.393
SKILLS				
MAINTAINING OPEN	Equal variances assumed	.609	.435	.673
COMMUNICATION	Equal variances not assumed			.676
MAKING USE OF OTHER	Equal variances assumed	3.410	.065	.993
PEOPLES COUNSEL	Equal variances not assumed			1.004
MAKING USE OF JOINT	Equal variances assumed	7.324	.007	-.462

IN-LAW AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	Equal variances not assumed			-471
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	1.812	.179	1.081
	Equal variances not assumed			1.090
CRYING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	.228	.633	-1.955
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.950

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
APPLYING PATIENCE	Equal variances assumed	791	.604	-.057
	Equal variances not assumed	716.385	.601	-.057
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	Equal variances assumed	791	.173	.145
	Equal variances not assumed	726.808	.168	.145
MAKING USE OF FAMILY COUNSELORS	Equal variances assumed	791	.962	-.005
	Equal variances not assumed	670.712	.962	-.005
LEARNING COMMUNICATION SKILLS	Equal variances assumed	791	.018	-.249
	Equal variances not assumed	713.821	.017	-.249
MAINTAINING OPEN COMMUNICATION	Equal variances assumed	791	.501	.071
	Equal variances not assumed	705.696	.499	.071
MAKING USE OF OTHER PEOPLES COUNSEL	Equal variances assumed	791	.321	.091
	Equal variances not assumed	722.899	.316	.091
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-LAW AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	Equal variances assumed	791	.644	-.045
	Equal variances not assumed	739.375	.638	-.045
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	791	.280	.108
	Equal variances not assumed	716.738	.276	.108
CRYING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	791	.051	-.189
	Equal variances not assumed	689.754	.052	-.189

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
APPLYING PATIENCE	Equal variances assumed	.110	-.273
	Equal variances not assumed	.109	-.271
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS	Equal variances assumed	.106	-.064

WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	Equal variances not assumed	.105	-.061
MAKING USE OF FAMILY	Equal variances assumed	.099	-.199
COUNSELORS	Equal variances not assumed	.100	-.201
LEARNING	Equal variances assumed	.105	-.455
COMMUNICATION SKILLS	Equal variances not assumed	.104	-.453
MAINTAINING OPEN	Equal variances assumed	.105	-.136
COMMUNICATION	Equal variances not assumed	.105	-.135
MAKING USE OF OTHER	Equal variances assumed	.091	-.088
PEOPLES COUNSEL	Equal variances not assumed	.090	-.087
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-	Equal variances assumed	.097	-.236
LAW AND FAMILY	Equal variances not assumed	.096	-.232
INTERVENTION	Equal variances assumed	.100	-.088
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	Equal variances not assumed	.099	-.087
CRYING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	.097	-.378
	Equal variances not assumed	.097	-.379

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
APPLYING PATIENCE	Equal variances assumed	.159
	Equal variances not assumed	.157
COMMUNICATING FEELINGS	Equal variances assumed	.353
WITHOUT BOTTLING THEM	Equal variances not assumed	.350
MAKING USE OF FAMILY	Equal variances assumed	.189
COUNSELORS	Equal variances not assumed	.191
LEARNING COMMUNICATION	Equal variances assumed	-.043
SKILLS	Equal variances not assumed	-.045
MAINTAINING OPEN	Equal variances assumed	.278
COMMUNICATION	Equal variances not assumed	.277
MAKING USE OF OTHER PEOPLES	Equal variances assumed	.270
COUNSEL	Equal variances not assumed	.268
MAKING USE OF JOINT IN-LAW	Equal variances assumed	.146
AND FAMILY INTERVENTION	Equal variances not assumed	.143
COMPLAINING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	.305
	Equal variances not assumed	.304
CRYING ALWAYS	Equal variances assumed	.001
	Equal variances not assumed	.001

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	Equal variances assumed	.070	.791	1.026
	Equal variances not assumed			1.028
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	Equal variances assumed	.707	.401	-.182
	Equal variances not assumed			-.183
LACKINTIMACY	Equal variances assumed	.266	.606	-1.627
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.627
HABITS	Equal variances assumed	.071	.790	-3.231
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.226
IRRESPONSIBLE	Equal variances assumed	.398	.529	-1.720
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.733
ISSUES	Equal variances assumed	1.981	.160	-2.535
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.502
CHALLENGES	Equal variances assumed	3.858	.050	-2.396
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.358
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	.759	.384	1.005
	Equal variances not assumed			1.010
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	.355	.552	-2.816
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.803

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	Equal variances assumed	791	.305	.103
	Equal variances not assumed	702.288	.304	.103
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	Equal variances assumed	791	.855	-.021
	Equal variances not assumed	704.856	.855	-.021
LACKINTIMACY	Equal variances assumed	791	.104	-.10069
	Equal variances not assumed	697.105	.104	-.10069
HABITS	Equal variances assumed	791	.001	-.19555
	Equal variances not assumed	693.454	.001	-.19555
IRRESPONSIBLE	Equal variances assumed	791	.086	-.10882
	Equal variances not assumed	714.489	.084	-.10882
ISSUES	Equal variances assumed	791	.011	-.14666
	Equal variances not assumed	663.989	.013	-.14666
CHALLENGES	Equal variances assumed	791	.017	-.14810

STRATEGIES	Equal variances not assumed	655.707	.019	-.14810
	Equal variances assumed	791	.315	.04051
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances not assumed	706.903	.313	.04051
	Equal variances assumed	791	.005	-.13996
	Equal variances not assumed	685.933	.005	-.13996

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	Equal variances assumed	.100	-.094
	Equal variances not assumed	.100	-.093
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	Equal variances assumed	.114	-.244
	Equal variances not assumed	.114	-.244
LACKINTIMACY	Equal variances assumed	.06189	-.22217
	Equal variances not assumed	.06188	-.22219
HABITS	Equal variances assumed	.06052	-.31436
	Equal variances not assumed	.06061	-.31455
IRRESPONSIBLE	Equal variances assumed	.06327	-.23301
	Equal variances not assumed	.06281	-.23213
ISSUES	Equal variances assumed	.05785	-.26021
	Equal variances not assumed	.05861	-.26174
CHALLENGES	Equal variances assumed	.06181	-.26942
	Equal variances not assumed	.06282	-.27145
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	.04029	-.03858
	Equal variances not assumed	.04013	-.03827
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	.04971	-.23754
	Equal variances not assumed	.04993	-.23800

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Upper	
MAKING USE OF CONFRONTATION	Equal variances assumed	.299	
	Equal variances not assumed	.299	
MAKING USE OF SELF CONTROL	Equal variances assumed	.203	

	Equal variances not assumed	.202
	Equal variances assumed	.02079
LACKINTIMACY	Equal variances not assumed	.02081
	Equal variances assumed	-.07675
HABITS	Equal variances not assumed	-.07655
	Equal variances assumed	.01536
IRRESPONSIBLE	Equal variances not assumed	.01448
	Equal variances assumed	-.03310
ISSUES	Equal variances not assumed	-.03157
	Equal variances assumed	-.02677
CHALLENGES	Equal variances not assumed	-.02475
	Equal variances assumed	.11960
STRATEGIES	Equal variances not assumed	.11930
	Equal variances assumed	-.04239
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances not assumed	-.04193

T-TEST GROUPS=PLACE(1 2)
 /MISSING=ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES=MARITALDYSFUNCTION
 /CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 08:10:14
Comments	
Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav
Active Dataset	DataSet1
Filter	<none>
Weight	<none>
Split File	<none>
N of Rows in Working Data	793
File	
Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
Missing Value Handling	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Cases Used	T-TEST GROUPS=PLACE(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=MARITALDYSFUNCTION /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Syntax	
Processor Time	00:00:00.05
Resources	Elapsed Time 00:00:00.09

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Group Statistics

	PLACE OF WORK	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	HOSPITAL	50	3.6854	.50407	.07129
N	TERTIARY	743	3.5980	.70217	.02576

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	6.641	.010	.866
N	Equal variances not assumed			1.154

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	791	.387	.08746
	Equal variances not assumed	62.562	.253	.08746

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	.10104	-.11087
	Equal variances not assumed	.07580	-.06403

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	.28579
	Equal variances not assumed	.23895

T-TEST GROUPS=GENDER(1 2)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES=MARITALDYSFUNCTION
 /CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 08:11:23		
Comments			
Input	Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav	
	Active Dataset	DataSet1	
	Filter	<none>	
	Weight	<none>	
	Split File	<none>	
	N of Rows in Working Data File	793	
	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.	
Missing Value Handling	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.	
		T-TEST GROUPS=GENDER(1 2)	
Syntax	/MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=MARITALDYSFUNCTION /CRITERIA=CI(.95).		
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05	
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.08	

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	MALE	325	3.5209	.69845	.03874
N	FEMALE	468	3.6608	.68139	.03150

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	.355	.552	-2.816
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.803

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	791	.005	-.13996
	Equal variances not assumed	685.933	.005	-.13996

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	.04971	-.23754
	Equal variances not assumed	.04993	-.23800

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
MARITALDYSFUNCTION	Equal variances assumed	-.04239
	Equal variances not assumed	-.04193

T-TEST GROUPS=PLACE(1 2)
 /MISSING=ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES=STRATEGIES
 /CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 08:13:16
Comments	
Input	
Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION
Active Dataset	ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav
Filter	DataSet1
Weight	<none>
Split File	<none>
N of Rows in Working Data	793
File	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing
	User defined missing values are treated as missing.

Cases Used		Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		T-TEST GROUPS=PLACE(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=STRATEGIES /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.16

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Group Statistics

	PLACE OF WORK	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
STRATEGIES	HOSPITAL	50	3.3384	.49752	.07036
	TERTIARY	743	3.1816	.56078	.02057

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	1.183	.277	1.927	791
	Equal variances not assumed			2.139	57.709

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	.054	.15681	.08139
	Equal variances not assumed	.037	.15681	.07331

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	-.00295	.31658
	Equal variances not assumed	.01006	.30356

T-TEST GROUPS=GENDER(1 2)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES=STRATEGIES

/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 08:16:22
Comments	

Input	Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	793
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing. Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
	Cases Used	T-TEST GROUPS=GENDER(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS
Syntax		/VARIABLES=STRATEGIES /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.09

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
STRATEGIES	MALE	325	3.2154	.55058	.03054
	FEMALE	468	3.1749	.56312	.02603

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	.759	.384	1.005	791
	Equal variances not assumed			1.010	706.903

Independent Samples Test

t-test for Equality of Means		
Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error

			Difference
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	.315	.04051
	Equal variances not assumed	.313	.04051

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
STRATEGIES	Equal variances assumed	-.03858	.11960
	Equal variances not assumed	-.03827	.11930

ONEWAY MARITALDYSFUNCTION BY OCCUPATION
 /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES EFFECTS HOMOGENEITY
 /MISSING ANALYSIS.

Oneway

Notes

Output Created	15-MAY-2017 08:19:41		
Comments			
Input	Data	C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav	
	Active Dataset	DataSet1	
	Filter	<none>	
	Weight	<none>	
	Split File	<none>	
	N of Rows in Working Data	793	
Missing Value Handling	File		
	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.	
Syntax	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.	
		ONEWAY MARITALDYSFUNCTION BY OCCUPATION /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES EFFECTS HOMOGENEITY /MISSING ANALYSIS.	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02	
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.14	

[DataSet1] C:\Users\HP 655\Documents\DYSFUNCTION ADJUSTMENT LATEST.sav

Descriptives

MARITALDYSFUNCTION

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean
--	---	------	----------------	------------	----------------------------------

					Lower Bound
NURSE	36	3.6954	.46913	.07819	3.5367
DOCTOR	14	3.6597	.60347	.16128	3.3113
TEACHING STAFF	440	3.5265	.71199	.03394	3.4598
NON-TEACHING	303	3.7017	.67546	.03880	3.6254
Total	793	3.6035	.69144	.02455	3.5553
Model	Fixed Effects		.68735	.02441	3.5556
	Random Effects			.07291	3.3715

Descriptives

MARITALDYSFUNCTION

	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
	Upper Bound				
	NURSE	3.8542			
DOCTOR	4.0081	2.93	4.70		
TEACHING STAFF	3.5932	1.03	4.85		
NON-TEACHING	3.7781	1.20	5.00		
Total	3.6517	1.03	5.00		
Model	Fixed Effects	3.6514			
	Random Effects	3.8355			.01034

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

MARITALDYSFUNCTION

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3.126	3	789	.025

ANOVA

MARITALDYSFUNCTION

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.878	3	1.959	4.147	.006
Within Groups	372.764	789	.472		
Total	378.642	792			