IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Effects Of Maladaptive Metacognition On Marital Adjustment

Rashmi Rani
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology,
Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur- - India

Arun Kumar Jaiswal,
Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapith, Varanasi – - India

ABSTRACT-The present study was planned to investigate the effects of maladaptive metacognitions on marital adjustment. The sample comprised of 300 married couples (300 husbands and 300 wives) chosen from Chowk and adjoining areas of Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh, India. The study tools included Hindi version of Metacognitions Questionnaire and Dyadic adjustment Scale. The participants falling below Mean-1SD and above Mean+1SD on the facets of metacognitions (positive beliefs, uncontrollability and danger, cognitive confidence, SPR, and cognitive self-consciousness) were respectively designated as low and high scorer participants (husbands and wives). The effects of levels (low and high) of facets of metacognitions on marital adjustment (dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion, dyadic satisfaction and DAS total) were analyzed by applying 2 × 2 MANOVA (2 spouses × 2 levels of facets of metacognitions). Results revealed non-significant effects of spouses on all measures of marital adjustment, and significant main effects of levels of cognitive confidence, cognitive self-consciousness and MCQ Total on dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion, dyadic satisfaction and DAS-H Total, however, non-significant main effect of levels of SPR and uncontrollability and danger on dyadic satisfaction. Participants who scored low on the facets of metacognitions exhibited significantly higher levels of marital adjustment spAecially on marital satisfaction facets of marital adjustment.

Key Words: Metacognition, Marital Adjustment, MCQ, DAS

INTRODUCTION

Metacognition is a person's self-awareness of his or her cognitive functions and facts, and enables a person purposefully to direct these functions and facts (3), (6). Dysfunctional metacognitions lead to dysfunctional thoughts and coping strategies, which are related to psychological disorders (2). Metacognitions were positively and significantly correlated with both perceived stress and negative emotions, such as anxiety and depression (17), and also predicted the development of anxiety and depression symptoms in the context of life-stress (22). Spada, Mohiyeddini and Wells (2008) found that negative beliefs about worry concerning uncontrollability and danger were the strongest predictors for both anxiety and depression (18). The results of this study also revealed that cognitive confidence, beliefs about the need to control thoughts, and cognitive self-consciousness predicted (although weakly) depression but not anxiety.

Self-regulatory executive function (S-REF) model (21) conceived that emotional distress becomes persistent when stored maladaptive metacognitive beliefs guide an individual to respond to commonly occurring thoughts and feelings in a certain way, and they termed this style of responding as 'cognitive attentional syndrome' (CAS). The CAS consists of repetitive negative thinking in the process of worry and

rumination that is driven by positive and negative beliefs about worry, concerning uncontrollability and danger, and limitations on executive control. Wells constructed a metacognitive theory for emotional disorders (20), and also developed self-report instruments for assessing dysfunctional metacognitive beliefs. Several studies revealed that emotional distress like anxiety and depression have adverse effects on marital relationship (4), (5), (8).

The domains of happy married life are important fields for psychological research because rapid industrial and technological development and social change might be putting additional pressure on couples' relationships thereby changing the marriage system. The marriage is determined by marital adjustment, marital satisfaction, communication style, happiness and conflict, and how the couples evaluate their marital life. One of features of married life is marital adjustment defined by Erbek (2005) as "marriage adjustment as effort of the spouses themselves and to each other to reach a consensus, achieve common purpose and balance on the specific conditions of marriage" (7). Marital adjustment is an important factor that affects the physical and psychological wellbeing and heath of the couples and other family members.

Researchers have shown that positive metacognitions and meta-emotions (12) contribute to marital adjustment, and high positive and low negative meta-emotions contribute to healthy marital adjustment in spouses (13). Marital communication is one of the key aspects of quality of marital life and (14) found that positive metacognitions and positive meta-emotions contribute to enhanced supportive communication and impaired aversive communication. The studies show the vital role of adaptive metacognition on various aspect of marital life. Hojati, Yousefi and Sajadian, (2014) studied the predictability of marital satisfaction by meta-cognition, thought control and resiliency and results of the stepwise multiple regressions showed that among meta-cognitive beliefs, positive beliefs about uncontrollability and danger were the best and inverse predictor of marital satisfaction and thought control and resiliency respectively correlated negatively and positively with marital satisfaction (9).

On the basis of aforementioned studies an inverse relationship between maladaptive metacognitions and quality of marital life can be hypothesized. As such, the present study was undertaken to explore the effect of metacognition on marital adjustment. The study aimed to examine (i) the independent and interaction effects of 'Spouses (husbands and wives)' and 'Levels of facets of metacognitions (low and high)' on facets of Marital adjustment (Dyadic consensus, Dyadic satisfaction and Dyadic cohesion), and (ii) the independent and interaction effects of 'Spouses (husbands and wives) and "Levels of facets (low and high of metacognitions)" on facets of Marital Adjustment (Dyadic consensus, Dyadic satisfaction and Dyadic cohesion) in Indian married couples.

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Sample

Three hundred married couples (300 husbands, mean age = 39.507, SD = 9.190 years; and 300 wives, mean age = 35.587, SD = 8.580 years) (N = 600) with at least graduation qualification from Chowk and adjoining areas of Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh, India were sampled by following multi-stage sampling. The analyses of the demographic characteristics indicted that length of the marriage of married couples ranged from 2 to 47 years (mean marital length = 11.920; SD = 9.295). Approximately 91.3% and 8.7% participants were respectively from urban and rural background; and 76.7% and 23.3% of participants were respectively from joint and nuclear families. The husbands were having a little higher educational qualification with 25.3% and 24.6% husbands were respectively graduate and postgraduate as compared to 21.3% and 28.7% graduate and postgraduate wives. This preliminary analysis of the extraneous variables revealed that these variables were almost relatively homogenously distributed across the sample.

Behavioural Measures

The husbands and wives were individually administered following behavioral measures: (i) Meta-cognitions Questionnaire (MCQ-H: Jaiswal et al., 2021; MCQ: Cartwright–Hatton & Wells, 1997), and Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS-H, Rani, Singh & Jaiswal, 2019; DAS, Spanier, 1976).

(i) Meta-cognitions Questionnaire

The MCQ (65-item questionnaire) evaluates individual differences in metacognitive beliefs, judgments and monitoring tendencies. The MCQ (the original questionnaire) is a valid scale with good internal consistency and reliabilities for the 5 subscales range from 0.72 to 0.89 and convergent validity as well as moderate test-retest reliability. MCQ-H (Hindi version) comprises five factors and originally named "positive beliefs about worry", "cognitive confidence", "superstitions, punishment and responsibility", "uncontrollability and danger" and "cognitive self – consciousness". High alpha coefficients for (i) positive beliefs about worry (0.87), (ii) Uncontrollability and Danger (0.89), (iii) Cognitive Confidence (0.84), (iv) Superstitions, Punishment and Responsibility (0.74), and (v) Cognitive Self-consciousness (0.72) have been reported. With the permission of Dr. Adrian Wells, the Hindi translation of MCQ was created using a back-translation procedure involving one well-versed and inborn speaker of both the languages, two Professors of Psychology and the investigator in an attempt to ensure the content equivalence and corrected for problematic phrases.

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale is a standardized assessment of couple's relationship (19). The DAS consists of 32 items with four subscales: (i) Dyadic Consensus (DC; the degree to which the couple agree on matters of importance to relationship), (ii) Dyadic cohesion (DCH; the degree to which the couple engages in activities together), (iii) Dyadic satisfaction (DS; the degree to which the couple is satisfied with the present state of relationship and is committed to its continuance); and (iv) affectional expression (AE; the degree to which the couple is satisfied with the expression of affection and sex in the relationship). Spanier (1976) reported fairly high Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.73 to 0.96, DAS correlated fairly high with (r = 0.86) with Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale). Most researchers, reasonably enough, simply sum the four scales for discrimination purposes of distressed and non-distressed couples.

The exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of the Hindi adaptation of DAS (16) revealed 16 items, comprising three factors respectively named as dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion and dyadic satisfaction. The CFA has indicated that DAS-H has acceptable and adequate model fit indicating good construct validity. The reliability coefficients (Split-half, Cronbach's alpha and Guttman lambda) of the three factors emerged acceptable - Dyadic Consensus (range 0.83 to 0.85), Dyadic Satisfaction (range 0.72 to 0.75) and Dyadic Cohesion (range 0.72 to 0.76) and the three factors explained a total of 51.045% of variance.

RESULTS

The objectives of the study aimed to elucidate main and interaction effects of 'Spouses' (husbands and wives) and 'Levels' (low and high) of facets of metacognition (maladaptive) separately on quality of marital life (dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion, dyadic satisfaction, and total score of dyadic adjustment) in Indian cultural context. The scores of the measures of dyadic adjustment were subjected to 2 × 2 MANOVA (2 Spouses × 2 Levels of facets of metacognitions, which revealed (i) non-significant multivariate main effects of 'Spouses', Wilks' Λ = 0.998, F(3/2018) = 0.120, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.002, power = 0.072; main effects of 'Levels of positive beliefs', Wilks' Λ = 0.997, F (3/218) = 0.196, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.003, power = 0.086; and interaction effects 'Spouses × Levels of positive beliefs', Wilks' Λ = 0.967, F (3/218) = 2.473, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.033, power = 0.609, (ii) non-significant multivariate main effects of 'Spouses', Wilks' Λ = 0.992, F(3/202) = 0.153, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.008, power = 0.153, and interaction effects of 'Spouses × Levels of cognitive confidence', Wilks' Λ = 0.994, F (3/202) = 0.417, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.006, power = 0.132; whereas significant multivariate main effects of 'Levels of cognitive confidence', Wilks' Λ = 0.910, F (3/202) = 6.654, $p < 0.01$, partial eta squared = 0.090, power = 0.972, (iii) non-significant multivariate main effects of 'Spouses', Wilks' Λ = 0.990, F (3/198) = 0.695, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.010, power = 0.196, and interaction effects of 'Spouses × Levels of superstition, punishment and responsibility' (SPR), Wilks' Λ = 0.980, F (3/198) = 1.331, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.020, power = 0.351), however, significant multivariate main effects of 'Levels of superstition, punishment and responsibility' (SPR), Wilks' Λ = 0.960, F (3/198) = 2.769, $p < 0.05$, partial eta squared =

0.040, power = 0.663, (iv) non-significant multivariate main effects of 'Spouses', Wilks' ʎ = 0.988, F (3/193) = 0.770, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.012, power = 0.214, and interaction effect of 'Spouses x Levels of uncontrollability and danger', Wilks' ʎ = 0.984, F (3/193) = 1.036, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.016, power = 0.278), while significant multivariate main effects of 'Levels of uncontrollability and danger', Wilks' ʎ = 0.929, F (3/193) = 2.769, $p < 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.071, power = 0.908, (v) non-significant multivariate main effects of 'Spouses', Wilks' ʎ = 0.985, F(3/226) = 1.148, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.015, power = 0.307; significant multivariate main effects of 'Levels of cognitive self-consciousness', Wilks' ʎ = 0.886, F (3/226) = 9.727, $p < 0.01$, partial eta squared = 0.114, power = 0.998; and non-significant interaction effect of 'Spouses × Levels of cognitive self-consciousness', Wilks' ʎ = 0.978, F (3/226) = 61.731, $p < 0.01$, partial eta squared = 0.022, power = 0.449, and (vi) non-significant multivariate main effects of 'Spouses', Wilks' ʎ = 0.996, F (3/179) = 0.261, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.004, power = 0.099;significant multivariate main effects of 'Levels of MCQ Total', Wilks' ʎ = 0.955, F (3/179) = 2.801, $p < 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.041, power = 0.667; and non-significant interaction effects of 'Spouses × Levels of MCQ Total', Wilks' ʎ = 0.983, F (3/179) = 1.047, $p > 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.373, power = 0.281.

The obtained results exhibited non-significant (i) univariate main effect of "Spouses" on 'Dyadic consensus' (F (1/ 224) = 0.084, $p > 0.05$), 'Dyadic cohesion' (F (1/ 224) = 0.037, $p > 0.05$), 'Dyadic satisfaction' (F(1/ 224) = 0.005, $p > 0.05$), and 'DAS-H Total' (F(1/ 224) = 0.017, $p > 0.05$); (ii) univariate main effect of "Levels of positive beliefs" on 'Dyadic consensus' (F (1/ 224) = 0.100, $p > 0.05$), 'Dyadic cohesion' (F (1/ 224) = 0.004, p > 0.05), 'Dyadic satisfaction' (F (1/ 224) = 0.535, $p > 0.05$), and 'DAS-H Total' (F (1/ 224) = 0.206, $p < 0.05$), and (iii) interaction effect of "Spouses × Levels of positive beliefs" on 'Dyadic consensus' (F (1/ 224) = 2.877, $p > 0.05$), 'Dyadic cohesion' (F (1/ 224) = 0.807, p > 0.05), 'Dyadic satisfaction' (F (1/ 224) = 1.904, $p > 0.05$), and 'DAS-H Total' (F (1/ 224) = 0.608, $p < 0.05$).

Means ± SD values of measures of dyadic adjustment (dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion, dyadic satisfaction and DAS-H Total) over levels of 2 Spouses (husbands and wives) and 2 levels (low and high) of positive beliefs sub-factor of metacognitions (Ns are shown in parentheses)

Facets of MCQ-H	Spouse	Levels	Dyadic consensus	Dyadic cohesion	Dyadic satisfaction	DAS-H Total
Positive Beliefs	Husbands	High (57)	36.63 ±6.36	14.51 ±4.29	14.84 ±4.58	65.98 ±13.13
		Low (51)	35.30 ±7.10	14.06 ±3.64	16.08 ± 3.32	65.43 ±10.99
	Wives	High (52)	35.27 ±8.79	13.92 ±4.64	15.69 ±4.28	64.8 ±15.36
		Low (64)	37.22 ±6.60	14.43 ±3.40	15.31 ±4.93	66.97 ±10.65
Cognitive Confidence	Husbands	High (38)	33.79 ±7.34	13.21 ±4.29	12.84 ±5.61	59.84 ±13.36
		Low (64)	37.38 ± 6.02	15.00 ± 4.07	15.06 ±5.00	67.44 ±12.16
	Wives	High (52)	33.19 ± 9.23	13.89 ±3.61	13.57 ±5.55	60.65 ±14.17
		Low (54)	38.00 ±5.56	15.26 ±3.59	15.41 ±4.95	68.67 ±10.02
Level of SPR	Husbands	High (50)	36.64 ±6.68	13.84 ±4.22	14.00 ±5.40	64.48 ±14.41
		Low (48)	36.58 ±6.69	14.04 ±4.09	16.17 ±4.39	66.79 ±13.75

	Wives	High (46)	36.09 ±7.23	14.70 ±3.58	15.22 ±4.66	66.00 ±13.09
		Low (60)	36.70 ±6.24	13.87 ±4.21	16.07 ±4.23	66.63 ±10.83
Uncontrollability and danger	Husbands	High (52)	35.35 ±8.06	15.08 ±3.29	13.92 ±4.10	64.35 ±12.05
		Low (48)	35.52 ±6.14	13.92 ±3.97	14.48 ±4.94	63.92 ±12.73
	Wives	High (54)	35.19 ±8.59	14.65 ±3.80	12.52 ±5.19	62.35 ±15.25
		Low (45)	37.62 ±5.34	14.36 ±3.97	15.27 ±4.15	67.24 ±9.00
Cognitive self-consciousness	Husbands	High (60)	36.77 ±6.62	15.23 ±3.76	15.13 ±4.43	67.13 ±11.17
		Low (48)	34.83 ±5.53	12.92 ±3.92	13.04 ±5.42	60.79 ±11.82
	Wives	High (62)	38.32 ±4.24	15.23 ±3.30	15.87 ±4.09	69.42 ±9.04
		Low (62)	33.52 ±8.09	12.58 ±4.23	14.32 ±3.98	60.42 ±13.43
MCQ-H Total	Husbands	High (42)	36.10 ±7.44	14.10 ±4.39	14.67 ±4.37	64.86 ±14.01
		Low (46)	37.00 ±6.49	14.74 ±3.65	16.39 ±3.37	68.13 ±11.51
	Wives	High (46)	34.48 ±9.07	14.22 ±4.66	14.74 ±5.00	63.44 ±6.24
		Low (51)	36.84 ±6.90	14.06 ±3.70	16.33 ±3.90	67.24 ±10.10

Non-significant univariate main effects of 'Spouses' on Dyadic consensus (F (1/208) = 000, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/208) = 0.725, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/208) = 0.532, $p > 0.05$); and DAS-H Total (F (1/208) = 0.339, $p > 0.05$). The results also showed significant univariate main effects of 'Levels of cognitive confidence' on Dyadic consensus (F(1/208) = 17.581, $p < 0.01$); Dyadic cohesion (F(1/208) = 8.337, $p < 0.01$); Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/208) = 7.493, $p < 0.01$); and DAS-H Total (F(1/208) = 19.803, $p < 0.01$), However, univariate interaction effect of 'Spouses x Levels of cognitive confidence' was not observed to be significant respectively on Dyadic consensus (F(1/208) = 0.373, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F(1/208) = 0.143, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/208) = 0.069, $p > 0.05$); and DAS-H Total (F(1/208) = 0.014, $p > 0.05$).

Results elicited non-significant univariate main effects of 'Spouses' on Dyadic consensus (F (1/204) = 0.054, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/204) = 0.356, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/204) = 0.722, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/ 204) = 0.139, $p > 0.05$), and non-significant univariate interaction effects of 'Spouses × Levels of superstition, punishment and responsibility' (SPR) on Dyadic consensus (F (1/204) = 0.127, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/204) = 0.817, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/204) = 1.003, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/ 204) = 0.211, $p > 0.05$). Results also manifested non-significant univariate main effects of 'Levels of superstition, punishment and responsibility' (SPR) on Dyadic consensus (F (1/204) = 0.087, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/204) = 0.303, $p > 0.05$); and DAS-H Total (F (1/ 204) = 0.650, $p > 0.05$) while significant main effect 'Levels of superstition, punishment and responsibility' (SPR) on Dyadic

satisfaction (F (1/204) = 5.258, $p < 0.05$). Post hoc mean comparisons displayed low scorer than high scorer participants on superstition, punishment and responsibility (SPR) facet of metacognitions manifested significantly higher level of dyadic satisfaction. Mean comparisons also exhibited that husbands and wives did not differ significantly from each other with regard to all measures of dyadic adjustment.

Results also revealed non-significant univariate main effects of 'Spouses' on Dyadic consensus (F (1/199) = 0.886, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/199) = 0.000, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/199) = 0.235, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/ 199) = 0.139, $p > 0.05$), and non-significant univariate main effects of 'Levels of uncontrollability and danger' on Dyadic consensus (F (1/199) = 1.605, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/199) = 1.852, $p > 0.05$); and DAS-H Total(F(1/ 999) = 1.555, $p > 0.05$), however, significant main effect of 'Levels of uncontrollability and danger' on Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/199) = 6.745, $p < 0.05$) and non-significant univariate interaction effects of 'Levels of uncontrollability and danger' on Dyadic consensus (F (1/199) = 1.204, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic cohesion (F (1/199) = 0.661, $p > 0.05$); Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/199) = 2.969, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/ 199) = 2.221, $p > 0.05$).

The results presented non-significant univariate main effects of 'Spouses' on Dyadic consensus (F(1/232) = 0.020, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic cohesion (F(1/232) = 0.116, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/232) = 2.943, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/232) = 0.400, $p > 0.05$), and significant univariate main effects of 'Levels of cognitive self-consciousness' on Dyadic consensus (F(1/232) = 16.296, $p < 0.01$), Dyadic cohesion(F(1/232) = 24.293, $p < 0.01$), Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/232) = 9.570, $p< 0.01$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/232) = 25.721, $p < 0.01$) and univariate insignificant interaction effects of 'Spouses × Levels of cognitive self-consciousness' on Dyadic consensus (F(1/232) = 2.961, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic cohesion (F(1/232) = 0.106, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/232) = 0.213, $p> 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/232) = 0.772, $p > 0.05$).

Non-significant univariate main effect of 'Spouses' on Dyadic consensus (F(1/185) = 0.640, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic cohesion (F(1/185) = 0.213, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/185) = 0.000, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/185) = 0.361, $p > 0.05$), and non-significant univariate interaction effect of 'Spouses × Levels of MCQ Total' on Dyadic consensus (F(1/185) = 0.434, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic cohesion (F(1/185) = 0.439, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic satisfaction (F(1/185) = 0.011, $p > 0.05$) and DAS-H Total (F(1/185) = 0.019, $p > 0.05$). However, results also revealed non-significant main effect of 'Levels of MCQ Total' on Dyadic consensus (F (1/185) = 2.174, $p > 0.05$), Dyadic cohesion (F (1/185) = 0.161, $p > 0.05$), and DAS-H Total (F (1/185) = 3.363, $p > 0.05$); whereas, significant effect on Dyadic satisfaction (F (1/185) = 7.218, $p < 0.01$). Post hoc mean comparisons proved that low scorer than high scorer spouses on MCQ Total measure displayed significantly higher level of dyadic satisfaction, while high and low scorer participants did not differ significantly from each other on dyadic adjustment like dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion and DAS-H Total measures.

DISCUSSION

In the present study results clearly difference between spouse was not found on any measures. However significant effects of Levels of cognitive confidence, cognitive self-consciousness and MCQ Total on dyadic consensus, dyadic cohesion, dyadic satisfaction and DAS-H Total were establish. Means decreased in cognitive confidence, cognitive self-consciousness and MCQ Total are related to increase in all the factors of marital adjustment. Results also manifested substantial effect SPR and uncontrollability and danger on dyadic satisfaction. Low scorer on SPR as compared to high scorers had significantly higher level of dyadic satisfaction. Though the paucity of studies relevant to present study, some indirect studies on adaptive metacognitions and meta-motions provide corroborative evidences (9), (12), (13), (14); (15).

Hojati et al., (2014) found that meta-cognition beliefs, positive beliefs about uncontrollability and danger, beliefs about cognitive competence, general negative beliefs, thought control, anxiety, reassessment and punishment, were significantly and negatively related with marital satisfaction, which is collaborative with the current outcomes. Rani and Jaiswal (2022) explored the effects of positive (adaptive) metacognitions and meta-emotions on marital Communication and manifested that 'confidence in setting flexible and feasible hierarchies of goals' (PMCEQ-H1) and 'confidence in interpreting own emotions as cues, restraining from immediate reaction and mind setting for problem solving' (PMCEQ-H2) factors of positive (adaptive) metacognitions and positive meta-emotions contributed to improved supportive communication and reduced aversive communication whereas 'confidence in extinguishing perseverative thoughts and emotions' (PMCEQ-H3) sub-factor had no effects on supportive communication (14).

Similarity Rani and Jaiswal, (2018) revealed that PMCEQ-H1 and PMCEQ-H2 substantially envisage marital satisfaction. Marital communication and marital satisfaction are the major factors in marital adjustment and adverse effect of maladaptive metacognition on marital adjustment can assumed with this reference, and present finding compliment it (15), (12). Rani and Jaiswal, (2021) studied the properties of meta-emotion on marital adjustment and found substantial effects of positive and negative meta-emotions on marital adjustment (13). Positive metacognitions and positive meta-emotions have also been found to have a positive and negative relationship with depression and life satisfaction, respectively (11). Hence, it can be assumed that presence of high level of positive metacognitions and positive meta-emotions may arm the couples with stress coping skills leading to better adaptation and well-being that may echo in high levels of supportive marital communication and low levels of aversive communication.

Financial support and sponsorship

This project was supported by UGC, New Delhi, India (University Grant Commination) under the program, Post-Doctoral Fellowship (No. F.15-1/2015-17/PDFWM-2015-17-UTT-31465 (SA-II)) awarded to the first author.

Conflicts of interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

(1) Beach, S.R.H., Tesser, A., Fincham, F.D., Jones, D.J., Johnson, D., & Whitker, D.J. (1998). Pleasure and pain in doing well, together: an investigation of performance–related affect in close relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 349 - 360.

(2) Cartwright-Hatton, S., & Wells, A. (1997). Beliefs about worry and intrusions: The Meta-Cognitions Questionnaire and its correlates. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 11*, 279–296.

(3) Crick, F. (1994). The Astonishing Hypothesis. Simon and Schuster

(4) Davila J, Bradbury TN, Cohan CL, Tochluk S. (1997). Marital functioning and depressive symptoms: Evidence for a stress generation model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 73, 849–861.

(5) Davila J, Karney BR, Hall TW, Bradbury TN. (2003). Depressive symptoms and marital satisfaction: Within-subject associations and the moderating effects of gender and neuroticism. *Journal of Family Psychology,* 17, 557–570.

(6) Dienes, Z., &Perner J. (1999). *A theory of implicit and explicit knowledge.* Cambridge University Press

(7) Erbek, E., Beştepe, E., Akar, H., Eradamlar, N., & Alpkan, R. L. (2005). *Evlilik Uyumu. Düşünen Adam, 18(1)*, 39-47.

(8) Goldfarb, M. R., & Trudel, G. (2019). Marital quality and depression: A review. *Marriage & Family Review, 55*(8), 737–763.

(9) Hojati, N., Yousefi, Z. & Sajadian, E. (2014). Predicting marital satisfaction: Meta-cognition, thought control and resiliency. *Comprehensive Research Journal of Education and General Studies, 2(6)*, 138 – 143.

(10) Jaiswal, A.K., Singh, L.N., Rani, R., Sarraf, S.R., Pandy, D., Sharma, P., Varsha Pandey, V., & Vishwakarma, N. (2021). Standardization and Validation of Hindi Version of Metacognitions Questionnaire in Indian Sample. *Indian Journal of Psychology and Education, 11, (2),* 76- 86.

(11) Jaiswal, A.K., Singh, L.N., Rani, R., Sarraf, S.R., & Pandey, D. (2017). Standardization and validation of Hindi version of positive metacognitions and meta-emotions questionnaire. Indian Journal of Positive Psychology, 8, 547-553.

(12) Rani, R., & Jaiswal, A.K. (2018). Role of positive metacognitions and meta-emotions in marital satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Review, 7*(3), 196-203.

(13) Rani, R., & Jaiswal, A.K. (2021). Differential effects of positive and negative meta-emotions on marital adjustment. *Indian Journal of Psychological Science, 14 (2),* 55-63.

(14) Rani, R., & Jaiswal, A.K. (2022). Effects of Positive Metacognitions and Positive Meta-emotions on Marital Communication. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology 13(3),* 202-206.

(15) Rani, R., Sarraf, S.R., Pandey, D., & Jaiswal, A.K. (2017). Positive meta-cognitions and meta-emotions facilitate marital adjustment. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing, 8*(11), 1409-1413.

(16) Rani, R., Singh, L.N., & Jaiswal, A.K. (2019). Factorial validation of Hindi version of Dyadic Adjustment Scale. *International Journal of Social Sciences, 7(5-II),* 1397-1303.

(17) Spada, M., Nikcevic, A., Moneta, G.B., & Ireson, J. (2006). Metacognitions as a mediator of the effect of test anxiety on a surface approach to studying. *Educational Psychology, 26 (5),* 615-625.

(18) Spada, M.M., Mohiyeddini, C., & Wells, A. (2008). Measuring metacognitions associated with emotional distress: Factor structure and predictive validity of the Metacognitions Questionnaire 30. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 45(3), 238–242.

(19) Spanier, G.B., & Cole, C.L. (1976). Toward classification and investigation of marital adjustment. *International Journal of Sociology of Family, 6,* 121 – 146.

(20) Wells, A. (2000). *Emotional disorders and metacognition: Innovative cognitive therapy*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

(21) Wells, A., & Matthews, G. (1994). *Attention and emotion: a clinical perspective*. Hove, UK: Erlbaum.

(22) Yılmaz, A.E., Gençöz, T., & Wells, A. (2011). The temporal precedence of metacognition in the development of anxiety and depression symptoms in the context of life-stress: A prospective study. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 25 (3),* 389-396.