

~~JAN 1 1968~~ et 11/26/69

~~AUG 3 1968~~ 6 31

~~JAN 24 1970~~

~~APR 5 1971~~ 5

~~FEB 2 1976~~ 3

~~AUG 28 1978~~ 4

~~SEP 21 1978~~ 54

ABSTRACT

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS AND MARITAL ADJUSTMENT

by Denna J. Palonen

The study of marital adjustment (MA) as it relates to personality variables was extended, for both self report (SR) and mate image (MI) descriptions. Two measures of MA, the Locke Scale and an adaptation of van der Veen's "Family Concept Inventory", and two personality measures, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (PPS) and LaForge's Interpersonal Check List (ICL), were administered to 40 married student couples with children. Tests were administered in group situations that prevented collaboration of husbands and wives.

Correlations between husbands and wives on the MA measures were higher than expected (ranging from .58 to .69); explanations other than a testing situation that prevents collaboration between marital partners must be considered for previous findings.

For ICL data, the correlations between MI discrepancy scores and MA were significant; between SR discrepancy scores and MA, the correlation was not significant but in the appropriate direction. Correlations between PPS discrepancy scores and MA were not significant for SR or MI data.

Correlations of specific personality variables with MA scores indicate that happy marriages tend to be those in which the wife is described by herself and by her spouse as rather submissive and loving, and in which the husband is not described as submissive by his wife or as submissive and loving

Donna J. Palonen

by himself. The PPS measure of need Heterosexuality was negatively correlated with MA in every comparison.

Approved J. P. R. Hurler
Chairman, Thesis Committee

Date 12 August 1966

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS AND MARITAL ADJUSTMENT

by

Donna J. Palonen

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1966

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the thoughtful assistance of Dr. John Hurley through every stage of its development and completion, this undertaking would not have been possible; my warmest thanks are extended to him. I also want to express my gratitude to Dr. William Stellwagen and Dr. Eertram Karon for their helpful suggestions and understanding patience.

Thanks are due to the married couples who served as subjects for this study.

The research for this study was completed during the tenure of a Predoctoral Fellowship from the National Institute of Mental Health, United States Public Health Services. Sincere thanks are due to them for the freedom that permitted the writer to fully invest herself in this research, and for the funds that allowed payment of subjects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of tables	iv
List of appendices	v
Introduction	1
Method	5
Results	9
Discussion	13
Summary	18
References	19
Appendices	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Correlations between MA scores of husband and wife in various studies	4
2.	Correlations between total discrepancy score and couples' Total MA	10
3.	Correlations of Total MA with ICL variables	11
4.	Correlations of Total MA with FPS variables	12

INTRODUCTION

Marital adjustment has been promisingly studied within the framework of interpersonal perception. In Tharp's 1963 review of the literature, congruence of self descriptions of mates was consistently reported to be positively correlated with marital adjustment (MA) measures. However, Tharp also noted that even larger correlations have been found between MA on the one hand, and congruence of self report (SR) and mate image (MI) on the other; that is, a person who perceives his spouse as similar to himself will tend to be more happily married than one who perceives his spouse as different from himself. More recently, the investigation of MI congruence, or degree of similarity between the husband's view of his wife and her view of him, has been added to the picture (Hurley and Silvert, 1966).

Two recent studies have focused on MA in relation to personality variables of the marital partners. Hoeg (1965) administered two MA measures, the Locke scale (Locke and Wallace, 1959) and Hurvitz's "Marital Roles Inventory" (Hurvitz, 1960), to a group of volunteer Michigan State Police officers and their wives; on the basis of these scores, he formed a "well-adjusted" group of 11 couples and a "less well-adjusted" group of 11 couples, and compared the two groups in terms of discrepancy scores derived from their completion of LaForge's (1963) Interpersonal Check List (ICL), administered under SR and MI instructions. Results varied from those reviewed by Tharp, in that SR congruence failed to correlate significantly with couples' MA scores ($r = -.05$), although congruence of MI was significantly related to MA ($r = .34$, $p < .05$). Hoeg also found several specific personality variables which correlated significantly with couples' MA: husbands who described themselves higher on variables labelled Competitive and Sadistic tended to be less happily married, and husbands who described

their wives as relatively high on variables Aggressive, Rebellious, or Self-effacing tended to be less happily married.

Powell (1965) did a similar study using the Edwards (1959) Personal Preference Schedule (PPS) and a new Q-sort measure of family adjustment (van der Veen, et. al., 1964) as an index of MA. Her sample consisted of 23 volunteer student and church group couples, and the results were in the same direction as the Hoeg data. Congruency of SR was almost significantly related to couples' MA ($\underline{r} = .34$, $p < .06$) but MI congruency was even more so ($\underline{r} = .55$, $p < .01$). Some specific personality variables also reached significance: the more happily married husbands were those who described their wives as being higher on need Change, higher on need Endurance, and lower on need Heterosexuality.

One outstanding feature of both the Hoeg and Powell studies is that all personality variables related significantly to couples' MA are concerned with descriptions made by the husband, either of himself or his wife. This suggests that observations and beliefs of the husband are more crucial than are the views of the wife in determining marital happiness for both partners.

The present study is in part a replication and extension of the Hoeg and Powell findings. Personality measures from both previous studies are utilized, as are the Locke MA scale and a revised version of the van der Veen, et. al., measure. Information regarding the generality of the former findings, in addition to a view in greater depth of the personality attributes related to the role of a married college student should result from using a more representative sample of couples from married housing units at Michigan State University (MSU).

The Silvert and Hoeg designs did not prevent collaboration of husband and wife while the MA ratings were being obtained. Hofman (1966), however, found notably lower correlations between adjustment scores of husband and

wife than those generally reported in the literature under conditions which did not allow communication in the testing situation. Results of the three studies are summarized in Table 1. By preventing communication between marital partners during data collection, the present study will also attempt to verify Hoffman's results.

A major drawback of previous findings is the possible non-representativeness of samples because of the necessity to include volunteer couples only. In the present study, a modified sampling procedure will be used in an attempt to draw a more representative sample.

On the basis of these considerations, the following hypotheses will be explored.

Hypothesis I. Congruence of SR between husband and wife on the personality measures is related to couples' MA scores.

Hypothesis II. Congruence of MI between husband and wife on the personality measures is related to couples' MA.

Hypothesis III. Congruency in spouses' MI is more highly related to couples' MA than congruency of SR.

Hypothesis IV. Certain personality variables are related to couples' MA scores. Specifically:

- (1) MA is correlated with husbands' SR scores on the ICL variables C (Competitive) and D (Sadistic).
- (2) MA is correlated with husbands' MI scores on the ICL variables E (Aggressive), F (Rebellious), and H (Self-effacing).
- (3) MA is correlated with husbands' SR scores on the PPS variable need Change.
- (4) MA is correlated with husbands' SR scores on the PPS variables need Endurance and need Heterosexuality.

Table 1. Correlations between MA scores of husband and wife in various studies.

MA measure	Hoeg	Powell	Hoffman
Locke	.58		.28
Hurvitz	.44		.46
Composite of Locke and Hurvitz	.74		
FCI Q-sort		.12	.30
FCI true-false			.14

METHOD

Subjects. Forty couples from MSU married housing comprised the sample (one additional couple was dropped because, due to an apparent lack of understanding of the instructions, their answer sheets were incorrectly completed, and corrections could not be arranged). The selection of couples residing in two-bedroom units restricted the sample to married students with children; this excluded the very newly married couples.

Five buildings, each with 8 or 12 apartments, were randomly selected from a list of all two-bedroom buildings on campus. Letters were sent to each eligible couple (eligibility consisted of student status for one member of the marital pair, which excluded couples where one partner was a faculty member and the other a non-student), explaining briefly the nature of the research, the amount of time required, and the payment fee of \$20.00 per couple for participation in the experiment. Out of 48 requests for participation, 41 couples completed all the test materials. Of the couples who did not participate, two reported a lack of time, one of the husbands was out of town at the time of testing, one couple could not arrange to come to the testing place, and three were not interested but gave no further reason.

Of the 40 couples included, the number of years of marriage ranged from 1 to 17, with a mean of 5.9; number of children ranged from 1 to 4, with a mean of 1.7 (mdn., 1). The age range for husbands was 20 to 43 (mean, 28.9), and for wives was 19 to 39 (mean, 26.6). Fourteen of the husbands were undergraduates, 26 were graduate students; 4 wives were undergraduates, and 4 were graduate students. Nine of the husbands maintained full time jobs, and 11 worked part time (30 hours per week or less); 9 of the wives worked

full time and 4 worked part time; 20 wives were not students and did not list an occupation (except "homemaker" or "housewife").

Procedure. Thirty-eight of the 40 couples were tested in groups ranging in size from 1 to 14 couples; husbands and wives were tested simultaneously and separated by seating them on opposite ends of the room. Circumstances made it necessary for two of the couples to complete the tests at home, away from the experimenter. The importance of independently completing the forms was stressed to these couples; however, lack of communication cannot be guaranteed in these instances. (An examination of the data from these 2 couples indicated that they did not differ in any significant way from others in the sample. Therefore, it was not necessary to exclude them from any of the analyses.)

Each subject was given a packet of test materials with an instruction sheet and allowed to work at his own speed. The order was the same for everyone:

(1) Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, completed with SR and MI instructions:

Read each pair of statements and decide which is more characteristic of what you like or how you feel. Then decide which is more characteristic of what your spouse likes or feels.

If the same statement of the pair applies to both of you, indicate this by marking an "S" in the appropriate space on the answer sheet.

If different statements apply to you and your spouse, then make the usual mark under the letter corresponding to the statement that is most characteristic of you.

For example, if statement A is more characteristic of both you and your spouse, make an "S" under A on the answer sheet.

If A is more characteristic of you while B is more characteristic of your spouse, then mark A on the answer sheet in the usual manner.

Sometimes it is difficult to decide between the two statements, but do your best on each item without skipping any.

(2) Interpersonal Check List, completed with SR and MI instructions:

For each item, decide whether the characteristic applies to you; then decide whether it applies to your spouse.

If it applies to both of you, make an "S" on the answer sheet under "true".

If it applies to neither of you, make an "S" on the answer sheet under "false".

If it applies to you but not to your spouse, mark the "true" column of the answer sheet in the usual manner.

If it applies to your spouse but not to you, mark the "false" column of the answer sheet in the usual manner.

Do not omit any items.

- (3) An adaption of van der Veen's "Family Concept Inventory", in a 5-choice format.
- (4) The Locke scale of marital adjustment.

Measuring instruments. The PPS is a forced choice inventory in which an attempt was made to control for social desirability; measures of 15 personality variables, labelled needs, are provided: Achievement, Deference, Order, Exhibition, Autonomy, Affiliation, Intraception, Succorance, Dominance, Abasement, Nurturance, Change, Endurance, Heterosexuality, and Aggression. In addition, a measure of Consistency, the number of identical choices made in 2 sets of the same 15 items, is provided. Coefficients of internal consistency for these variables have been found to range from .60 to .87; stability coefficients (with a one-week interval) range from .74 to .88.

The ICL consists of a series of 134 personality characteristics; subjects are required to answer "true" or "false" to each item as it applies to them (or to their spouse, in this study). It is scorable in a variety of ways, ranging from global factor scores to specific scores determined by the eight items constituting each basic variable. In this study, scores for the 16 basic personality variables were obtained; these variables have been labelled and arranged in a circular profile in which opposite elements represent opposing variables. The scales are A- Managerial, B- Narcissistic, C- Competitive, D- Sadistic, E- Aggressive, F- Rebellious, G- Distrustful, H- Self-effacing, I- Masochistic, J- Docile, K- Dependent, L- Cooperative, M- Over-conventional, N- Hypernormal, O- Responsible, P- Autocratic. Scores for these scales can be combined by using a formula based upon trigonometric considerations (LaForge, 1963, p. 42) to provide scores on two more global dimensions, Love-Hate (LH) and Dominance-Submission (DS). An additional score, Nic, or total number of items answered "true", has been found to be

related to Acquiescence Response Style, or a "willingness to talk". Test-retest reliability coefficients for the 16 variables range from .64 to .77. Internal consistency measures range from .51 to .86 for the 16 basic variables, and are above .90 for the summary scores.

In the present study, SR and MI instructions provide a score for Non-identical Responses, or the number of items in which each subject reports a different answer for self than for spouse, in both the ICL and PPS.

The FCI used in this study is a new adaption of the original Q-sort measure reported by van der Veen. Hoffman administered both the Q-sort and a true-false version of the measure to the same subjects, and reported a correlation between the two of .72. To facilitate a wider distribution of scores, the true-false items were administered with instructions to check one of five categories (strongly agree, tend to agree, neutral, tend to disagree, strongly disagree) rather than just "true" or "false". Median test-retest reliabilities of .71 and .80 have been reported for the Q-sort form. In the present study, the split-half reliability of the 5-choice form was .85.

The Locke scale consists of 15 basic or fundamental items used in previous MA measures; possible scores range from 2 to 158. For a sample of 236, Locke and Wallace (1959) reported a split-half reliability coefficient of .90, as well as good discrimination between a well-adjusted group and a mal-adjusted group of marriages (mean adjustment scores were 135.9 and 71.7, respectively).

RESULTS

All data was analyzed by means of product-moment correlation coefficients; two-tailed tests and a significance level of .05 were used.

The correlation between MA scores of husband and wife on the Locke scale was .58; on the FCI it was .65; on a composite score that assigns equal weight to both MA measures, the correlation between husband and wife was .69; correlations between FCI and Locke scores were .72 for husbands, .69 for wives, and .73 for the combined groups of husbands and wives. On the basis of these substantial correlations, it was decided to use composite MA scores in further analyses; T-scores were used to assign equal weight to each MA measure and to both husband and wife. In this way, a couples' Total Adjustment Score (Total MA) was derived for each couple.

A total discrepancy score, the summed raw score differences between husband and wife on each personality test was computed for each couple, for both SR and MI data. This is the same measure used in the Hoeg (1965) and Powell (1965) studies. The results are reported in Table 2. The difference between the MA vs. MI and MA vs. SR discrepancy correlations was not significant. Correlations between Total MA and specific personality variables are reported in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 2. Correlations between total discrepancy score and couples' Total MA.

	ICL	PFS
SR	-.17	-.12
MI	-.39*	.01
<u>r</u> between SR and MI	.39	.02

* $p < .05$

Table 3. Correlations of Total MA with ICL variables.

	Self Report		Mate Image	
	husband	wife	husband	wife
A- Managerial	.12	-.30	-.19	.06
B- Narcissistic	.11	-.08	-.00	.04
C- Competitive	.08	-.15	-.09	-.06
D- Sadistic	.22	-.30	.02	-.12
E- Aggressive	.20	-.40*	-.43*	-.04
F- Rebellious	-.20	-.47*	-.65*	-.25
G- Distrustful	-.17	-.42*	-.42*	-.42*
H- Self-effacing	-.31*	.14	.05	-.26
I- Masochistic	-.34*	.39*	.18	-.12
J- Docile	.13	.27	.18	-.07
K- Dependent	-.32*	.22	.26	-.09
L- Cooperative	-.47*	-.05	.00	-.24
M- Over-conventional	-.08	.08	.24	.03
N- Hypernormal	-.31*	.12	.49*	.07
O- Responsible	-.10	.17	.43*	.13
P- Autocratic	.16	-.37*	.07	-.21
Love-Hate	-.22	.40*	.51*	.12
Dominance-Submission	.27	-.28	.08	.21
Nic	-.24	-.15	.02	-.21

*p < .05

Table 4. Correlations of Total MA with PPS variables.

	Self Report		Mate Image	
	husband	wife	husband	wife
nAchievement	.05	.01	.16	-.13
nDeference	.04	.08	.24	-.21
nOrder	.20	.33*	.03	.14
nExhibition	.15	-.08	-.02	-.04
nAutonomy	-.06	.01	-.29	.22
nAffiliation	-.08	-.03	.11	.10
nIntracception	-.07	-.08	.22	.02
nSuccorance	-.08	.07	-.22	.09
nDominance	.23	.13	.11	.29
nAbasement	-.30	.24	.00	.08
nNurturance	-.08	-.10	.27	.06
nChange	.21	-.09	-.12	.11
nEndurance	.18	.03	.21	-.20
nHeterosexuality	-.39*	-.37*	-.38*	-.36*
nAggression	-.05	-.07	-.30	-.01
Consistency	-.31*	.02	-.22	-.16

*p < .05

DISCUSSION

Correlation of spouses' MA scores. The unexpectedly high correlations between husbands and wives on the MA measures are difficult to explain. The low correlations reported by Hofman, previously assumed to be due to the experimental procedure of preventing communication of husband and wife during testing, must now be reconciled in some other way.

The most obvious explanation seems to be differences in the nature of samples in various studies. The present sample, all student couples with children, and the Hoeg sample, all State Police, are more restricted than those used by Powell (some student couples and some couples from a church group) and Hofman (some student couples and some couples seeking help for disturbed children).

The implication from the present sample is that happily married people tend to be married to each other, and unhappily married people tend to be married to each other. This is not surprising. In his classical study of marital happiness, Terman (1938) found an almost identical correlation (.59) between total happiness scores of husband and wife. His comment remains applicable: "It is inadmissible that in so complementary a relationship as marriage the fortunes of either could in general be independent of the partner's" (Terman, 1938, p. 81).

However, this dependence is far from complete. Only 47.5% of the covariance is accounted for in the composite correlation of .69 between husbands and wives. Over half of the covariance remains unpredictable from a knowledge of spouses MA. Thus, it seems that "marital adjustment of a couple" is not as meaningful a measure as is the "marital adjustment of a husband or wife." In order to predict the happiness of one member of a marital pair, crucial factors other than the happiness of his partner must be sought.

Discrepancy scores and Total MA. Results for correlations between ICL discrepancy scores and MA measures were highly consistent with those reported by Hoeg. The correlation for MI was significant; that for SR was not significant, but in the appropriate direction. Thus, it seems verified that similarity of spouses' descriptions of each other on the ICL is positively related to marital adjustment.

Correlations between PPS discrepancy scores and MA were not significant for SR or MI data. This is in contradiction with Powell's findings, and seems difficult to reconcile with results of the ICL discrepancy scores. Among several possibilities, two explanations seem most cogent. (1) Completing the PPS is a tedious task, and one in which unmotivated subjects might be expected to be careless; in the present study, subjects were paid, and were subjected to a longer testing session than in the Powell study. An examination of other data, however, makes lack of motivation an unlikely explanation for the present findings. The relatively high consistency scores would not be expected from unmotivated subjects. Also, the number of distinctive responses (those in which a different response is indicated for self and spouse) does not decrease in the second half of the inventory although the amount of effort required to give a distinctive response seems to be slightly greater. These considerations make lack of motivation an unlikely explanation for the lack of significant correlation between ICL discrepancy scores and MA.

(2) An alternative view stems from indications that husbands and wives in the present sample are more different from each other, or perceive more differences between themselves. Thus, fewer items were answered with the same response for both SR and MI in the present sample than in that of Powell. Because the PPS is controlled for social desirability and the ICL is not, it is reasonable to assume that perceived differences between self and spouse are more likely to show up on the PPS, especially when the subjects

are relatively happy in their marriage, as they are in the present sample. This seems to be the most appropriate explanation for confirming results on the ICL but not on the PPS.

Results, then, did not confirm Hypothesis I, although correlations for both ICL and PPS data were in the appropriate direction. Hypothesis II was supported by the ICL data, but not by the PPS data; therefore, Hypothesis II was partially confirmed.

Hypothesis III was not confirmed; in fact, correlations for the PPS discrepancy scores fall slightly in the opposite direction from that which was hypothesized. The fact that MA correlated more highly, even though not significantly, with MI congruency than with SR congruency on the ICL is intriguing, especially since this variable has been overlooked in the literature for so long. Hurley and Silvert (1966) have pointed out that this finding would be expected because of the interactional character of marital relationships. Seemingly, discrepancies between self reports could hardly have an effect on the relationship if not perceived by the respective spouses, although this conclusion is not confirmed by the present data.

Specific variables. Hypothesis IV was partially confirmed: three of the eight previously reported significant correlations between Total MA and personality measures were also significant here. All three, Aggression, Rebelliousness, and need Heterosexuality, involve the husband's perception of their wives, and all are in the negative direction. The conclusion can be reached that the marital adjustment of a couple tends to be lower when the wife is described by her husband as aggressive, rebellious, or highly heterosexual.

This seems to suggest that happy marriages, in general, are those in which the wife fulfills the role she is expected to fill, at least in her husband's eyes. Interestingly enough, Corsini (1956) has reported that

marital happiness is related to the degree to which men conform to a cultural stereotype, although he did not find this relationship with women. A further look at the present data can clarify this point.

In general, significant results from Tables 2 and 3 can be summarized by saying that happy marriages tend to be those in which the wife is described by herself and by her spouse as rather submissive and loving, and in which the husband is not described as submissive by his wife or as submissive and loving by himself. This implies that well-adjusted marriages tend to be those in which both partners fill stereotyped roles: The husband dominates and the wife willingly complies to his wishes and concentrates on making him happy.

The PPS measure of need Heterosexuality was the most consistent personality variable studied. In both SR and MI data, for both husband and wife, MA was significantly related to lower scores on this measure. This implies that happily married people are less interested in sex than unhappily married people. The cause and effect problem remains unanswered here. Perhaps a high need Heterosexuality score implies an excessive concern for sexual activity, to the exclusion of other things that are at least equally important in marriage; or, it might be true that unhappily married people are likely to score high on need Heterosexuality because they are quite aware of their own inadequate sex life and are looking for something better.

Implications for further research. Although the roles of both husband and wife seem important to marital adjustment, the relative importance of them is left in doubt. Corsini reports that the husband's role is more crucial, while present results suggest the wife's role is, although both play a part. Further research is necessary to clarify this point.

The measurement of MA is an area that remains uncertain. Although traditional measures have been found to correlate highly with each other, it remains to be seen whether they are measuring a really meaningful aspect of marriage. Perhaps, for example, they are reflecting some kind of social conformity, and high scorers tend to be those who are compelled, for one reason or another, to say positive things about themselves and their marriages. Future research could initiate a measure of social conformity as a control for this.

Another possible advancement in the measurement of MA might be the use of sophisticated clinicians to rate marriages on the basis of interview material. Or, an experimental setting utilizing a problem-solving or conflict situation might be beneficial in an examination of marital adjustment; examples of this type of procedure can be found in Feldman and Rand (1965) and Ryder and Flint (1963).

The nature of the present sample must be considered before generalizing any findings. The 85% turnout is high in comparison with other studies; generalization to other married student populations seems justified, although other variables, such as size of the university or college and geographical location, may be important to consider. In view of differences between data from this study and those of Hoeg, Powell, and Hofman, generalization to a non-student population must remain tentative, pending results of further work in the area.

SUMMARY

The study of marital adjustment (MA) as it relates to personality variables was extended, for both self report (SR) and mate image (MI) descriptions. Two measures of MA, the Locke scale and an adaptation of van der Veen's "Family Concept Inventory", and two personality measures, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (PPS) and LaForge's Interpersonal Check List (ICL), were administered to 40 married student couples with children. Tests were administered in group situations that prevented collaboration of husbands and wives.

Correlations between husbands and wives on the MA measures were higher than expected (ranging from .58 to .69); explanations other than a testing situation that prevents collaboration between marital partners must be considered for previous findings.

For ICL data, the correlations between MI discrepancy scores and MA were significant; between SR discrepancy scores and MA, the correlation was not significant but in the appropriate direction. Correlations between PPS discrepancy scores and MA were not significant for SR or MI data.

Correlations of specific personality variables with MA scores indicate that happy marriages tend to be those in which the wife is described by herself and by her spouse as rather submissive and loving, and in which the husband is not described as submissive by his wife or as submissive and loving by himself. The PPS measure of need Heterosexuality was negatively correlated with MA in every comparison.

REFERENCES

- Corsini, Raymond J. Understanding and similarity in marriage. J. Abn. Soc. Psychol., 52: 327-332, 1956.
- Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Feldman, Harold, and Rand, Martin E. Egocentrism-altercentrism in the husband-wife relationship. J. Marr. Fam., 27: 386-391, 1965.
- Hoeg, Bion L. Marital adjustment and the comparison of personality descriptions of mates. Unpublished masters thesis, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Hofman, Kees. An investigation of the construct validity of marital adjustment and the similarity between marital adjustment of spouses. Unpublished masters thesis, Michigan State University, 1966.
- Hurley, John R. and Silvert, Diane M. Mate-image congruity and marital adjustment. Submitted to the American Psychological Association, 1966.
- Hurvitz, N. The measurement of marital strain. Amer. J. Sociol., 60: 47-51, 1960.
- LaForge, Rolfe. Research use of the ICL. Oregon Research Institute Technical Report, Vol. 3, No. 4, Oct., 1963.
- Locke, Harvey J. and Wallace, Karl M. Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: their reliability and validity. Marr. Fam. Liv., 21: 251-256, 1959.
- Powell, Diane M. A personality inventory approach to the study of marital adjustment. Unpublished masters thesis, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Ryder, R. G. and Flint, A. A. Vicissitudes of marital disputes: the Object Matching Test. Unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1963.
- Terman, Lewis M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.
- Tharp, Roland G. Psychological patterning in marriage. Psychol. Bull., 60: 97-117, 1963.
- van der Veen, Ferdinand. The family-concept Q-sort. Unpublished mimeographed paper, 1963.

Appendix A. Letter sent to prospective subjects

Donna Palonen
Graduate Student
Department of Psychology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Dear Mr. and Mrs.

I am a graduate student in psychology and am planning a research project dealing with married college students and their families. I have randomly selected a number of married housing units for study, and yours is included. All couples in your building are being asked to participate.

It would be very helpful to me if both of you would agree to participate in this research project. This would involve one session of approximately three hours, to be spent in filling out true-false type questionnaires. Each couple that completes the procedure will receive \$20.00 for their time and effort.

Your cooperation is very important; I hope you will be able to help me out. I will be reaching you by telephone some time in the next week or two to arrange a time that is convenient, if this meets with your approval.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Donna Palonen

LOCKE SCALE

[illegible]

Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Handling family finances:
Matters of recreation:
Demonstrations of affection
Friends
Sex Relations
Conventionality (right, good or proper conduct)
Philosophy of life
Ways of dealing with in-laws

Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? All of them _____, some of them _____, very few of them _____, none of them _____?

In leisure time do you generally prefer: to be "on the go" _____, to stay at home ?

Does your mate generally prefer: to be "on the go" . to stay at home ?

Do you ever wish you had not married? Frequently ____, occasionally ____, rarely ____, never ____.

If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: marry the same person _____, marry a different person _____, not marry at all _____?

Do you confide in your mate: almost never _____, rarely _____, in most things _____, in everything _____?

Appendix C.

FAMILY CONCEPT INVENTORY

Instructions: Indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following items as it applies to your immediate family (husband or wife and children) and encircle the letter(s) representing the appropriate response. First impressions are satisfactory, and most people are able to complete this inventory in ten minutes. It is quite important that you give a response to each item, even though it may sometimes be difficult to make a decision.

	<u>SA</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>SD</u>
	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Tend to Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</u>	<u>Tend to Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1. We usually can depend on each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
2. We have a number of close friends.	SA	a	N	d	SD
3. We feel secure when we are with each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
4. We do many things together.	SA	a	N	d	SD
5. Each of us wants to tell the others what to do.	SA	a	N	d	SD
6. There are serious differences in our standards and values.	SA	a	N	d	SD
7. We feel free to express any thoughts or feelings to each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
8. Our home is the center of our activities.	SA	a	N	d	SD
9. We are an affectionate family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
10. It is not our fault that we are having difficulties.	SA	a	N	d	SD
11. Little problems often become big ones for us.	SA	a	N	d	SD
12. We do not understand each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
13. We get along very well in the community.	SA	a	N	d	SD
14. We often praise or compliment each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
15. We do not talk about sex.	SA	a	N	d	SD
16. We get along much better with persons outside the family. than with each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
17. We are proud of our family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
18. We do not like each other's friends.	SA	a	N	d	SD
19. There are many conflicts in our family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
20. We are usually calm and relaxed when we are together.	SA	a	N	d	SD
21. We respect each other's privacy.	SA	a	N	d	SD
22. Accomplishing what we want to do seems to be difficult for us.	SA	a	N	d	SD
23. We tend to worry about many things.	SA	a	N	d	SD
24. We are continually getting to know each other better.	SA	a	M	d	SD
25. We encourage each other to develop in his or her own individual way.	SA	a	N	d	SD
26. We have warm, close relationships with each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
27. Together we can overcome almost any difficulty.	SA	a	N	d	SD
28. We really do trust and confide in each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
29. The family has always been very important to us.	SA	a	N	d	SD
30. We get more than our share of illness.	SA	a	N	d	SD
31. We are considerate of each other.	SA	a	N	d	SD
32. We can stand up for our rights if necessary.	SA	a	N	d	SD
33. We have very good times together.	SA	a	N	d	SD
34. We live largely by other people's standards and values.	SA	a	N	d	SD
35. Usually each of us goes his own separate way.	SA	a	N	d	SD
36. We resent each other's outside activities.	SA	a	N	d	SD
37. We have respect for each other's feelings and opinions even when we differ strongly.	SA	a	N	d	SD
38. We sometimes wish we could be an entirely different family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
39. We are sociable and really enjoy being with people.	SA	a	N	d	SD
40. We are a disorganized family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
41. We are not really fond of one another.	SA	a	N	d	SD
42. We are a strong, competent family.	SA	a	N	d	SD
43. We just cannot tell each other our real feelings.	SA	a	N	d	SD
44. We are not satisfied with anything short of perfection.	SA	a	N	d	SD
45. We forgive each other easily.	SA	a	N	d	SD
46. We usually reach decisions by discussion and compromise.	SA	a	N	d	SD
47. We can adjust well to new situations.	SA	a	N	d	SD
48. Our decisions are not our own, but are forced on us by circumstances.	SA	a	N	d	SD

Appendix D. Marital adjustment scores.

couple	Locke		FCI		Total MA
	husband	wife	husband	wife	
1	125	126	148	153	207
2	121	128	171	162	220
3	121	136	177	175	231
4	110	131	170	171	220
5	139	108	159	150	208
6	119	107	126	159	189
7	126	153	159	167	230
8	136	142	172	185	241
9	96	85	120	111	149
10	125	145	153	174	226
11	102	125	166	168	212
12	120	135	143	186	222
13	139	118	154	143	207
14	100	110	150	160	194
15	146	120	179	170	232
16	43	51	94	91	95
17	127	122	162	175	222
18	118	146	158	182	229
19	120	151	169	184	239
20	126	115	142	145	197
21	67	103	104	120	143
22	85	129	162	148	196
23	112	139	151	141	208
24	109	127	168	127	198
25	141	139	166	165	231
26	89	98	136	161	181
27	150	144	164	153	231
28	94	134	165	169	211
29	105	85	132	159	178
30	55	117	82	128	139
31	84	98	134	104	153
32	107	113	157	160	201
33	137	137	167	165	229
34	116	147	117	166	206
35	31	105	97	145	139
36	122	149	150	180	229
37	91	95	104	125	151
38	95	121	147	170	200
39	144	157	180	182	253
40	121	95	126	109	164

Appendix E. Husbands' ICL self description scores.

couple	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	IH	DS
1	4	5	4	4	4	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	4	19	30
2	1	2	4	4	3	4	5	5	2	2	4	1	4	3	0	4	16	17
3	3	3	2	6	4	2	3	4	4	5	6	4	7	6	5	5	32	21
4	3	7	5	7	6	4	5	3	3	5	5	2	5	4	2	5	14	26
5	7	3	4	7	6	4	4	5	2	4	3	2	2	2	1	4	11	24
6	5	6	2	7	5	3	3	1	1	4	3	2	2	2	1	6	14	32
7	2	7	5	6	6	4	3	0	3	4	4	4	5	3	4	5	19	30
8	7	7	5	6	6	3	3	2	0	3	3	2	4	4	3	7	16	41
9	7	7	5	5	5	5	4	4	2	2	4	5	3	6	4	8	20	36
10	3	3	1	3	2	2	2	5	4	2	4	4	2	6	3	4	29	21
11	2	4	1	4	2	4	2	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	27	18
12	5	4	3	4	5	3	2	1	2	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	34	31
13	3	3	4	4	4	2	3	6	5	6	5	4	3	5	4	3	25	16
14	6	3	2	3	4	4	3	2	0	1	2	2	4	5	1	6	21	33
15	5	4	5	5	3	2	2	2	2	5	3	3	4	4	5	7	26	34
16	7	6	5	3	5	4	4	2	4	3	4	5	7	7	8	7	31	36
17	5	4	4	5	5	3	3	5	3	2	4	3	5	4	3	4	20	26
18	4	7	4	5	4	3	3	1	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	6	16	36
19	4	4	4	3	4	2	1	3	1	4	3	1	4	4	3	4	23	30
20	7	6	5	5	7	4	4	6	1	3	4	1	2	5	4	3	11	31
21	2	5	4	6	4	2	2	5	3	3	4	4	0	1	1	5	14	23
22	7	8	6	4	8	3	6	7	2	4	4	1	2	4	3	5	09	30
23	5	5	3	5	4	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	4	4	4	5	20	33
24	1	5	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	1	3	2	4	6	3	2	23	23
25	7	6	4	6	6	5	4	2	0	2	3	3	3	5	7	8	19	42
26	3	4	4	7	5	2	3	3	3	2	3	5	5	3	2	5	20	27
27	6	4	1	7	5	7	5	0	1	4	4	2	4	2	5	6	17	30
28	6	5	5	6	4	2	3	5	5	5	4	4	4	6	4	5	24	27
29	5	6	5	5	4	1	2	2	1	1	5	6	6	3	2	3	25	32
30	3	2	2	6	4	5	4	5	4	1	4	3	4	5	3	3	19	19
31	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	6	5	5	4	4	4	6	4	2	33	07
32	5	5	4	7	5	3	4	2	2	3	4	4	7	5	2	4	22	29
33	4	2	3	5	4	5	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	1	0	4	14	21
34	8	6	4	6	5	3	3	3	1	4	4	4	4	0	1	0	16	34
35	1	1	0	4	1	5	4	8	7	5	7	6	4	8	5	0	34	01
36	5	4	3	6	5	2	3	2	2	2	1	3	5	3	3	6	20	33
37	5	7	5	6	5	5	5	2	1	3	4	5	4	4	2	7	17	33
38	3	4	3	5	4	2	5	3	6	4	6	4	3	3	4	3	22	17
39	8	4	4	6	5	2	3	2	3	5	3	3	4	4	7	7	25	36
40	6	1	3	5	4	1	2	4	4	6	5	3	8	5	7	6	36	26

Appendix F. Husbands' ICL mate image scores.

couple	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	LH	DS
1	4	5	3	4	4	1	3	0	2	3	3	2	4	3	4	4	24	32
2	1	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	4	3	5	2	4	4	3	5	28	23
3	3	4	2	5	3	2	2	3	3	4	5	4	7	6	5	4	33	25
4	4	3	3	6	4	3	3	3	4	3	5	2	7	6	6	4	28	26
5	4	3	1	5	3	1	2	4	3	3	3	4	6	7	6	4	24	27
6	4	4	3	5	4	5	3	5	2	4	2	1	2	3	1	6	13	25
7	1	2	3	1	3	2	5	5	5	6	6	3	5	5	4	4	31	11
8	2	6	4	5	3	4	2	4	2	3	5	4	3	4	5	4	23	27
9	5	1	6	6	6	7	5	4	3	2	3	1	0	1	2	3	02	22
10	3	5	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	1	3	6	6	4	25	34
11	4	5	3	3	2	3	2	4	3	4	2	2	4	2	4	4	22	26
12	2	4	2	5	5	4	4	5	2	5	8	7	4	6	6	5	27	18
13	4	3	5	2	3	2	3	3	4	7	5	4	4	5	6	4	32	22
14	2	4	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	4	4	4	5	3	4	29	26
15	1	2	4	5	3	2	2	5	4	6	4	3	4	5	5	6	28	20
16	6	7	6	4	8	8	4	2	3	3	2	5	2	0	1	4	04	28
17	3	2	4	5	5	4	6	2	3	3	5	3	5	6	4	4	23	22
18	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	5	4	3	2	4	4	5	4	29	24
19	4	2	2	2	3	1	1	4	2	6	4	1	4	4	5	4	31	23
20	3	4	5	3	7	5	4	4	2	3	4	2	4	5	5	5	18	27
21	1	0	1	3	7	6	6	5	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	3	10	12
22	4	5	3	2	4	1	4	5	6	6	7	6	7	8	8	4	41	19
23	2	3	2	3	3	1	1	6	5	4	6	1	4	5	7	4	31	20
24	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	4	4	2	4	2	3	6	4	3	28	21
25	3	6	2	5	3	3	2	2	1	4	4	4	4	6	8	6	31	35
26	3	2	2	5	5	3	5	3	4	5	6	5	5	4	3	5	26	16
27	2	3	1	3	2	1	0	4	5	3	4	5	7	6	6	2	39	21
28	6	5	5	6	4	2	5	2	3	4	4	3	7	4	3	5	23	30
29	2	1	3	1	3	2	4	2	2	3	1	3	4	4	3	4	25	21
30	1	4	1	2	0	4	2	1	2	5	7	4	6	5	6	5	41	22
31	5	1	0	0	4	4	2	2	2	6	3	3	5	6	6	5	36	24
32	6	5	4	7	5	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	7	6	6	4	25	33
33	3	3	4	6	5	2	2	1	3	2	4	2	4	5	5	5	23	31
34	1	3	2	2	0	1	2	4	6	7	7	5	4	5	2	5	38	11
35	5	7	6	8	6	7	4	3	3	2	2	0	2	2	0	5	00	32
36	3	2	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	6	5	4	5	5	3	5	39	15
37	1	1	1	2	2	1	4	3	5	5	5	6	7	7	7	4	25	15
38	0	3	2	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	6	5	4	5	6	4	33	17
39	4	2	4	5	3	2	2	2	3	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	34	28
40	4	3	1	5	6	4	3	4	1	3	4	2	7	4	4	7	24	28

Appendix G. Wives' ICL self description scores

couple	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	LH	DS
1	6	3	4	4	6	1	1	6	3	2	2	4	4	3	1	3	17	26
2	4	4	2	2	4	3	3	1	2	2	5	4	4	4	3	2	26	24
3	2	4	1	5	4	1	2	6	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	25	21
4	4	5	2	7	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	4	4	5	3	26	32
5	6	3	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	3	5	2	4	4	5	2	29	27
6	6	4	5	7	5	5	4	4	2	3	4	3	4	4	4	6	16	31
7	4	2	1	1	4	2	2	2	3	5	4	3	4	7	4	3	33	22
8	2	2	3	4	3	1	5	6	8	5	4	3	4	5	3	4	25	11
9	5	4	2	7	5	4	3	3	2	0	2	3	1	2	3	3	11	32
10	7	4	2	6	5	4	5	2	4	0	2	4	5	5	7	5	22	34
11	4	5	4	5	5	2	4	3	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	4	10	29
12	4	5	2	3	2	1	1	2	2	3	4	6	8	5	3	5	37	29
13	4	2	2	5	4	5	6	5	5	6	3	6	6	6	4	3	26	14
14	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	5	6	5	7	2	4	4	6	4	30	12
15	2	4	5	5	4	2	3	5	6	3	4	2	4	4	2	3	19	19
16	7	7	4	3	6	7	5	0	0	3	3	4	5	4	2	6	17	35
17	3	0	3	3	4	3	4	5	4	4	6	4	8	6	5	3	33	15
18	3	4	5	4	2	2	2	2	4	5	6	5	8	6	5	4	37	25
19	0	4	1	1	2	3	4	6	5	6	6	3	4	7	5	3	33	11
20	5	5	4	5	6	4	3	2	2	5	4	3	4	5	4	3	20	28
21	2	0	1	7	6	6	6	6	1	2	4	4	6	5	3	6	19	18
22	4	5	2	6	2	2	5	4	6	6	6	5	7	5	4	3	31	16
23	3	4	3	5	3	2	0	6	5	5	5	4	3	6	4	5	29	22
24	1	2	0	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	5	1	5	5	1	3	25	16
25	3	5	5	3	4	1	1	1	2	4	4	2	7	3	2	5	27	30
26	4	2	1	6	4	5	4	3	3	4	7	5	6	4	3	4	27	17
27	1	2	1	3	5	5	3	5	4	7	6	4	2	3	5	4	25	10
28	7	5	4	6	6	6	4	2	3	3	3	5	4	2	3	4	14	23
29	1	3	2	1	3	4	4	3	5	4	5	4	4	6	5	5	32	17
30	4	3	4	7	3	5	3	5	5	5	6	7	8	7	7	5	34	21
31	3	6	5	5	6	3	5	3	1	5	4	2	4	4	3	5	17	28
32	3	7	2	3	6	4	4	3	0	3	3	3	5	4	2	3	19	27
33	2	4	2	2	2	3	2	5	2	3	7	5	4	2	4	4	30	18
34	2	2	2	5	2	4	2	7	7	8	4	5	7	5	5	5	33	11
35	6	5	3	7	5	2	6	5	4	2	2	3	5	4	3	4	16	27
36	2	2	1	3	1	2	5	7	6	6	6	5	7	5	5	3	36	03
37	3	1	2	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	27	19
38	2	3	3	6	1	2	2	7	6	5	6	4	8	6	5	3	34	15
39	3	4	3	5	3	3	2	5	3	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	26	22
40	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	5	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	3	11	25

Appendix H. Wives' ICL mate image scores.

couples	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	PH	IG
1	0	4	4	4	4	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	2	4	1	2	17	23
2	1	3	1	1	1	3	3	4	4	6	1	3	2	4	5	4	28	17
3	3	3	2	4	4	2	3	2	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	27	25
4	4	4	3	5	4	1	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	4	2	3	20	28
5	2	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	4	4	4	16	31
6	5	5	4	6	3	3	1	2	1	1	4	2	4	4	4	6	22	37
7	4	2	2	2	4	1	2	0	3	5	4	3	4	6	4	3	33	25
8	7	5	3	4	2	4	3	1	0	1	3	1	4	4	5	6	23	40
9	3	4	3	2	2	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	3	4	21	25
10	0	0	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	4	5	2	1	4	1	4	27	17
11	2	2	1	4	3	1	0	3	3	2	1	3	4	3	3	5	21	26
12	4	5	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	3	4	6	8	5	3	5	37	30
13	3	3	3	6	6	4	3	4	4	5	3	3	2	5	2	4	16	20
14	4	2	3	4	2	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	3	5	6	5	22	28
15	6	5	4	6	4	2	3	0	1	2	6	2	4	5	2	5	22	35
16	5	4	3	4	4	2	5	2	3	5	3	5	5	6	3	8	29	28
17	5	4	4	4	3	1	2	3	2	3	4	5	8	7	5	6	36	33
18	3	4	5	4	2	3	2	2	4	5	6	5	8	6	5	4	35	23
19	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	4	6	5	5	27	32
20	4	3	3	4	2	2	4	3	3	2	4	3	3	4	3	7	25	27
21	3	3	1	6	2	2	5	5	3	1	6	5	3	4	3	4	25	19
22	3	5	2	4	3	1	4	1	4	5	4	4	4	3	2	3	26	21
23	5	5	3	5	4	2	2	4	2	5	3	1	2	4	4	5	20	30
24	2	5	2	4	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	1	5	4	4	4	24	23
25	7	4	5	3	5	1	3	2	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	5	17	32
26	4	5	2	5	1	2	2	1	2	3	5	3	6	4	6	5	33	32
27	6	4	3	5	7	4	3	3	1	0	1	1	4	4	1	5	12	34
28	4	5	3	5	3	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	4	5	4	4	22	32
29	5	4	3	5	1	2	3	2	2	1	2	3	5	4	3	5	25	33
30	5	4	6	5	6	5	4	5	3	4	0	3	6	5	3	5	14	22
31	1	1	4	5	4	6	7	3	2	6	6	3	4	4	0	4	17	11
32	1	6	2	4	1	3	2	2	1	2	6	3	5	3	2	4	27	25
33	4	4	3	5	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	3	5	4	3	5	26	29
34	8	7	6	7	6	3	4	1	1	3	1	4	7	6	5	6	21	44
35	2	2	2	6	4	3	3	7	4	4	4	4	1	7	5	4	23	17
36	5	4	3	5	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	5	7	5	4	4	21	30
37	6	8	5	4	5	3	2	1	0	2	4	2	3	2	4	5	17	40
38	3	4	4	7	3	3	4	3	3	5	3	2	4	5	4	3	20	25
39	3	4	3	5	3	3	2	6	4	5	5	3	5	4	7	5	20	22
40	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	5	4	5	8	4	4	6	36	25

Appendix I. Husband's FFS self description scores.

couple	Ach	Def	Ord	Exh	Aut	Aff	Int	Suc	Dom	Aba	Nur	Chg	End	Het	Agg	Con
1	22	11	13	12	11	12	24	09	23	03	10	24	19	08	09	11
2	20	10	07	19	17	11	18	12	19	10	09	16	16	08	18	12
3	17	15	12	09	14	17	19	12	16	04	18	21	04	19	13	13
4	22	17	17	08	09	12	18	13	10	19	15	09	23	03	15	12
5	12	14	07	11	12	14	24	09	22	15	13	13	12	11	16	11
6	15	08	19	14	12	19	15	11	15	12	14	19	07	15	15	11
7	21	15	17	11	12	17	08	11	08	08	15	19	23	08	17	13
8	20	10	14	15	20	09	14	15	20	09	12	14	12	13	13	09
9	19	05	04	14	20	15	10	14	19	08	17	21	05	24	15	10
10	22	14	11	12	14	09	22	12	18	05	14	16	08	14	19	13
11	14	16	15	12	13	17	22	13	06	07	20	19	10	17	09	14
12	18	13	07	17	07	14	06	17	23	19	15	17	09	11	17	13
13	11	19	13	09	17	16	13	04	21	19	15	13	15	10	15	14
14	17	10	09	10	17	09	20	08	24	12	14	20	07	17	16	11
15	22	14	18	17	07	11	08	06	28	08	05	17	18	16	15	12
16	13	11	06	14	13	21	23	03	19	15	20	14	05	12	21	14
17	19	15	21	09	12	16	10	06	18	11	11	08	23	15	16	13
18	25	08	11	17	16	15	18	04	20	09	16	19	08	12	12	13
19	17	14	07	12	16	25	23	11	12	03	18	17	10	16	09	12
20	20	09	10	19	15	06	08	16	12	15	11	14	20	21	14	13
21	23	15	15	09	10	12	16	12	03	06	16	15	21	21	16	14
22	12	12	13	15	09	11	03	08	23	19	10	13	23	25	14	11
23	12	08	01	17	20	17	22	04	15	15	14	17	06	22	20	12
24	22	12	18	09	19	09	19	01	08	09	17	17	20	11	19	12
25	22	06	12	17	20	12	14	05	25	03	10	15	13	15	21	13
26	08	14	15	13	17	08	10	03	12	18	10	21	18	19	24	12
27	07	06	07	09	19	12	16	13	13	21	22	08	23	09	25	14
28	15	14	16	10	08	08	11	08	35	18	09	19	20	14	15	12
29	19	15	08	23	18	11	17	09	20	16	04	16	06	15	13	11
30	20	08	14	10	14	08	19	15	10	13	09	08	23	28	11	14
31	17	16	08	10	21	10	12	14	09	23	17	13	06	21	13	13
32	19	10	13	20	20	13	03	07	15	06	03	19	15	28	19	13
33	13	16	23	09	12	12	18	05	19	13	14	18	15	08	15	10
34	16	11	22	15	17	10	14	10	20	05	00	14	22	14	20	11
35	17	14	13	06	13	15	24	18	06	12	14	17	11	22	08	12
36	19	11	06	18	15	20	26	11	19	05	10	20	11	08	11	10
37	22	11	09	12	15	11	19	13	24	12	12	07	07	21	15	13
38	15	15	15	11	09	08	16	13	05	17	15	10	24	21	16	12
39	16	12	14	14	14	14	18	12	20	05	12	19	19	12	09	09
40	16	16	11	14	15	11	16	08	24	17	10	14	20	01	17	13

Appendix J. Husbands' PPS mate image scores.

couple	Ash	Def	Ord	Exh	Aut	Aff	Int	Suc	Dom	Aba	Nur	Chg	End	Hot	Agg	Con
1	15	12	23	18	13	09	12	17	12	19	09	12	20	10	09	12
2	13	12	17	11	07	10	19	15	12	14	26	15	09	11	19	11
3	21	16	18	05	10	22	15	07	13	04	13	22	17	19	08	13
4	18	15	20	10	11	13	19	11	08	20	17	08	18	06	16	10
5	14	10	09	17	22	18	13	13	11	12	24	10	07	13	17	11
6	16	15	16	11	10	15	09	15	12	20	11	15	11	21	13	13
7	08	15	06	10	19	21	17	14	16	16	24	05	04	18	17	13
8	22	18	15	13	10	13	16	12	13	10	13	12	13	13	17	04
9	18	09	14	15	17	11	21	11	20	07	11	17	03	21	15	09
10	22	05	05	13	16	23	21	17	11	05	22	17	04	13	16	13
11	13	12	20	14	13	08	05	20	15	17	07	19	18	14	15	11
12	20	12	15	09	09	18	12	21	03	19	20	18	11	14	09	10
13	12	17	12	21	19	18	11	04	21	14	16	11	13	08	13	11
14	14	15	15	13	14	20	15	08	08	19	15	19	11	17	07	09
15	15	18	22	11	08	10	14	07	09	15	08	22	20	19	12	12
16	15	15	12	12	16	13	04	13	14	13	11	24	11	19	18	12
17	11	15	13	10	13	24	05	08	14	14	18	24	14	15	12	10
18	17	10	12	19	12	20	13	07	15	10	25	23	07	13	07	15
19	14	18	08	10	14	23	17	21	05	09	23	17	08	19	04	10
20	18	14	07	12	13	13	17	17	12	13	08	17	10	23	16	14
21	24	08	08	07	15	18	13	14	01	14	14	21	19	17	17	14
22	11	10	13	12	05	22	13	18	08	17	20	20	11	18	12	08
23	07	10	13	12	14	20	21	17	08	15	21	16	09	22	05	11
24	15	10	10	13	14	19	23	06	05	16	22	22	13	11	11	13
25	27	11	14	18	14	10	14	06	21	07	11	17	17	10	13	12
26	09	10	12	12	09	14	08	23	12	18	14	21	09	20	19	13
27	18	17	17	14	08	17	12	13	11	13	22	15	25	07	01	12
28	16	14	15	10	08	09	11	07	24	16	11	18	20	15	16	12
29	14	13	17	15	14	17	20	15	13	13	09	22	08	15	05	11
30	12	04	07	18	21	18	08	19	16	05	17	10	07	28	20	13
31	09	11	16	13	20	17	15	19	16	16	21	12	04	07	14	09
32	17	09	09	16	16	21	07	09	14	08	10	25	18	18	13	11
33	18	12	14	12	09	21	15	15	16	11	21	24	05	10	07	11
34	15	16	11	12	14	21	19	18	09	08	17	24	10	11	05	10
35	19	19	25	14	09	12	06	18	10	07	07	21	18	14	11	12
36	14	14	21	09	10	25	10	21	06	17	19	21	14	03	06	11
37	11	12	14	06	11	26	19	17	07	14	22	23	07	16	05	14
38	12	10	13	13	07	18	07	13	20	18	21	18	14	13	13	10
39	15	11	18	10	14	14	11	14	22	10	13	18	16	15	09	07
40	12	11	21	09	15	17	14	20	06	10	15	17	07	23	13	10

Appendix K. Wives' PFS self description scores.

couple	Ach	Def	Ord	Ech	Aut	Aff	Int	Sus	Dom	Aba	Nur	Chg	End	Net	Agg	Con
1	15	12	23	18	13	09	12	17	12	19	09	12	20	10	09	12
2	15	05	11	18	18	20	07	07	06	22	18	23	11	11	18	11
3	21	14	14	11	12	15	13	14	08	18	15	21	09	13	12	15
4	23	12	20	14	07	15	12	14	11	15	14	13	17	15	08	10
5	13	06	04	21	17	19	21	08	18	15	15	15	11	18	09	13
6	17	12	14	10	12	16	19	14	17	15	18	17	15	08	06	10
7	15	15	15	04	10	12	22	13	11	20	18	15	22	04	14	14
8	15	13	20	12	12	17	15	15	06	15	13	20	11	09	17	11
9	22	08	08	15	15	22	17	05	10	04	16	24	10	18	16	11
10	12	06	11	11	14	18	24	09	21	04	14	23	12	08	23	12
11	21	12	09	20	17	09	26	08	12	11	05	21	10	14	15	11
12	16	08	11	12	06	14	12	13	18	12	14	23	08	23	20	12
13	15	16	11	09	10	15	12	13	17	19	23	19	07	11	13	12
14	18	18	10	09	13	17	19	10	05	15	19	19	11	11	16	10
15	22	14	14	16	17	07	10	08	14	13	04	19	12	24	16	14
16	15	05	04	21	17	10	22	12	14	05	14	24	09	21	17	12
17	06	08	15	16	08	22	20	13	11	28	17	17	08	15	06	13
18	08	15	18	13	06	15	16	12	20	19	15	17	24	01	11	09
19	06	13	12	12	11	21	21	15	13	14	17	19	06	17	13	11
20	15	05	09	15	14	09	02	17	10	22	13	20	20	20	19	14
21	17	06	09	13	13	12	15	08	11	14	17	18	18	18	21	15
22	17	13	16	14	12	19	14	12	14	15	11	19	11	13	10	14
23	19	12	14	10	13	16	15	15	03	16	17	18	12	18	12	14
24	11	09	08	13	12	20	21	13	08	18	21	19	08	12	17	09
25	21	06	13	12	20	15	17	10	19	10	10	14	15	15	13	15
26	13	11	14	15	08	12	12	17	12	17	13	20	09	22	15	11
27	15	11	11	04	17	19	19	19	07	17	22	17	08	06	08	10
28	15	08	15	07	11	14	11	16	13	09	19	13	24	21	14	12
29	12	12	17	17	14	21	15	09	03	10	11	25	10	13	21	13
30	15	21	14	07	06	16	12	08	07	23	17	16	23	17	08	11
31	16	10	16	10	13	20	17	15	06	09	17	18	11	21	11	11
32	09	06	14	16	10	16	14	03	12	15	17	23	19	21	15	09
33	18	16	17	19	14	17	10	16	16	16	14	14	12	05	06	13
34	24	22	20	12	10	15	10	12	13	14	11	13	18	07	09	13
35	11	20	17	11	05	21	16	19	05	10	15	16	19	16	09	13
36	11	13	16	14	16	19	12	20	13	07	20	21	18	01	09	14
37	08	11	09	13	09	24	24	09	21	17	24	14	09	15	03	13
38	11	12	10	12	12	16	14	13	04	25	11	16	22	23	09	11
39	14	20	19	15	08	15	23	02	10	14	10	21	20	10	09	10
40	17	15	17	12	20	10	16	15	16	12	05	17	17	05	16	10

Appendix L. Wives' PFS mate image score.

couple	Ach	Def	Ord	Exh	Aut	Aff	Int	Suc	Dom	Aba	War	Chg	End	Het	Agg	Con
1	19	16	13	13	20	11	13	12	10	11	09	12	21	17	13	13
2	15	17	08	15	20	14	21	18	14	08	07	14	15	11	13	12
3	15	13	13	17	14	13	18	15	12	13	16	19	04	13	15	07
4	24	14	20	06	16	16	13	09	15	17	12	08	18	08	14	09
5	12	17	10	05	10	12	25	09	18	09	13	15	15	23	17	11
6	12	12	11	20	15	12	08	11	16	05	15	19	14	21	19	11
7	13	16	19	08	08	14	23	09	11	16	21	14	23	03	12	13
8	16	12	13	15	13	18	13	11	18	07	13	23	11	13	14	11
9	21	13	09	07	20	14	09	12	08	04	20	23	17	23	10	12
10	16	18	24	16	10	09	08	19	10	21	11	05	19	16	08	11
11	16	10	06	08	07	14	23	18	15	18	18	13	14	17	13	07
12	16	11	10	18	12	15	06	10	22	09	15	24	07	17	18	09
13	17	17	27	08	15	08	10	10	17	13	13	15	20	08	12	13
14	23	15	08	13	14	11	23	09	13	10	12	20	10	13	16	12
15	22	12	19	14	15	13	07	15	25	01	04	13	22	10	18	10
16	17	14	14	20	06	15	12	13	15	09	09	17	14	16	19	11
17	20	19	14	12	15	13	17	07	16	11	05	09	19	17	16	12
18	12	16	18	13	08	18	15	13	12	16	16	19	24	03	07	09
19	10	13	19	14	15	11	24	03	18	10	13	16	13	16	15	11
20	21	13	13	07	23	09	13	06	08	15	10	16	17	21	18	13
21	15	15	15	17	13	07	06	07	14	19	09	17	22	17	17	13
22	18	19	13	15	13	12	06	13	17	09	06	19	17	14	19	11
23	19	15	12	13	15	08	12	11	17	13	10	17	17	17	14	11
24	17	16	18	18	19	09	18	10	12	01	09	18	24	09	12	14
25	20	07	08	12	21	12	13	10	24	10	15	18	07	12	21	10
26	16	14	13	16	14	16	16	06	11	08	13	19	18	19	11	09
27	10	16	16	19	16	13	10	09	17	12	15	19	12	10	16	08
28	17	11	19	12	06	07	13	11	21	13	11	12	25	23	09	12
29	18	16	06	15	17	07	13	12	24	12	10	09	17	21	13	14
30	18	15	17	17	13	17	11	11	14	01	18	09	23	08	18	12
31	12	21	17	08	16	06	09	19	12	13	07	07	19	27	17	11
32	16	13	16	16	08	15	12	04	11	09	15	21	18	24	12	09
33	16	14	23	14	15	10	16	09	13	17	10	16	23	06	08	05
34	22	11	19	15	10	10	14	05	22	04	08	09	23	18	20	13
35	14	17	16	06	07	10	25	14	05	21	17	19	17	19	03	11
36	15	08	12	18	23	13	15	15	20	07	15	15	19	02	13	13
37	18	12	17	15	08	11	25	07	14	09	16	06	21	19	12	09
38	17	13	15	11	18	04	17	06	06	21	03	14	25	24	16	13
39	11	09	15	13	17	10	02	23	15	13	12	22	12	17	19	11
40	17	11	12	15	15	13	09	09	18	10	17	16	20	12	16	08

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03142 6954