



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
**Jungian Psychological Type as Measured
by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator
and its Relationship to
Marital Adjustment.**

presented by

James Michael Gosse

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in **Counseling
Psychology**

Major professor

Date June 6, 1978



OVERDUE FINES ARE 25¢ PER DAY
PER ITEM

Return to book drop to remove
this checkout from your record.

~~AUG 1 1983~~
~~05 235~~
~~060234~~
~~AUG 21 1983~~
~~02144~~
~~21 215~~
~~AUG 05 1984~~
~~02 235~~

© 1978

JAMES MICHAEL GOSSE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

JUNGIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE AS MEASURED BY
THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR AND
ITS RELATIONSHIP TO MARITAL
ADJUSTMENT

By

James Michael Gosse

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services
and Educational Psychology

1978

ABSTRACT

JUNGIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE AS MEASURED BY
THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR AND
ITS RELATIONSHIP TO MARITAL
ADJUSTMENT

By

James Michael Gosse

The major purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between psychological type and marital adjustment. Carl Gustav Jung's theory of psychological types and his predictions about psychological compatibility between people of various types served as the theoretical foundation for the investigation. By focusing upon the marriage relationship it was possible both to test Jung's theory of psychological type and to provide guidelines for the use of psychological type in clinical work with couples.

The investigation was conducted in two parts. The major part consisted of the empirical testing of hypotheses designed to discover significantly different levels of marital adjustment between groups of couples who share Homogeneous type preferences and couples who share Heterogeneous type preferences. A secondary part utilized

post-test interviews with subjects to gather clinical impressions about the role of psychological type in their marriages.

A sample of 117 couples was drawn from the married population of the Michigan State University faculty, staff, and students, as well as the adjacent East Lansing population. Subjects were administered two test instruments. The first was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, based upon Jung's theory of psychological type and designed to identify a person's preferences on each of the following four dimensions: Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving. Both spouses of a couple had to score at least seven Preference Score points on relevant dimensions in order to be included in the pool of subjects for the hypothesis tests. The psychological type combination of each couple provided the independent variable in the research design. The second instrument was the Marriage Relationship Survey, which was a combination of a demographic questionnaire and Spanier's Dyadic Adjustment Scale. This instrument yielded a global measure of marital adjustment which served as the dependent variable in the research design.

An analysis of variance with planned comparisons design was used to test the hypotheses that examined differences in mean marital adjustment scores across single preference dimensions. The Pearson product-moment

correlation was used in the design which examined the relationship between mean marital adjustment scores and the degree of homogeneity in spouses' psychological type preferences. An analysis of variance with planned comparisons design was used to test for significant differences in mean marital adjustment scores among three groups of couples whose dominant type functions were identical, auxiliary, and opposing, respectively.

Eleven hypotheses were tested with an experimental alpha set at the .05 level. Three major conclusions were drawn. First, no relationship was found to exist between dyadic adjustment and couples' preference constellations for any single dimension on the M.B.T.I. Secondly, no relationship was found to exist between dyadic adjustment and the extent of similarity of couples' preferences across all four M.B.T.I. dimensions, or even across their constellations of two preferred functions. Thirdly, no relationship was found to exist between dyadic adjustment and the compatibility of spouses' dominant functions.

These three related sets of hypotheses which examined the impact of psychological type upon marriage offer no support to Jung's or Myers' contentions that people of similar type will find their relationships to be more harmonious than will people of dissimilar types.

A more subtle relationship between psychological type and marital adjustment appears to have emerged from

the clinical interviews conducted as an adjunct to the empirical study. It was discovered that subjects reported a wide range of styles and stresses in their marriages that appeared to be type-related. Therefore, it may well be that marriages of similar levels of dyadic adjustment arrive at that point by using different coping strategies and that these various coping strategies are type-related.

To Carol

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the people who assisted me in the course of my work on this dissertation. These people are:

Bill Hinds, who rendered valuable assistance as the chairperson of my committee, and who has served as my advisor throughout my program.

Cecil Williams, who always found time to explore the nuances of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator with me, and has supported my work with encouragement and materials.

Sam Plyler and Marsha Worby, for serving on my committee, and helping me to remember the importance of the person around whom the theories are built.

Judith Taylor, whose expertise in empirical analysis was exceeded only by her generosity with her time.

Ann Evans, Dianne Rister, Marilyn Szedlak, Linda Trevarthen, and Rob Davis, who efficiently and generously aided me in securing materials and information.

Stan Cahill, Laura Kern, Jim Ruesink, Shelley Powell, Margaret Parsons, Jack Boelens, Carl Staser, and Paul Oliaro, who assisted me in collecting data.

Penny Hornschemeier, who allowed me so much flexibility as my working partner, and who helped type the final draft.

Jan Bowles and John Groves, and Scott and Lois Ames, who helped me take care of my mental health.

The many subjects who took the time to participate in the study.

My parents who have always encouraged me.

Carol, who endured the most, received the least, and helped me make the most difficult decisions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Importance of the Study.	3
Purpose of the Study.	6
Definitions of Terms as Used in the Study	7
Research Hypotheses	15
Assumptions.	17
Overview of the Study	18
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	19
Carl Gustav Jung's Theory of Psychological Type	19
Investigation of Jung's Typology.	21
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	26
Uses of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	31
Marital Adjustment	34
Measurement of Marital Adjustment	37
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.	41
Selection of the Sample Population	41
Description of the Sample Population	44
Procedures Used in Collecting Data	48
Instrumentation	49
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	49
The Dyadic Adjustment Scale.	50
Research Design	52
Statistical Hypotheses	57
Statistical Analysis Procedure	67
Clinical Interview Procedure and Rationale.	70
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS.	73
Results of Hypothesis Tests	73
Summary of the Hypothesis Tests	86

	Page
Interviews with Subjects	88
Summary of the Interviews.	94
V. SUMMARY	100
Results.	104
Conclusions and Discussion	106
Limitations	109
Suggestions for Further Research	111
Discussion of the Interviews.	113
Implications for Clinical Work with Couples	115
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX	
A. SOLICITATION LETTER SENT TO POTENTIAL SUBJECTS	119
B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRES. .	120
C. CONSENT FORM FOR MARRIAGE STUDY	121
D. MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP SURVEY	122
E. MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TYPE TABLE FOR 117 WIVES PARTICIPATING IN STUDY	125
F. MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TYPE TABLE FOR 117 HUSBANDS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY	126
G. TYPE TABLE: COMBINATIONS OF COUPLES.	127
REFERENCES	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Results of the Demographic Questionnaire . .	45
3.2 Numbers of Couples in Data Pool for Each M.B.T.I. Dimension.	68
3.3 Numbers of Couples Whose Preference Scores Surpassed the Cut-Off Level on 0-4 M.B.T.I. Dimensions (N=126).	69
4.1 Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for Analysis of the Extraversion/ Introversion Dimension (N=74)	74
4.2 One-Way Analysis of Variance for Extraver- sion/Introversion on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale	75
4.3 Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for Analysis of the Sensing/ Intuition Dimension (N=87)	76
4.4 One-Way Analysis of Variance for Sensing/ Intuition on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale .	77
4.5 Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for Analysis of the Thinking/ Feeling Dimension (N=88).	78
4.6 One-Way Analysis of Variance for Thinking/ Feeling on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale . .	79
4.7 Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for Analysis of the Judging/Per- ceiving Dimension (N=84).	80
4.8 One-Way Analysis of Variance for Judging/ Perceiving on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale .	80
4.9 Frequency Distribution of Couples over the Possible Range of Concurrence on Four M.B.T.I. Preferences (N=29).	81

Table		Page
4.10	Number of Homogeneous Preferences Over all Four M.B.T.I. Dimensions and Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores	82
4.11	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Between Number of Homogeneous Preferences Over Four M.B.T.I. Dimensions and Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores	82
4.12	Frequency Distribution of Couples Over the Possible Range of Concurrence on M.B.T.I. Function Preferences (N=67)	83
4.13	Number of Homogeneous Preferences Over M.B.T.I. Function Dimensions and Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores	84
4.14	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Between Number of Homogeneous M.B.T.I. Function Preferences and Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores	84
4.15	Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for Analysis of the Degree of Compatibility Between Spouses' Dominant Functions	85
4.16	One-Way Analysis of Variance for Compatibility of Dominant Functions on the Dyadic Adjust- ment Scale.	86

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Jung's classification of psychological types .	20
2.2 Myers' classification of 16 psychological types	28
3.1 Test design for Hypotheses I through VIII . .	54
3.2 Test design for Hypothesis IX	55
3.3 Test design for Hypothesis X	56
3.4 Test design for Hypothesis XI	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Ever since Carl Gustav Jung's seminal work on the subject of psychological types in 1921 (Jung, 1923), there has existed the potential for investigation of the impact of psychological type upon human interaction. Jung postulated that much of what appears to be random variation in human behavior can be seen as orderly and consistent when viewed as a result of basic differences in the ways people prefer to use perception and judgment. However, not until the 1940s was there a serious effort to develop a test instrument for determining an individual's psychological type (Gray & Wheelwright, 1946; Myers, 1962). In 1962 Isabel Briggs Myers published the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the result of years of empirical research. Since 1962, many research studies using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator have been conducted on the relationship between psychological type and various aspects of human interaction. Representative topics are: occupation-type compatibility, supervisor-supervisee interaction, student-teacher interaction, sex-role expectations, counselor-client

compatibility, employee-organization interaction, nurse/doctor-patient interaction, individual-group interaction, and others (McCaulley et al., 1977).

Relatively little research has been conducted, though, on the impact of psychological type upon marriage. Indeed, Jung himself treated the subject of psychological type and marriage only lightly (Campbell, 1971). He did not prescribe particular combinations of types that would lead to greater or lesser harmony between spouses; rather, he chose to point out generalized potentials for disharmony under a variety of conditions and circumstances. Myers (1962b) postulates that the more similar the function preference combinations between two persons, the better are their chances for understanding one another and getting along. However, she does not speak specifically to the marital interaction, except to state that married couples generally prefer likeness to difference. In addition, she has not published empirical evidence to support either of these two predictions.

Hall and Nordby (1973), in their interpretation of Jung, refer to the notion of incompatibility between certain types as a source of conflict between individuals. On the other hand, they write, "It cannot be said as a general rule that opposite types will either be more or less compatible than the same types. So much depends upon whether the union is complementary or not" (p. 107).

To date, the question of specific type combination effects upon the interaction between spouses has been treated only with postulates. Previous marriage research involving the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has used the instrument as a tool for establishing other constructs such as empathy (Norton, 1971) or interpersonal understanding (Lindner, 1972).

This study will be more specifically designed to determine whether or not psychological type combinations in marriage, as identified by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, can be shown to significantly impact the marital relationship. In order to come to some empirical conclusions about this question, married couples were asked to respond to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and to the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The latter instrument is designed to measure the degree of satisfaction, cohesion, consensus, and affectional expression in a relationship between cohabiting individuals. Statistical tests were applied to the data in an attempt to locate significant relationships between type combinations and measures of marital adjustments.

Importance of the Study

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (M.B.T.I.) has begun to attract the interest of researchers and therapists in the area of marriage (DiTiberio & Hammer, 1977; Williams, 1971; Lindner, 1972; Neville, 1971; Norton,

1971). The main reason for this interest in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is its theoretical grounding in the concept of psychological type as developed by Carl Gustav Jung (1923). Jung postulated that people prefer and manifest different combinations of the two basic attitudes and four functions of personality. Thus, our personalities can be generally "typed" as one of the eight basic categories of psychological type, while still retaining unique individual qualities which are the products of different life experiences.

Not only did Jung suggest a matrix of psychological types, but he also generated descriptions of the varieties of psychopathology to which each type is predisposed. In addition, Jung developed a theoretical scheme of opposition between the two attitudes and of opposing and auxiliary functions in the intra-psychic operations of personality. From these two theoretical foundations--(1) the predisposition of specific types of personalities to specific varieties of psychopathology, and, more importantly, (2) the intra-psychic interaction among opposing and auxiliary attitudes and functions--Jung postulated a very general set of predictions regarding the outcomes of interpersonal interaction. He suggested that people would find interpersonal communication, understanding, attraction, reasoning, and interests to be affected positively or negatively, depending upon the degree of complementarity or similarity

between their psychological types. Jung did not ever fully develop this theoretical position.

Myers (1962b), in describing uses of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, also suggests, but does not develop empirically, the notion that interpersonal relationships are affected by typology:

Type theory would hold that type differences yield differences in interests, values, and problem-solving techniques which may facilitate or handicap a working relationship between two or more people. (p. 75)

She goes on to state,

. . . most people . . . pick friends mainly from their own type column, a fact generally apparent if one enters his friends upon a Type Table. In marriage there is a significant tendency to prefer likeness to difference, especially on S/N. (p. 75)

In contrast to this position are the conclusions by Gray (1949), and Gray and Wheelwright (1944), that people show significant tendencies to choose spouses whose psychological type is different from their own.

Thus, these issues of type compatibility have been raised by Jung (1923), Myers (1962b), and Gray (1949), but none have specified in detail which type characteristics impact other type characteristics. Nevertheless, these notions have been promoted in solving employee-employer conflicts and worker-activity conflicts (Myers, 1962b). The M.B.T.I. has been introduced as a tool for working with married couples, with the intention of finding patterns of interpersonal conflict or harmony that may

be due to typology interaction (DiTiberio & Hammer, 1977). However, very little empirical research has been applied to this question. If the M.B.T.I. and the Jungian construct of typology are to be legitimate tools for use in therapeutic or prophylactic treatment of marriage relationships, the notion that type impacts upon that relationship must be tested empirically and either confirmed or rejected.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study developed around the questions raised in the previous discussion of Jung's constructs of typology and their implications for marital adjustment. If Jungian typology and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator are to be effective tools for therapeutic intervention and/or marriage effectiveness training, the impact of psychological type upon marriage must be more clearly defined and understood than it is at present. Not only is it important to discover which type combinations are more compatible, or more antagonistic, but it is also important to realize that psychological type may contribute only minimally to marital harmony or conflict. In either case, therapists, caseworkers, and other professionals, and ultimately their clients, will benefit from the resolution of this question.

The findings of this study are limited by the fact that the relationships were examined by correlational

means which in no way provide cause-and-effect information. In order for such findings to be realized, additional research is required.

Definitions of Terms as Used in the Study

The following definitions will include the terms "Extravert," "Introvert," "Sensor," "Intuitor," "Thinker," "Feeler," "Judger," and "Perceiver." The use of such words to describe people is simply a convention intended to save time and space in subsequent references to persons who prefer various attitudes and functions. At no time is it fair or accurate to reduce a person to a mere category.

attitude.--A term used by Jung to indicate a person's preferred orientation of libido; a person with an Introverted attitude orients libido inwardly to the intra-psychic world, whereas a person with an Extraverted attitude orients libido outwardly to the world of objects.

conflict.--Self-reported disagreement or difficulty between spouses in the areas of perceptual and judgmental functions and in attitude. Conflict is not indicated merely by different scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

continuous score.--(Myers-Briggs Type Indicator)

"For an I, N, F or P score, the continuous score is the preference score plus 100. For an E, S, T or J score, the continuous score is 100 minus the preference score" (Myers, 1962b, p. 9).

degree of compatibility between dominant functions.--Identical dominant functions shared by spouses are most compatible; a rational dominant function paired with an irrational dominant function is the next most compatible combination; two opposite rational functions or two opposite irrational functions comprise the least compatible combination of dominant functions.

dominant function.--That function which is thought by Jung to have been developed first in the subject's life, and the function upon which the subject relies most heavily. In the scheme devised by Myers (1962b, pp. 59-62), the dominant function is defined as the irrational function for Extravert/Perceivers and Introvert/Judgers; it is the rational function for Extravert/Judgers and Introvert/Perceivers.

Extravert.--Described by Jung as a person who habitually turns libido outward from subject to object and is dependent upon the object. Myers uses the term to refer to a person who focuses perception and judgment primarily upon people and things--the "outer world."

Operationally, it refers to a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Extraversion side of the Extraversion/Introversion index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Feeling.--One of the four basic psychological functions described by Jung (1923). He defined Feeling as a rational "process that takes place primarily between the ego and a given content . . . [imparting] . . . to the content a definite value in the sense of acceptance or rejection" (p. 434). Myers (1962b) calls Feeling one of the two ways of judging, "a process of appreciation . . . bestowing on things a personal, subjective value" (p. 52). Operationally, a Feeler is a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Feeling side of the Thinking/Feeling index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

function.--According to Jung (1923), "a particular form of psychic activity that remains the same in principle under varying conditions . . . a manifestation of libido" (p. 436). He declared that the four functions (sensation, intuition, thinking, and feeling) cannot be related or reduced to one another, essentially defining them as factors of psychic activity. Myers refers to the functions as "processes."

harmony.--Self-reported agreement or lack of difficulty between spouses in the areas of perceptual and

judgmental functions and in orientation. Harmony is not indicated merely by similar scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Heterogeneous.--A couple is Heterogeneous by type if, for a given dimension of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, they have different preferences (e.g., on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension one spouse is an Introvert and the other is an Extravert).

Homogeneous.--A couple is Homogeneous by type if, for a given dimension of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, they have similar preferences.

Introvert.--Described by Jung as a person who habitually withdraws libido from the object and into the subject. Myers uses the term to describe a person who orients perception and judgment primarily toward concepts and ideas--the "inner world." Operationally, it refers to a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Introversion side of the Extraversion/Introversion index.

Intuition.--One of the four basic psychological functions described by Jung. He defined Intuition as the irrational "function that mediates perceptions in an unconscious way . . . a kind of instinctive apprehension" (1923, pp. 453-454). Myers (1962b) calls Intuition "indirect perception by way of the unconscious, accompanied

by ideas or associations which the unconscious tacks on to the perceptions coming from outside" (p. 51). Operationally, an Intuitor is a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Intuition side of the Sensing/Intuition index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

irrational function.--The functions defined by Jung (1923) as being "not contrary to reason, but something beyond reason" (p. 454). He declared that both irrational functions (Sensation and Intuition) "find fulfillment in the absolute perception of the flux of events" (p. 454).

Judger.--Written with a capital "J," this term refers to a person who prefers to rely "primarily upon a judging process (Thinking or Feeling) . . . in his dealings with the outer world, that is, in the extraverted part of his life" (Myers, 1962b, p. 2). Operationally, it refers to a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Judging side of the Judging/Perceiving index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

judgment.--Written with a lower case "j," this term refers to what Myers (1962b) calls "the processes of coming-to-conclusions about what has been perceived" (p. 1). Jung referred to the two rational functions--Thinking and Feeling--as judging functions.

objective.--"Refers to the world that lies outside of and surrounds the person; a world of people and things, of customs and conventions, of political, economic, and social institutions, and of physical conditions. This objective world is referred to as the environment, the surroundings, or external reality" (Hall & Nordby, 1973, p. 97).

orientation.--A term which refers to the predominant flow of psychic energy into either an extraverted attitude or an introverted attitude of the conscious mind.

Perceiver.--Written with a capital "P," this term refers to a person who prefers to rely "primarily upon a . . . perceptive process (Sensing or Intuition) in his dealings with the outer world, that is, in the extraverted part of his life" (Myers, 1962b, p. 2). Operationally, it refers to a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Perceiving side of the Judging/Perceiving index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

perception.--Written with a lower case "p," this term refers to what Myers calls "the processes of becoming-aware,--of things or people or occurrences or ideas" (1962b, p. 1). Jung referred to the two irrational functions--Sensing and Intuition--as perceiving functions.

Preference Score.--The score for each of the four indices (Extraversion/Introversion; Sensing/Intuition; Thinking/Feeling; Judging/Perceiving) which indicates the direction of a preference and its magnitude (e.g., T=25). The Preference Score is computed by subtracting the lesser raw score from the greater raw score on a given dimension (e.g., Thinking/Feeling), multiplying the difference by two, and then adding a point if the preference is zero or in the direction of I,N,T,P (for males) or I,N,F,P (for females). A point is subtracted from the total if the preference is in the direction of E,S,F,J (for males) or E,S,T,J (for females).

psychological type.--For the purposes of this study, psychological type shall mean the particular combination of four indexed Myers-Briggs Type Indicator preferences as indicated by a four-letter code. There are 16 possible combinations (and therefore 16 types) in Myers' scheme. Myers elaborated upon Jung's notions of judging and perceiving by making them into a fourth dimension, thus increasing Jung's original schema of eight types to 16.

rational function.--The functions defined by Jung (1923) as being "decisively influenced by reflection. They function most perfectly when they are in the fullest possible accord with the laws of reason" (p. 459). The rational functions are Thinking and Feeling.

Sensing.--One of the four basic psychological functions described by Jung (1923). He defined Sensing as "the psychological function that mediates the perception of a physical stimulus. Sensation is related not only to external stimuli but to inner ones, i.e., to changes in the internal organic processes" (p. 461). Myers (1962b) calls Sensing "the familiar process by which we become aware of things directly through our five senses" (p. 51). Jung, in his writings, used the terms "sensing" and "sensation" interchangeably; Myers uses only the term "sensing" and does not include internal organic processes in her definition of sensing. Operationally, a Sensor is a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Sensing side of the Sensing/Intuition index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

subjective.--"Designates the inner and private world of the psyche. It is private because it is not directly observable by outsiders, . . . [and] . . . not even always directly accessible to the conscious mind" (Hall & Nordby, 1973, p. 97).

Thinking.--One of the four basic psychological functions described by Jung (1923). He defined Thinking as the rational "psychological function which, following its own laws, brings the contents of ideation into conceptual connection with one another" (p. 481). Myers

(1962b) calls Thinking one of the two ways of judging, "a logical process, aimed at an impersonal finding" (p. 52). Operationally, a Thinker is a person who obtains a Preference Score on the Thinking side of the Thinking/Feeling index of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses formed the basis of this investigation and are presented in statistical terminology in the chapter on Research Design and Methodology.

Hypothesis I:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Extravert couples and Homogeneous Introvert couples.

Hypothesis II:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension.

Hypothesis III:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Sensing couples and Homogeneous Intuitors couples.

Hypothesis IV:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Sensing/Intuition dimension.

Hypothesis V:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Thinker couples and Homogeneous Feeler couples.

Hypothesis VI:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

Hypothesis VII:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Judger couples and Homogeneous Perceiver couples.

Hypothesis VIII:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Judging/Perceiving dimension.

Hypothesis IX:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on all four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator dimensions: Extraversion/Introversion; Sensing/Intuition; Thinking/Feeling; and Judging/Perceiving.

Hypothesis X:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on the two Myers-Briggs Type Indicator function dimensions: Sensing/Intuition and Thinking/Feeling.

Hypothesis XI:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the degree of compatibility between dominant functions as defined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are pertinent to the validity of the empirical results. They represent some of the limitations encountered while conducting research with human subjects.

1. It is assumed that all subjects answered the test instruments honestly.

2. It is assumed that the subjects who self-administered the test instruments at their homes did not consult with their spouses until both had finished responding to the instruments independently.

3. It is assumed that the two test instruments measure the domains of behavior and personality for which they were designed and that reported reliability and validity measures for both instruments are accurate.

4. It is assumed that the subjects tested were sufficiently similar to the norm groups cited in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator manual for the validity and reliability measures to apply.

5. It is assumed that psychological type did not affect the rate of response to the investigator's request for subject participation.

6. It is assumed that a couple's level of marital adjustment did not affect the rate of response to the investigator's request for subject participation.

Overview of the Study

There appears to be a need to test the conclusions drawn by Carl Jung and Isabel Briggs Myers regarding the impact of psychological type upon the marriage relationship. The potential benefits to professional therapists and counselors who work with married couples have been cited.

The terminology to be employed in this study has been presented and defined. The hypotheses have been presented in general form. The assumptions underlying the collection of data have been listed.

The remainder of the study was organized as an investigation of the problem. Chapter II is a review of the relevant literature. In Chapter III, the research design and methodology are presented; the population and sample are discussed; the dependent and independent variables are presented in conjunction with a presentation of the instrumentation; and the procedure for data analysis is discussed. Chapter IV is devoted to reporting and analysis of the results of the investigation. Chapter V is a summary of the study, a discussion of the impact of the limitations of the study, and contains suggestions for additional investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study focuses upon three related areas of investigation. One is the theory of Jungian psychological type and attempts to define and evaluate it critically. The second area is the legitimacy of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as an instrument capable of identifying the domains of personality congruent with Jung's types. The third area is that of marital adjustment and attempts to define and measure it. The review of the literature will treat each of these three areas in such a way as to effect a confluence of ideas at the point of the empirical research.

Carl Gustav Jung's Theory of Psychological Type

In 1921, Carl Gustav Jung, a psychiatrist who had studied and worked alongside such renowned principals in the field as Eugen Bleuler, Alfred Adler, and Sigmund Freud, published a book entitled Psychological Types (1923). In this work, Jung developed a matrix of

psychological types in order to explain the recurrence of systematic differences in the personalities of his patients and acquaintances (1961).

The matrix consists of two attitudes, Extraversion and Introversion, and four psychological functions, Sensation, Intuition, Thinking, and Feeling. The resulting eight combinations of attitude and function comprise the framework for Jung's classification of various behaviors and orientations to intra-psychic and external worlds. This framework is illustrated in Figure 2.1.

Extraverted Sensing	Introverted Sensing
Extraverted Intuition	Introverted Intuition
Extraverted Thinking	Introverted Thinking
Extraverted Feeling	Introverted Feeling

Figure 2.1. Jung's classification of psychological types.

The ideas and impressions which led to the development of Jung's typology were heavily influenced by his encounters with patients suffering from "nervous illnesses" (Jung, 1923, p. ix). He was able to state the relationship between each of the eight psychological types and the corresponding predispositions for specific

forms of psychopathology (Campbell, 1971). This sequence of theory following empirical observation was a regular practice of Jung's (Whitmont & Kaufman, 1973). His earlier development of the theory of complexes and the mechanism of repression followed empirical work with Galton's word association test (Hall & Lindzey, 1970). Likewise, his notions of archetypes and the collective unconscious arose from his observation of recurring symbolism in the dreams of his patients and cross-cultural art forms (Jung, 1959). Indeed, throughout his career, Jung posited many hypotheses about the human psyche as a result of his recognition of patterns, commonalities among cultures, and recurring historical references to symbols, the occult, and alchemy. He took the role of empirical observer of human behavior and induced his theories from his observations (Hall & Nordby, 1973). Thus he was prepared to state in the case of psychological types that the existence of exactly four psychological functions was a matter of empirical fact (Hall & Lindzey, 1970).

Investigation of Jung's Typology

In recent years various researchers have undertaken the task of submitting Jung's construct of psychological type to empirical investigation. A summary of these efforts follows.

In 1944, Gray and Wheelwright took one of the first steps toward examining the interaction between Jungian psychological type and marriage, taking an actuarial and descriptive approach. They found early evidence for "complementary mating," or the pairing of spouses of opposite types. They published another article (Gray & Wheelwright, 1945) on Jung's typology with emphasis upon the irrational and rational functions. By 1946, Gray and Wheelwright had developed a 75-item self-report instrument designed to identify a person's psychological type. Three scales measured the dimensions of Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, and Thinking/Feeling.

Additional studies performed by Gray and Wheelwright examined psychological type as it relates to age change (1947) and actuarial distribution by sex (1948). In 1949, Gray elaborated upon the 1944 study in an attempt to support the notion of complementary mating. He states,

The thesis here is the paradox that the choice of mates is often motivated, not by similarities but by differences, that they are specifiable though ordinarily unrealized, that they could be fairly easily diagnosed, that they would then be factors for teamplay instead of tensions. (p. 189)

Thus, Gray proposed early applications of Jungian typology for marriage counseling.

In a study by Eysenck (1953) the author found what he considered to be confirmation of Jung's attitude of Extraversion/Introversion as one of the three primary

dimensions of personality, along with psychoticism and neuroticism. This finding does not speak to the four functions which Jung proposed, however.

In a comprehensive examination of major personality assessment instruments such as Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Test, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and the Rorschach test, Carrigan (1960) focused upon Extraversion/Introversion as a personality dimension. Her findings were cautious:

In the various media, then, the situation remains essentially as Eysenck found it in 1953, with well-defined E-I factors appearing in questionnaire and rating studies, suggestive ones in analyses of objective and projective tests. True, a great deal more evidence has accumulated, particularly in the questionnaire medium, and much of it is favorable. Nevertheless, in terms of the first criterion--the consistent appearance of E-I factors in all media of observation--the unidimensionality of extraversion-introversion has not been conclusively demonstrated. (p. 355)

Myers (1962b) provided some of the first empirical evidence for the existence of dichotomous dimensions corresponding to Jung's typology. Her construction of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (1962a) was similar to that of Gray and Wheelwright (1946), in that it attempted to classify persons' types. Hers was the most positive endorsement of Jung's two attitudes and four functions to date.

Bradway (1964) asked 28 Jungian analysts to categorize themselves according to Jung's typology and then

administered to them both the Gray-Wheelwright Questionnaire and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This effort at validating the constructs of Jung's typology yielded most positive results for the Extraversion/Introversion dimension on both instruments. Significant correlations were obtained for the Sensing/Intuition dimension for both instruments, and significant correlations were obtained from the Gray-Wheelwright Questionnaire on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

Stricker and Ross (1964a) used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to test four structural properties attributed by Jung to his typology. Jung had declared that the attitudes and functions: (a) are stable over time and not easily changed; (b) are categorical or qualitatively dichotomous; (c) are interacting (such that extraverted thinking is different than introverted thinking, etc.); and (d) underlie variations in surface personality traits such as values and interests. In addition, Stricker and Ross examined Jung's contention that type indeterminacy produces ineffective and maladaptive behavior. Their results were as follows:

Some structural properties of Jung's typology were investigated, using a self-report inventory, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The findings were that: (a) the type classification had moderate stability; (b) Indicator score distributions were not bimodal; (c) with one exception (T/F), the regressions of other variables on Indicator scales did not change at the zero point of the Indicator scales; (d) the Indicator scales did not interact; (e) the Indicator scales did not moderate the

regressions of other variables on one another; and (f) type indeterminacy was unrelated to ineffective behavior and maladjustment. It was concluded that those results offer little support for any of the structural properties attributed to the typology. (1964a, p. 62)

In a study utilizing factor-analysis of Q-sorted self-descriptors, Gorlow, Simonson, and Krauss (1966) attempted to verify Jung's typology. They were able to account for 46.03% of the total variance in responses by identifying six factors which corresponded to Jungian types. These factor-analysis-derived "types" were: (a) extraverted-feeling; (b) introverted-thinking, type A; (c) extraverted-thinking; (d) introverted-thinking, type B; (e) extraverted-sensing; and (f) extraverted-intuition. Basing their judgment upon these results, Gorlow, Simonson, and Krauss lent their support to the Jungian system of types.

Ball (1967) undertook a factor analytic investigation of Jung's attitudes of Extraversion/Introversion and the functions of Thinking/Feeling. He found six factors which accounted for 42% of total variance in occupational style preference for his sample, all of which were defined in terms of Extraversion/Introversion, Thinking/Feeling or both.

Cook (1970) also undertook to subject Jung's dimensions of Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, and Thinking/Feeling to theoretical and experimental analysis. He concluded that the negative correlations

between the four pairs of "counter-types" constructed from the possible E/I-S/N and E/I-T/F combinations (ES-IN; IS-EN; ET-IF; IT-EF) could be accounted for simply by the Extravert/Introvert attitude factor. His study led him to provide only a qualified support for Jung's typology.

Jung's typology receives little support, if not outright rejection, from orthodox Freudians (Fenichel, 1945; Glover, 1956). The limited empirical evidence in support of Jung's typology cited above lends less than whole-hearted endorsement to his constructs. As Hall and Lindzey (1970) report in their comparison of the research generated by Freud's and Jung's respective theories, "Jung's theories seem to have stimulated very little interest among psychologists and even less research." However, the interest in Jung's theories seems to be steadily increasing of late (Singer, 1972), and one might reasonably expect that with an increase in interest will come an increase in research.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Introduced in 1962 (Myers, 1962b), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is an instrument built firmly upon the foundation of Jung's psychological typology. The original Jungian attitudes of Extraversion/Introversion, as well as the four psychological functions--Sensing, Intuition, Thinking, and Feeling (Jung, 1923)--have been

operationalized and scaled. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has four dichotomous dimensions, yielding 16 personality type categories. The first dimension is designated Extraversion/Introversion (E/I). The second is the Sensing/Intuition (S/N) dimension, combining both of Jung's opposing perceptual functions. The third is the Thinking/Feeling (T/F) dimension, combining both of Jung's opposing judging functions. The fourth dimension is called Judging/Perceiving (J/P), and represents an elaboration by Isabel Myers and Katharine Briggs upon Jung's original theory. The J/P dimension provides an indication as to the person's preference for utilization of either a perceptual function (Sensing or Intuiting) or a judgment function (Thinking or Feeling) when dealing with the external environment. Thus, it provides a guide to the dominant function, since Extraverts reveal their dominant function when dealing with the external environment, and Introverts reserve their dominant function for dealing with the internal or intra-psychic world (Myers, 1962b, pp. 59-62).

Because of this additional emphasis upon the person's preference for utilization of a judging or a perceiving function when dealing with the external world, Myers altered the matrix of types suggested by Jung. In addition, she has also introduced a conceptual framework in which both an irrational function (Sensing or

Intuiting) and a rational function (Thinking or Feeling) coexist as contributing factors to a particular type. This modification, combined with the modification involving the Judging/Perceiving dimension, necessitated the formulation of a new matrix of psychological types.

Whereas Jung had built his matrix upon a 2 x 4 design of two attitudes (Extraversion and Introversion) and four functions (Sensing, Intuition, Thinking, and Feeling), Myers used a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 design: two attitudes (Extraversion and Introversion), two irrational functions (Sensing and Intuition), two rational functions (Thinking and Feeling), and the additional fourth dimension of Judging/Perceiving.

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ

Figure 2.2. Myers' classification of 16 psychological types.

Myers cites extensive research in the theoretical groundwork, construction, and validation of the Indicator (1962b). The personality variables in the Indicator have

been correlated with the Gray-Wheelwright Psychological Type Questionnaire, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the Personality Research Inventory. Correlations with various nontest variables were also included to provide support for the evidence provided by self-report instruments. Split-half reliabilities reported for the M.B.T.I. yield respectable results for a personality instrument. They range from .75 to .85 in nearly all groups cited by Myers (1962b).

In addition to information about test construction, Myers provides an extensive discussion on the potential uses of the attitudes and functions, the 16 types, the usefulness of opposite preferences between people, and descriptions of modal behaviors and interests of people with various type preference combinations (Myers, 1976).

The reaction to the M.B.T.I. by researchers has been mixed, but generally positive. Stricker and Ross (1963, 1964a) performed their own research on the inter-correlations and reliability of the M.B.T.I., with results similar to those of Myers.

Webb (1964) used phi coefficients to determine the independence of the dichotomous type dimensions used by Myers. He found relative independence, especially among the dimensions directly based upon Jung's original two attitudes and four functions. Thus, to the extent that

the J/P dimension on the M.B.T.I. is used within the constraints originally conceived by Myers, the M.B.T.I. can be said to accurately represent Jung's structural distinction amongst the attitudes and functions. In 1969, Richek found similar results to those of Webb (1964) using Pearson product-moment correlations. In an extensive review of the literature on the statistical analysis of the M.B.T.I., Carlyn (1976) cites numerous corroborations of the basic validity and reliability of the Indicator as it relates to Jungian typology.

Mendelsohn (1970) cited one of the weaker areas of M.B.T.I. reliability evidence, that being the area of test-retest. This is consistent with Myers' own indication that test-retest studies, especially longitudinal studies, are needed. Mendelsohn remains one of the most critical reviewers of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, suggesting that Myers has not been able to provide operationalized scales for Jung's typology.

Ross (1966) conducted a study in which the M.B.T.I. was intercorrelated with a battery of 32 test instruments, including 15 ability tests, seven experimental interest tests, and 10 scales taken from a personality inventory. By performing separate factor analyses on the data collected from male and female subjects, Ross was able to show that the M.B.T.I. scales, taken together, were linked with variables of ability, interest, and

personality. However, he concluded that all four M.B.T.I. scales reflect surface characteristics rather than typological differences.

Thus the majority of the evidence suggests that the M.B.T.I. performs about as well as most other personality instruments on the issues of reliability and validity. Some questions remain about the construct validity of the M.B.T.I., a problem generated at least in part by Jung's own imprecision in defining his constructs, and in part by the difficulty in measuring any theoretical construct.

Uses of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Until October, 1976, the M.B.T.I. was classified as an "experimental" instrument (Myers, 1962b). As Myers has stated in her discussion of the limitations of the Indicator,

As with any new instrument of this sort, the most sagacious use involves a constant search for separate verification and new meanings, as noted. In any use, but particularly where decisions must be made about a person which affect his welfare, the decision-maker should bear the onus of conducting research to test the application made.
(p. 77)

That many applications of the M.B.T.I. are being made in the areas of personal interaction is evidenced by a recent bibliography of research involving the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (McCaulley, et al., 1977). Of the 391 sources cited, nearly 40% deal with some aspect of

psychological type impact upon interpersonal relations. Some consider the patterning of types in various vocations which emphasize human interaction, such as mental and physical health care delivery, and others consider compatibility between people of various types in employer-employee, student-instructor, and other structured relationships.

However, in the very specific application of Jungian typology to the understanding of interpersonal compatibility and adjustment between intimates, the existing literature is sparse. Eigenbrod (1969) conducted a study on the effects of personality compatibility, as defined by shared M.B.T.I. preferences, upon satisfaction with college roommates. Those combinations of roommates who shared more similar function preferences also indicated more satisfaction with the relationship. This finding would seem to lend support to Myers' hypotheses regarding greater compatibility between persons of similar type. Osgood (1972), in a similar study which examined the relationship between friendship bonds and Jungian psychological types, was able to find only a nonsignificant tendency for friends to be more similar on the M.B.T.I. than randomly assigned pairs of subjects.

In a study tangentially related to the issues of psychological type and marriage, Neville (1971) examined differential responses of people of various types to

marital enrichment groups. He found Intuitors and Feelers most predominant amongst the participants, while Sensors and Thinkers were least well represented. However, no clear statement about the quality of the relationships between spouses of various type combinations emerged from this study.

Norton (1971), in a study on empathic ability and its relationship to marital adjustment, used the M.B.T.I., form C. However,

. . . this instrument was not chosen as a device to measure personality but was used for the purpose of obtaining data necessary for the measurement of empathy. The four indicator scales were examined, however, to determine if there was any relationship between them and the empathy scores. The T-F scale was examined specifically for any relationship to the empathy scores. (pp. 59-60)

Lindner (1972) examined the relationship between various interpersonal understanding variables and a measure of marital happiness. In this study, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was used in a response-predicting paradigm in which item-by-item comparisons were made between actual and predicted responses. Real Similarity (RS) was defined as "the number of items on which mates are in fact similar" (p. 52); it was not based upon type categories. In his discussion on the impact of type combinations upon marriage, Lindner notes that various opposing hypotheses have been proposed but not subjected to empirical research. The present study is aimed specifically at that very question.

DiTiberio and Hammer (1977) also raised the issue of type combinations and their effect upon marriage. While presenting a model for enhancing skills in listening, self-disclosure, and feedback between spouses in a group counseling setting, they suggested the use of the M.B.T.I. as a tool for examining differences in peoples' skill levels. A question which evolved from this work with couples is, "Whether certain combinations of types in a close relationship are more or less likely than other combinations to have difficulties interacting and understanding one another" (p. 7). Again various hypotheses have been suggested by Jung (1923), Myers (1962a), and others. In order for this question to be examined empirically, it is necessary to find a suitable way of measuring marital compatibility, happiness, or harmony, so that various type-combinations can be compared with varying levels of marital satisfaction.

Marital Adjustment

Ever since Hamilton introduced the Marital Adjustment Test in 1929, the subject of marital adjustment has drawn the interest of researchers (Spanier, 1976). A common conceptual model of the problem faced in marital adjustment is that of complementarity versus symmetry in the relationship (Bateson, 1936). Symmetry in a marriage relationship implies similarities, homogeneity of needs, likenesses between the two people. Complementarity refers

to differences, heterogeneity of needs, a give-and-take between dissimilar but mutually useful attributes.

One of the great controversies in the exploration of marital adjustment revolves around the relative importance of symmetry and complementarity in explaining marital attraction and adjustment.

Newcomb (1956), after reviewing the work of such theorists as Kelley, Winch, and Jennings, comes to the conclusion that similarities between people offer the best predictive information about interpersonal attraction. Tharp (1963) also supports the pre-eminence of symmetry and claims that theories of complementary needs and roles in marriage, as suggested by Winch (1954), are untenable. Cattell and Nesselroade (1967) examined the three principles of likeness, completion, and dynamic adjustment. They found that stably married couples were positively correlated on eight of 16 source traits of personality, while unstably married couples were positively correlated on two source traits, and negatively correlated on three source traits. They concluded that the likeness theory (i.e., symmetry) was more useful in explaining marital adjustment than was complementarity.

Of those proponents of the theory of marital adjustment via complementarity, Winch (Winch, Ktsanes, & Ktsanes, 1954) offered the first analytical and descriptive evidence. He states:

If individuals A and B have complementary need patterns, B's resulting behavior will be a greater source of gratification to A than will be the case with the behavior of C, who is psychically similar to A. (p. 242)

He tempered his theory with the notion that peoples' needs could be considered complementary even if their needs were the same, but differing greatly in intensity.

Kerckhoff and Davis (1962), using the FIRO-B in a study of need complementarity and value consensus as factors in mate selection, conclude that need complementarity is a viable hypothesis in explaining mate selection. In addition, Levinger (1964), in a review of the arguments over complementarity, points out some semantic difficulties in the distinction between complementarity and similarity of needs but suggests that Winch's notion of complementarity is tenable.

In a refreshing amalgam of opposing viewpoints, Jackson (Lederer & Jackson, 1968), following in the footsteps of Bateson (1936), uses both complementarity and symmetry to explain the dynamics of spouse and family relationships. He conceptualizes the two notions as homeostatic mechanisms which operate simultaneously to help define roles in the family.

The Jungian position on this issue, though never expressed by him in explicit terms, is summarized by Lindner (1972). He interprets Jung's and Myers' positions on complementarity/symmetry as essentially pro-symmetry.

They both assign greater probability of conflict and lack of understanding to those marriages in which the spouses' types are very dissimilar.

Measurement of Marital Adjustment

The attempts to measure marital adjustment have generally taken one of three main approaches. The first may be considered a diagnostic approach. Spouses are tested on instruments designed to measure individual personality characteristics, and the responses of the spouses are compared by means of subjective interpretation. Instruments used in this approach are the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis, the Edwards Personal Preference Survey, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Leary's Interpersonal Check List, the Sex Knowledge Inventory--form X, the Mooney Problem Check List, and the Personal Data Blank (Philips, 1973). The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory has been used to discriminate marriage counselees from married couples in general on the basis of interacting pathological tendencies (Arnold, 1970). Jones (1976) has used Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire to examine symmetry and complementarity issues. Schutz' FIRO-B instrument has been used by Burke and Weir (1976) to examine personality differences between members of one-career and two-career families. In general, this approach requires therapists, clients, and researchers to make assumptions about symmetrical

versus complementary personality characteristics and the subsequent impact upon marriage.

The second approach to measuring marital adjustment may be considered an indirect approach in which certain factors are identified as critical to marital adjustment and then measured. From comparisons of these measures and supplementary self-reports on marital adjustment, inferences are made regarding the utility of the specified factors in identifying marital adjustment. Examples of this approach are: Gilbert's (1976) exploration of the relationship between self-disclosure and marital satisfaction; Thomas' (1974) comparison of spouse-spouse value profiles between stable and unstable couples; Lefkowitz' (1973) examination of role expectation/enactment and stress factors as they relate to marital risk; Clark's (1973) study on interpersonal communication variables and marital satisfaction; Lindner's (1972) exploration of interpersonal understanding and marital happiness; and Norton's (1971) study of the relationship between empathic ability and marital adjustment.

The third approach is more direct. Marital adjustment is measured by direct self-report, and most of the empirical energies are directed toward the task of making the self-report instrument more valid and reliable. Examples include global measures of marital companionship, satisfaction, tensions, and happiness

(Marini, 1976), and single, self-report items (Chadwick, Albrecht, & Kunz, 1976; Orden & Bradburn, 1973). In addition, more extensive efforts at sampling the various domains of marital behavior and attitudes have been offered. A classic instrument was devised by Locke (1951), who later issued a shorter form in collaboration with Wallace (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale has attracted critical analysis (Kimmel & Van der Veen, 1974; Spanier, 1972) and will not be reviewed further here. Another instrument which has been used extensively is a series of schedules, the Marital Success Schedules, devised by Burgess and Wallin (1953).

An amalgam of the existing instruments used to measure marital satisfaction has been offered by Spanier (1976). His Dyadic Adjustment Scale, which borrows heavily from the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale and the Burgess-Wallin Marital Success Schedules, is the result of a factor-analytic distillation of a pool of approximately 300 items found in various marital adjustment instruments. Spanier reports evidence for high scale reliability (sub-scale reliabilities range from .73 to .94, and total scale reliability is .96). He also presents evidence for content, criterion-related, and construct validity.

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale was chosen for use in this investigation because it appears to be the most comprehensive attempt presently available at measuring marital adjustment. It draws upon the strengths of the classic instruments of Locke and Wallace (1959) and of Burgess and Wallin (1953), while having the additional advantage of factor-analytic verification.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The study was designed to examine the relationship between the psychological type combinations of spouses and their marital adjustment. In order to study this relationship, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was used to obtain measures of spouses' psychological type. The Dyadic Adjustment Scale was used to obtain a global measure of spouses' marital adjustment. In addition, post-test interviews were conducted to obtain clinical impressions about the couples.

This chapter includes descriptions of the following: (a) the selection of the sample population; (b) the procedures used in collecting data; (c) the instrumentation; (d) the research design; (e) the statistical hypotheses; and (f) the statistical analysis procedures. In addition to the formal research design, this chapter includes the rationale for the clinical interviews.

Selection of the Sample Population

The sample consisted of married couples from the Michigan State University community and East Lansing,

Michigan community. Subjects were solicited from three major groups in these communities: the Michigan State University faculty and staff--professional and nonprofessional; the married student housing units of the university; and from groups representing the nonuniversity-affiliated organizations in the East Lansing area. These were primarily the retail establishments, service agencies, and churches. The sample included professors, instructors, graduate students, clerical-technical employees, administrators, managers, physical plant employees, undergraduate students, retailers, service agency employees, and their spouses.

A concerted effort was made to obtain a representative sample of the faculty/staff population by soliciting participation from the 14 largest of the university's 17 colleges. One and sometimes two (depending upon the size of the college) departments from each college were randomly selected. In order to include nonacademic departments in the sample, representative groups of administrative and service departments of the university were also selected in a similar manner. Half of the married people in these university departments were chosen at random to be contacted. Their marital status was indicated in the university faculty-staff telephone directory. The investigator sent solicitation letters and return postcards to these people. This letter is found in Appendix A.

Members of the sample who did not come from university departments were selected in a similar manner. Letters or phone calls were used to contact randomly selected community organizations. Those persons who indicated their willingness to participate in the research study were then given the research instruments and became subjects for the study.

Between February 8 and April 23, a total of 330 couples were contacted and asked to participate in the study. From this group, 142 couples, or 43% of the couples, initially indicated that they would respond to the test instruments. Subsequently, 126 couples, or 89% of these original respondents, returned completed data sheets. Fourteen of the couples had changed their minds about participating, and the remaining two packets of test responses were apparently lost in the mail. Of all the groups contacted, the academic departments had the lowest rate of participation, with no discernible differences between departments. The greatest participation rate occurred among the university administrative departments.

The subjects returned their test packets during the period of time from February 13 to May 18, with an average return time of about 20 days.

Description of the Sample Population

The subjects were administered a demographic questionnaire as a precursory section of the Marriage Relationship Survey. The results of the 12 items are presented in Table 3.1.

A summary of the demographic survey indicates that:

1. Just over half of the men were over 30 years of age, and just under half of the women were over 30 years old.
2. About half of all subjects worked full-time; nearly all the men were employed and about 75% of the women worked.
3. Most subjects were not enrolled in college coursework; those who were students were nearly all part-time.
4. Over 90% of the sample had attended or completed college.
5. The overwhelming portion of the sample had been married only once and had been married for an average of about six to 10 years, though a fourth of the subjects had been married less than three years.
6. About two-thirds of the sample had children; their ages ranged all the way from the infancy years

Table 3.1
Results of the Demographic Questionnaire

	Ages of Subjects (%)					
	23	23-30	31-40	41-50	> 50	
Wives	7	47	25	9	12	
Husbands	2	43	24	18	14	
	# Hours/Week Spent at a Paying Job (%)					
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	> 40
Wives	29	5	10	10	34	13
Husbands	7	0	3	10	30	50
	# College Credits Currently Enrolled in (%)					
	0	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	> 16
Wives	73	7	11	5	3	1
Husbands	64	7	15	9	3	3
	# Years of Formal Education (%)					
	7-12	13-16	17-18	19-22	> 22	
Wives	9	45	28	17	2	
Husbands	7	20	24	39	10	
	# Times Married (%)					
	1	2				
Wives	91	9				
Husbands	91	9				

Table 3.1 (Continued)

	# Years Married to Present Spouse (%)					
	0-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Wives	26	21	16	11	9	17
Husbands	25	22	17	10	10	17
	# Years Lived with Spouse Prior to Marriage (%)					
	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	> 2
Wives	72	8	5	10	3	3
Husbands	72	7	6	10	3	3
	Did Your Parents Approve of Your Marriage? (%)					
	Yes	No	Don't Know			
Wives	86	7	7			
Husbands	86	10	4			
	# Children (%)					
	0	1	2	3	4	> 4
Wives	39	17	21	14	8	2
Husbands	37	17	23	14	8	2
	Age of Eldest Child (%)					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	> 24
Wives	22	18	25	10	5	20
Husbands	23	20	25	10	4	19

Table 3.1 (Continued)

	Age of Youngest Child (%)					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	> 24
Wives	32	30	17	7	7	8
Husbands	32	29	15	7	9	8
	Serious Behavioral Difficulty with Any Child? (%)					
	Yes	No				
Wives	13	87				
Husbands	12	88				

past 24; about 10% of the parents reported having had at least some serious behavior difficulties with a child.

Procedures Used in Collecting Data

The subjects were given the following materials to facilitate their participation in the study:

1. An instruction sheet, indicating the manner in which to proceed. Subjects were instructed to first sign the consent forms, then to answer the research instruments without consulting their spouses. They responded first to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and then to the Marriage Relationship Survey. A copy of the instructions is found in Appendix B.
2. Two consent forms--one for each spouse. A copy of the consent form is found in Appendix C.
3. A Myers-Briggs Type Indicator booklet.
4. Two Myers-Briggs Type Indicator computer answer sheets (Michigan State University Printing Service).
5. A Marriage Relationship Survey booklet. A copy of the Marriage Relationship Survey is found in Appendix D.
6. Two Marriage Relationship Survey computer answer sheets.
7. A #2 scoring pencil.

8. A large pre-addressed stamped envelope to be used in mailing the total packet to the researcher.

All answer sheets and consent forms were numerically coded in order to protect subjects' identity during data analysis and to allow interested subjects to receive the results from their own Myers-Briggs Type Indicator upon their request.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, were selected to measure the independent and dependent variables, respectively. The rationale for their selection was developed in the chapter on Review of the Literature. Each instrument will be discussed separately.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (M.B.T.I.) is a self-administered, 166-item, ipsatively scored instrument designed to indicate psychological type as described by Carl Gustav Jung. The independent variable, psychological type, is composed of four separate sub-variables, each corresponding to one of the dichotomous dimensions provided by the M.B.T.I. These dimensions are: (a) Extraversion/Introversion; (b) Sensation/Intuition; (c) Thinking/Feeling; and (d) Judging/Perceiving.

The issue of the reliability of the M.B.T.I. has been discussed extensively by Myers (1962b) and Carlyn (1977; 1976). Split-half reliabilities reported by Carlyn (1977) in her survey of M.B.T.I. reliability studies range between: (a) .63 and .87 for the E/I dimension (median = .81); (b) .75 and .90 for the S/N dimension (median = .85); (c) .67 and .86 for the T/F dimension (median = .76); and (d) .80 and .87 for the J/P dimension (median = .82). With median split-half reliabilities in the high .70s and low .80s for all four dimensions, the M.B.T.I. compares favorably with other self-report psychological inventories (Myers, 1962b).

The construct validity of the M.B.T.I. has been the subject of several previous studies (Myers, 1962b; Bradway, 1964; Stricker & Ross, 1964; Webb, 1964; Richek, 1969). The general consensus of these investigators is that the M.B.T.I. adequately identifies domains of personality that correspond to Jung's typology.

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (D.A.S.) is a 32-item instrument composed of Likert scale response choices and is designed to measure the degree of adjustment between cohabiting couples, married or unmarried. It was derived from an original pool of approximately 300 test items found in an exhaustive search of marital and dyad adjustment instruments (Spanier, 1976). Through elimination

of redundant and less powerful items, and subsequent factor analysis, the original pool was reduced to 32 items. These items are distributed among four factors:

1. dyadic satisfaction;
2. dyadic cohesion;
3. dyadic consensus; and
4. affectional expression.

The internal consistency reliability for each of the four subscales ranges from .73 to .94, with a total scale reliability of .96 (Spanier, 1976).

Evidence to support the content, criterion-related, and construct validity of the D.A.S. is cited by Spanier (1976), and he describes fairly stringent methods for determining the validity results. His t-tests for significant differences between criterion groups and for correlation with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale yielded significant differences at the .001 level.

On the basis of the research conducted by Spanier on the major instruments available for measuring marital adjustment, the investigator selected Spanier's instrument for use in the study. The Dyadic Adjustment Scale incorporates the strengths of Terman's 1938 edition of the Marital Happiness Index, the Nye-MacDougall Marital Adjustment Scale introduced in 1959, Orden and Bradburn's Dimension of Marriage Happiness instrument introduced in

1968, the Burgess-Cottrell Marital Adjustment Form of 1939, and the extensive work of Locke and his colleagues (Spanier, 1976).

Two adjustments were made in the appearance of the D.A.S. by the investigator. The first was to preface the original D.A.S. with 12 items designed to elicit demographic information. This information was collected to provide a clinical description of the sample group. The second adjustment was to change the name of this amalgamated instrument to the Marriage Relationship Survey. This was done to attempt to reduce the possibility of subjects responding with a social-desirability set when presented with the word "Adjustment" in the title of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. However, throughout the description of this study, the original name Dyadic Adjustment Scale will be used to refer to the test instrument. Its author, Graham Spanier, kindly agreed to the use of his instrument in the present study in whatever form was necessary.

Research Design

Each pair of spouses was treated in the design as a single unit for purposes of comparison with other pairs of spouses. Couples were classified into various groups on the basis of their personality type combinations. The couples were measured on all four dimensions of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Extraversion/Introversion,

Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving. By combining the preferences of both spouses on each of the four dimensions, couples could be classified either as Homogeneous (same preference) or Heterogeneous (opposite preferences). For example, a couple could be classified on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension as:

1. Homogeneous Extraverts--both spouses prefer Extraversion;
2. Homogeneous Introverts--both spouses prefer Introversion;
3. Heterogeneous--one spouse prefers Extraversion, and one spouse prefers Introversion.

In the same manner, the couples were classified either as Homogeneous or Heterogeneous on each of the other three dimensions: Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving. On this basis, Hypotheses I through VIII were tested. Hypotheses I and II are related to the planned comparisons of Extravert/Introvert groups; Hypotheses III and IV are related to the planned comparisons of the Sensing/Intuition groups; Hypotheses V and VI are related to the planned comparisons of Thinking/Feeling groups; and Hypotheses VII and VIII are related to the planned comparisons of Judging/Perceiving groups. The design for these hypothesis tests is illustrated in Figure 3.1.

			D.A.S.
Hom	Hom ₁	S's	
	Hom ₂	S's	
Het		S's	

Hom = Homogeneous Preference for given dimension

Het = Heterogeneous Preference for given dimension

Hom₁ = Homogeneous Preference for E, S, T, or J

Hom₂ = Homogeneous Preference for I, N, F, or P

S's = Subjects

D.A.S. = Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale score

Figure 3.1. Test design for Hypotheses I through VIII.

In addition to classifying couples on each of the four dimensions of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, they were also classified according to the number of dimensions (from zero to four) upon which they were Homogeneous. In this way, the degree of similarity between spouses could be related to overall marital adjustment. This relationship was the basis of Hypothesis IX. The design is illustrated in Figure 3.2.

The design used to test Hypothesis X was similar to that employed in testing Hypothesis IX. Couples were classified according to the number of functions (from zero

		D.A.S.
Hom ₀	S's	
Hom ₁	S's	
Hom ₂	S's	
Hom ₃	S's	
Hom ₄	S's	

Hom₀ = Homogeneous Preferences on 0 Dimensions

Hom₁ = Homogeneous Preference on 1 Dimension

Hom₂ = Homogeneous Preferences on 2 Dimensions

Hom₃ = Homogeneous Preferences on 3 Dimensions

Hom₄ = Homogeneous Preferences on 4 Dimensions

S's = Subjects

D.A.S. = Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores

Figure 3.2. Test design for Hypothesis IX.

to two) upon which they were Homogeneous. The functions are defined as Sensing/Intuition and Thinking/Feeling. The design for the test of Hypothesis X is illustrated in Figure 3.3.

		D.A.S.
Hom ₀	S's	
Hom ₁	S's	
Hom ₂	S's	

Hom₀ = Homogeneous Preferences on 0 Functions

Hom₁ = Homogeneous Preference on 1 Function

Hom₂ = Homogeneous Preferences on 2 Functions

S's = Subjects

D.A.S. = Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Score

Figure 3.3. Test design for Hypothesis X.

Finally, in order to test Hypothesis XI, the couples were classified according to a scheme of relative compatibility between their dominant functions. To reiterate, the dominant function is theorized by Jung to be the function developed first in a person's life. It is manifest on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as the preferred irrational function for Introvert-Judgers and Extravert-Perceivers; it is the preferred rational

function for Introvert-Perceivers and Extravert-Judgers. For example, a person whose psychological type is ESTJ (Extravert-Sensor-Thinker-Judger), the preferred rational function, and therefore the dominant function, is Thinking. The design used to test Hypothesis XI is illustrated in Figure 3.4.

		D.A.S.
F _O	S's	
F _A	S's	
F _I	S's	

F_O = Dominant Functions Opposed

F_A = Dominant Functions Auxiliary

F_I = Dominant Functions Identical

S's = Subjects

D.A.S. = Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Score

Figure 3.4. Test design for Hypothesis XI.

Statistical Hypotheses

In order to test empirically the relationship between spouses' personality type combinations (independent variable) and marital adjustment (dependent variable), the following hypotheses were developed. They are presented in null form with alternate hypotheses where

appropriate. The list of abbreviations used in stating the statistical hypotheses is presented below.

H_o = Null Hypothesis

H_a = Alternate Hypothesis

M = Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale score for all subjects in a given category

Hom = Homogeneous couple--Mean Score

Het = Heterogeneous couple--Mean Score

ρ = Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient

E/E = couple composed of two Extraverts

I/I = couple composed of two Introverts

E/I = couple composed of one Extravert and one Introvert

S/S = couple composed of two Sensors

N/N = couple composed of two Intuitors

S/N = couple composed of one Sensor and one Intuitior

T/T = couple composed of two Thinkers

F/F = couple composed of two Feelers

T/F = couple composed of one Thinker and one Feeler

J/J = couple composed of two Judgers

P/P = couple composed of two Perceivers

J/P = couple composed of one Judger and one
Perceiver

The first hypotheses were developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the ways in which spouses prefer to focus their capacities for perception and judgment--either upon the "outer world" of people and things, or upon the "inner world" of concepts and ideas. Neither Jung nor Myers have hypothesized about differences between two Extraverts and two Introverts in terms of their ability to understand one another. However, both Jung and Myers have suggested that similar preference between spouses is more advantageous than opposing preferences. Therefore, the relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis I:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Extravert couples and Homogeneous Introvert couples.

$$H_o: M_{E/E} = M_{I/I}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Extravert couples and Homogeneous Introvert couples.

$$H_a: M_{E/E} \neq M_{I/I}$$

Null Hypothesis II:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension.

$$H_0: \text{Hom}_{E/E;I/I} = \text{Het}_{E/I}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension.

$$H_a: \text{Hom}_{E/E;I/I} > \text{Het}_{E/I}$$

The second set of hypotheses was developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the ways in which spouses prefer to perceive. Perception is accomplished by Sensing, a process involving primarily the familiar five physical senses, or by Intuition, a more indirect process which involves unconscious ideas and associations. Again, Jung and Myers have postulated that similarity in preference with respect to perception is advantageous to the functioning of a relationship but do not treat the question of differences between two Sensors and two Intuitors. Therefore, the relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis III:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Sensor couples and Homogeneous Intuitior couples.

$$H_o: M_{S/S} = M_{N/N}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Sensor couples and Homogeneous Intuitior couples.

$$H_a: M_{S/S} \neq M_{N/N}$$

Null Hypothesis IV:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Sensing/Intuition dimension.

$$H_o: Hom_{S/S;N/N} = Het_{S/N}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Sensing/Intuition dimension.

$$H_a: Hom_{S/S;N/N} > Het_{S/N}$$

The third set of hypotheses was developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the ways in which spouses prefer to make judgments. Judgment is accomplished by Thinking, a process of reasoning which utilizes logical and impersonal operations, or by Feeling, a process of reasoning which utilizes personal and subjective values. As in the case of the first two dimensions, Jung and Myers postulate that similarity of preference is advantageous to a relationship but do not

indicate that mutual preference for Thinking presents any advantage or disadvantage vis-a-vis mutual preference for Feeling. Therefore, the relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis V:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Thinker couples and Homogeneous Feeler couples.

$$H_o: M_{T/T} = M_{F/F}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Thinker couples and Homogeneous Feeler couples.

$$H_a: M_{T/T} \neq M_{F/F}$$

Null Hypothesis VI:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

$$H_o: Hom_{T/T;F/F} = Het_{T/F}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

$$H_a: Hom_{T/T;F/F} > Het_{T/F}$$

The fourth set of hypotheses was developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the functions which spouses prefer to use in their dealings with the outer world of people and things, that is, which functions they extravert. Judgers are those who prefer to extravert the functions used in making judgments--Thinking and Feeling. Perceivers are those who prefer to extravert the functions used in perceiving--Sensing and Intuition.

Jung did not specifically identify Judging and Perceiving as separate dimensions of psychological type but used these terms to categorize the four functions of Sensing, Intuition, Thinking, and Feeling. Consequently, he offered no hypotheses about interpersonal compatibility with regard to preference for Judging or Perceiving.

Myers, on the other hand, suggests in her treatment of the idea of compatibility, that similarity in preference is advantageous to a relationship. In the absence of a more specific hypothesis regarding the extraversion of similar or dissimilar functions, the null hypothesis will reflect Myers' general postulate. Therefore, the relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis VII:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Judger couples and Homogeneous Perceiver couples.

$$H_0: M_{J/J} = M_{P/P}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Judger couples and Homogeneous Perceiver couples.

$$H_a: M_{J/J} \neq M_{P/P}$$

Null Hypothesis VIII:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Judging/Perceiving dimension.

$$H_o: Hom_{J/J;P/P} = Het_{J/P}$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Judging/Perceiving dimension.

$$H_a: Hom_{J/J;P/P} > Het_{J/P}$$

The ninth hypothesis was developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the extent to which spouses share Homogeneous preferences. Jung and Myers have postulated that the more similar two persons' preferences, the more their compatibility would be enhanced. Therefore, the relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis IX:

There is no relationship between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on all four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator dimensions: Extraversion/Introversion; Sensing/Intuition; Thinking/Feeling; and Judging/Perceiving.

$$H_0: \rho = 0$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on all four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator dimensions: Extraversion/Introversion; Sensing/Intuition; Thinking/Feeling; and Judging/Perceiving.

$$H_a: \rho > 0$$

The tenth hypothesis was developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the extent to which spouses share Homogeneous function preferences. As stated, this relationship becomes a special case of the more general relationship tested in Hypothesis IX. The four functions, Sensing, Intuition, Thinking, and Feeling, are defined by Jung as irreducible factors of psychic activity. They are the factors which permit the perception of stimuli and the subsequent judgments made about stimuli. Of particular importance is the value-orientation implicit in the judgment function, as Thinking and Feeling are opposing rational functions. The relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis X:

There is no relationship between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on the two Myers-Briggs Type Indicator function dimensions: Sensing/Intuition and Thinking/Feeling.

$$H_0: \rho = 0$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on the two Myers-Briggs Type Indicator function dimensions: Sensing/Intuition and Thinking/Feeling.

$$H_a: \rho > 0$$

The eleventh hypothesis was developed to test the relationship between dyadic adjustment and the degree of compatibility between two spouses' dominant functions. The notion of compatibility between functions derives from Jung's belief that opposition or conflict in the personality are essential. He posited an opposition between the two perceptual functions--Sensing and Intuition, and an opposition between the two judgment functions--Thinking and Feeling. To the extent that this intrapsychic conflict between functions is manifest in interpersonal relations, conflict may be expected to occur between two persons who rely upon opposite dominant functions. Conversely, two people who rely upon identical dominant functions may be expected to experience substantially less conflict. Those people whose dominant functions are auxiliary are expected to experience levels of conflict somewhere between the two levels described above. Auxiliary dominant function combinations are those in which a perceptual function--either Sensing or Intuition--is paired with a judgment function--either Thinking or Feeling. The relevant hypotheses are stated as follow:

Null Hypothesis XI:

There is no relationship between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the degree of compatibility between dominant functions as defined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

$$H_0: \rho = 0$$

experimental alpha = .05

Alternate Hypothesis:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the degree of compatibility between dominant functions as defined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

$$H_a: \rho > 0$$

Statistical Analysis Procedure

The first eight hypotheses, those treating the possible differences between various populations of Heterogeneous and Homogeneous couples, were tested by means of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with planned comparisons. The specific model of analysis was the Helmert contrast in which the first planned comparison was that between the two Homogeneous groups (Hypotheses I, III, V, and VII), and the second planned comparison was that between the Heterogeneous group and the two combined Homogeneous groups (Hypotheses II, IV, VI, and VIII).

A minimum level for Preference Scores on any given dimension was established in order to control for erroneous classification. The standard error of measurement for the four preference dimensions was found to be approximately three Preference Score points. A criterion

level of two standard errors of measurement was established for both the wife's and the husband's scores when testing any given hypothesis. Therefore, both spouses had to score at least seven points on a given dimension in order to be included in the hypothesis test. In this way, it was possible to establish a band of scores for use in testing the hypotheses. Within the band are dimension preferences (e.g., Introversion, Thinking, etc.) which would be expected to remain stable upon retest at least 95 times out of 100. All hypotheses were tested at an alpha level of .05.

Of the 126 couples who returned completed answer sheets to the investigator, 117 had Preference Scores which surpassed the cut-off criterion on at least one of the four M.B.T.I. dimensions. The number of couples whose M.B.T.I. scores surpassed the cut-off criterion for each dimension are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Numbers of Couples in Data Pool for Each M.B.T.I. Dimension

M.B.T.I. Dimension	<u>N</u>
Extraversion/Introversion	74
Sensing/Intuition	87
Thinking/Feeling	88
Judging/Perceiving	84

The couples' Preference Scores qualified for varying numbers of M.B.T.I. dimensions. Table 3.3 indicates the number of couples whose Preference Scores surpassed the cut-off criterion on zero, one, two, three, and four dimensions, respectively.

Table 3.3

Numbers of Couples Whose Preference Scores Surpassed
the Cut-Off Level on 0-4 M.B.T.I. Dimensions

(N=126)

# of M.B.T.I. Dimensions	<u>N</u>
0	9
1	9
2	28
3	51
4	29

Hypotheses IX and X, those treating the relationship between couples' average Dyadic Adjustment Scale scores and the extent to which they share Homogeneous preferences, were tested by the use of the Pearson product-moment correlation. Only those couples in which both spouses met the cut-off criterion of a minimum of seven Preference Score points on all relevant dimensions were used. Again, an experimental alpha level of .05 was set for rejection of the null hypotheses.

Hypothesis XI treated the possibility of differences between three separate categorical groups on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The statistical analysis was conducted by the use of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The seven-point criterion for Myers-Briggs Preference Scores was used, as well as an experimental alpha of .05.

Clinical Interview Procedure and Rationale

As an attempt to gather additional impressions about the ways in which psychological type impacts marriage, the investigator conducted short interviews with some of the couples in the sample. It needs to be emphasized that this procedure was not a part of the empirical investigation of the hypotheses. The interviews were conducted for the purpose of elucidating some of the typical, or perhaps, unique strategies employed by the couples in coping with their type preference combinations.

A regular procedure was followed in the conduct of the interviews. Twenty-four of the couples attended one of the several group interpretation sessions and received an oral presentation on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. During this presentation, the concepts of psychological type, Extraversion, Introversion, Sensing, Intuition, Thinking, Feeling, Judging, and Perceiving were described to the subjects. The 16 type combinations

were described, as well as the Jungian type theory which underlies the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The scoring system of the M.B.T.I. was explained, and finally, subjects were introduced to the notion of compatibility between various attitudes and functions. At this point in the interpretation program, the couples were asked to discuss the incongruities and congruities between the theoretical predictions of type interaction and their own real experiences.

The couples were asked to discuss several areas. First, they focused upon the ways in which each of the attitudes and functions of Jung's typology impacted their interactions. Specific behaviors which were related to psychological type dimensions, such as basing one's decisions upon logical, objective data (Thinking), were discussed at length. The subjects were also asked to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages, as they perceived them, of having both Homogeneous as well as Heterogeneous preferences. In addition, subjects were asked to choose the function (Sensing, Intuition, Thinking, or Feeling) which best described the kinds of childhood behaviors in which they engaged, and to assess the importance of this function in their marriage relationships. Finally, special attention was given to the various strategies people used to compensate for any discomfort in the relationships which may have been related to their type similarities or differences.

All of these groups were small, and most subjects were very active in asking questions, trying to redefine and understand the concepts being presented, and to participate in the interviews at their own pace and level of disclosure.

The outcomes of these interviews were reported in a section of Chapter IV, separate from the data analysis. A discussion of implications and conclusions to be drawn from them was presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This chapter is divided into two major sections for the purpose of reporting the results of the investigation. The first section consists of a restatement in nonstatistical form of the null research hypotheses, along with supporting data. The second section is a narrative account of interviews conducted with some of the research subjects.

Results of Hypothesis Tests

The first eight hypotheses are presented in four pairs (I with II, III with IV, V with VI, and VII with VIII), reflecting the critical theoretical and empirical relationships which exist within these pairs. Following each pair of hypotheses is the empirical data germane to the retention or rejection of the null hypotheses. The last three hypotheses are presented individually, accompanied by data relevant to the retention or rejection of the null hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis I was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Extravert couples and Homogeneous Introvert couples.

Alternate Hypothesis I was stated as follows:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Extravert couples and Homogeneous Introvert couples.

Null Hypothesis II was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension.

Alternate Hypothesis II was stated as follows:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension.

The means and standard deviations of the D.A.S. scores and cell sizes used to test Hypotheses I and II are listed in Table 4.1. The results from the tests of Hypotheses I and II are listed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.1

Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for
Analysis of the Extraversion/Introversion Dimension

(N=74)

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Homogeneous Extraverts	19	115.00	13.19
Homogeneous Introverts	24	109.19	15.58
Heterogeneous (E/I)	31	111.55	8.79

Table 4.2

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Extraversion/Introversion
on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Contrast	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Homogeneous Extraverts contrasted with Homogeneous Introverts	1.324	.193	No
Homogeneous couples contrasted with Heterogeneous couples	.202	.841	No

Note. Omnibus F-test yielded: F ratio = 1.155;
F probability = .32.

Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained for Hypothesis I with a t of 1.324 and a p level of .193, and therefore the null was not rejected. Likewise, with a t of .202 and a p level of .841, the test of Hypothesis II failed to yield significant differences between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples at the .05 level.

Null Hypothesis III was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Sensing couples and Homogeneous Intuitor couples.

Alternate Hypothesis III was stated as follows:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Sensing couples and Homogeneous Intuitor couples.

Null Hypothesis IV was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Sensing/Intuition dimension.

Alternate Hypothesis IV was stated as follows:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Sensing/Intuition dimension.

The means and standard deviations of the D.A.S. scores and cell sizes used to test Hypotheses III and IV are listed in Table 4.3. The results from the tests of Hypotheses III and IV are listed in Table 4.4.

Table 4.3

Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for
Analysis of the Sensing/Intuition Dimension
(N=87)

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Homogeneous Sensors	24	113.04	15.63
Homogeneous Intuitors	30	111.02	8.91
Heterogeneous (S/N)	33	111.64	13.36

Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained for Hypothesis III with a t of .565 and a p level of .575, and therefore the null was not rejected. Likewise, with a t of .134 and a p level of .894, the test of Hypothesis IV failed to yield significant differences between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples at the .05 level.

Table 4.4

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Sensing/Intuition
on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Contrast	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Homogeneous Sensors contrasted with Homogeneous Intuitors	.565	.575	No
Homogeneous couples contrasted with Heterogeneous couples	.134	.894	No

Note. Omnibus F-test yielded: F ratio = .173;
F probability = .841.

Null Hypothesis V was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Thinking couples and Homogeneous Feeling couples.

Alternate Hypothesis V was stated as follows:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Thinking couples and Homogeneous Feeling couples.

Null Hypothesis VI was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

Alternate Hypothesis VI was stated as follows:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

The means and standard deviations of the D.A.S. scores and cell sizes used to test Hypotheses V and VI are

listed in Table 4.5. The results from the tests of Hypotheses V and VI are listed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.5
Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for
Analysis of the Thinking/Feeling Dimension
(N=88)

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Homogeneous Thinkers	18	111.14	13.69
Homogeneous Feelers	27	114.15	11.14
Heterogeneous (T/F)	43	111.57	10.66

Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained for Hypothesis V with a t of $-.777$ and a p level of $.443$, and therefore the null was not rejected. Likewise, with a t of $.425$ and a p level of $.672$, the test of Hypothesis VI failed to yield significant differences between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples at the .05 level.

Null Hypothesis VII was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Judging couples and Homogeneous Perceiving couples.

Alternate Hypothesis VII was stated as follows:

There is a difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous Judging couples and Homogeneous Perceiving couples.

Table 4.6

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Thinking/Feeling
on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Contrast	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Homogeneous Thinkers contrasted with Homogeneous Feelers	-.777	.443	No
Homogeneous couples contrasted with Heterogeneous couples	.425	.672	No

Note. Omnibus F-test yielded: F ratio = .530;
F probability = .591.

Null Hypothesis VIII was stated as follows:

There is no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Judging/Perceiving dimension.

Alternate Hypothesis VIII was stated as follows:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores are greater for Homogeneous couples than for Heterogeneous couples on the Judging/Perceiving dimension.

The means and standard deviations of the D.A.S. scores and cell sizes used to test Hypotheses VII and VIII are listed in Table 4.7. The results from the tests of Hypotheses VII and VIII are listed in Table 4.8. Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained for Hypothesis VII with a t of 1.731 and a p level of .098, and therefore the null was not rejected. Likewise, with a t of .414 and a p level of .680, the test of

Table 4.7

Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for
Analysis of the Judging/Perceiving Dimension
(N=84)

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Homogeneous Judgers	37	115.07	14.49
Homogeneous Perceivers	9	108.67	8.49
Heterogeneous (J/P)	38	110.83	10.43

Table 4.8

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Judging/Perceiving
on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Contrast	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Homogeneous Judgers contrasted with Homogeneous Perceivers	1.731	.098	No
Homogeneous couples contrasted with Heterogeneous couples	.414	.680	No

Note. Omnibus F-test yielded: F ratio = 1.606;
F probability = .207.

Hypothesis VIII failed to yield significant differences between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples at the .05 level.

Null Hypothesis IX was stated as follows:

There is no relationship between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on all four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator dimensions (Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, Judging/Perceiving).

Alternate Hypothesis IX was stated as follows:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on all four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator dimensions.

The frequency distribution of couples available for testing Hypothesis IX is listed in Table 4.9. The cell sizes, means, and standard deviations of the variables used to test Hypothesis IX are listed in Table 4.10; results of the empirical analysis are listed in Table 4.11.

Table 4.9

Frequency Distribution of Couples over the Possible Range of Concurrence on Four M.B.T.I. Preferences

(N=29)

Number of Homogeneous Preferences	<u>N</u>
0	1
1	6
2	9
3	8
4	5

Table 4.10

Number of Homogeneous Preferences Over All Four M.B.T.I.
Dimensions and Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
# of Homogeneous Preferences	29	2.34	1.11
Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scores	29	110.16	11.88

Table 4.11

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Between Number of
Homogeneous Preferences Over Four M.B.T.I.
Dimensions and Mean Dyadic Adjustment
Scale Scores

Correlation Coefficient	<u>p</u>	Significant
.039	.420	No

Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained, as the p level was equal to .420. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis X was stated as follows:

There is no relationship between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on the two Myers-Briggs Type Indicator function dimensions (Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling).

Alternate Hypothesis X was stated as follows:

Mean marital adjustment scores correlate positively with the number of Homogeneous preferences a couple shares when measured on the two Myers-Briggs Type Indicator function dimensions.

The frequency distribution of couples available for testing Hypothesis X is listed in Table 4.12. The cell sizes, means, and standard deviations of the variables used to test Hypothesis X are listed in Table 4.13; results of the empirical analysis are listed in Table 4.14.

Table 4.12

Frequency Distribution of Couples Over the Possible Range of Concurrence on M.B.T.I. Function Preferences

(N=67)

Number of Homogeneous Preferences	<u>N</u>
0	13
1	33
2	21

Table 4.13

Number of Homogeneous Preferences Over M.B.T.I. Function
Dimensions and Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
# of Homogeneous Preferences	67	1.12	.71
Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scores	67	111.07	11.16

Table 4.14

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Between Number of
Homogeneous M.B.T.I. Function Preferences and
Mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores

Correlation Coefficient	<u>p</u>	Significant
-.047	.352	No

Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained as the p level was equal to .352. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis XI was stated as follows:

There is no relationship between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the degree of compatibility between dominant functions.

Alternate Hypothesis XI was stated as follows:

Mean dyadic adjustment scores correlate positively with the degree of compatibility between dominant functions.

Cell sizes, means, and standard deviations of the D.A.S. scores are listed in Table 4.15; results of the empirical test of Hypothesis XI are listed in Table 4.16.

Table 4.15

Dyadic Adjustment Scale Scores of Couples Selected for
Analysis of the Degree of Compatibility Between
Spouses' Dominant Functions

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Identical Dominant Functions	10	106.95	14.948
Auxiliary Dominant Functions	10	108.70	10.975
Opposing Dominant Functions	9	115.35	7.969

Table 4.16

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Compatibility of Dominant Functions on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Source of Variance	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Significant
Groups	1.323	.284	No

Statistical significance at the .05 level was not obtained for Hypothesis XI with an F of 1.323 and a p level of .284; therefore the null was not rejected.

Summary of the Hypothesis Tests

Eleven hypotheses related to the empirical investigation of Jungian psychological type theory as it applies to dyadic adjustment were tested. The results of the hypothesis testing were as follows:

<u>Hypotheses</u>	<u>Results</u>
<u>Null Hypothesis I</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous Extravert couples and Homogeneous Introvert couples.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis II</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis III</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous Sensor couples and Homogeneous Intuitors couples.	Not Rejected

<u>Hypotheses</u>	<u>Results</u>
<u>Null Hypothesis IV</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Sensing/Intuition dimension.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis V</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous Thinker couples and Homogeneous Feeler couples.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis VI</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Thinking/Feeling dimension.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis VII</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous Judger couples and Homogeneous Perceiver couples.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis VIII</u> stated that no difference in mean dyadic adjustment scores would exist between Homogeneous couples and Heterogeneous couples on the Judging/Perceiving dimension.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis IX</u> stated that no relationship exists between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the number of Homogeneous preferences which couples share when measured on all four M.B.T.I. dimensions.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis X</u> stated that no relationship exists between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the number of Homogeneous preferences when measured on the two M.B.T.I. function dimensions.	Not Rejected
<u>Null Hypothesis XI</u> stated that no relationship exists between mean dyadic adjustment scores and the degree of compatibility between spouses' dominant functions.	Not Rejected

Interviews with Subjects

The purpose of interviewing subjects was to gather information outside the specific requirements of the empirical hypothesis testing. This information played no part in the decisions to retain or reject the null hypotheses. However, it did elucidate some of the strategies which couples use in adapting to the differences and similarities in their type preferences. Subjects were interviewed after having attended an interpretation of their M.B.T.I. results. No questionnaires were used in this procedure. Rather, subjects were asked to describe to the investigator some of the difficult as well as facile aspects of their relationship in the areas of communication, perception, values, and decision-making. A few couples are described in this section to provide an illustrative cross-section of the people interviewed. They are identified only by code numbers which differ from the code numbers appearing on their computerized scoring sheets.

Couple #114:

Wife: psychological type--ENFJ; dominant function--F
 Husband: psychological type--ESTJ; dominant function--T
 couple: dominant functions are opposite
 Homogeneous preferences--Extraversion and
 Judging

This couple's psychological type configuration suggests, in theory, possible discord in the area of their opposing dominant rational functions (Feeling and Thinking) and perhaps in the area of their opposing auxiliary irrational functions (Sensing and Intuition). Concurrence on the Extraversion preference and the Judging function suggests, theoretically, agreement on primary interest in external objects and persons and for extraverting the rational function.

This couple described a notably rational approach to division of responsibilities for decision-making. A given question would be discussed openly, with little need to prod one another for hidden ideas. If one spouse or the other were more invested in the outcome of a particular question, then that spouse would, by mutual consent, make the final decision. They claimed fairly good success with this method and felt that it facilitated quick and satisfactory decision-making. The investigator was also able to observe this couple actually working through part of this process while they decided on the purchase of a major home appliance. Their description of their method was borne out by the observation. The husband, who has a preference for Sensing and Thinking, raised most of the questions about cost, convenience, and suitability of the appliance for their needs. The wife, who prefers Intuition and Feeling, more often

compared this appliance to a similar one which she had seen in the home of a friend and had "liked" immediately. They proceeded quickly through the discussion, exploring one another's concerns, and decided to buy the appliance.

Couple #91:

Wife: psychological type--ESFJ; dominant function--F

Husband: psychological type--ISTP; dominant function--T

couple: dominant functions are opposite
 Homogeneous preference--Sensing

In contrast with couple #114, who had the same configuration of opposing dominant rational functions, this couple concurred neither in their Extraversion/Introversion attitude nor upon the Judging/Perceiving dimension. According to Jung's postulates, conflict would be expected to appear in all three of these areas.

The subjects themselves described having some difficulty reaching mutually agreeable levels of verbal communications. The wife, who prefers Extraversion, expressed some considerable amount of frustration in her attempts to learn what her husband is thinking about, as he often keeps his thoughts to himself. Likewise, in the area of decision-making, they indicated notable disparity in their respective needs for time to consider a given question. The husband, who prefers to extravert his perceptual function of Sensing, comes to decisions much more slowly than does his wife, who extraverts her

judging function of Feeling. They describe their strategy for coping with these differences in terms of the wife "waiting" for the husband. She sometimes delays decisions until he is ready to decide and sometimes makes her decision without him, especially in noncrucial situations.

Couple #117:

Wife: psychological type--INTJ; dominant function--N

Husband: psychological type--ISTJ; dominant function--S

couple: dominant functions are opposite
Homogeneous preferences--Introversion, Thinking,
and Judging

This couple would be expected, according to theory, to be quite compatible on the basis of similarity in preferences. However, opposition of dominant irrational functions combined with mutual preference for Introversion could signal a danger of unspoken assumptions within the relationship.

The couple's actual report of their relationship indicates that they have compensated quite well for their difference in dominant functions. Both are aware of the husband's excellent capacity for handling and recalling detailed information, and they rely upon this strength for their mutual benefit. Likewise, both are aware of the wife's strength in the area of intuitive problem solving. Their mutual preference for Introversion has helped shape a relatively "quiet" relationship in which each works independently on his/her own projects without

extensive collaboration. Both appreciate logical, clear-cut decisions and have to remember to ask one another for information and input before coming to decisions.

Couple #163:

Wife: psychological type--ENFJ; dominant function--F

Husband: psychological type--ENFP; dominant function--N

couple: dominant functions are auxiliary
Homogeneous preferences--Extraversion, Intui-
tion, and Feeling

This couple, in contrast to the last couple, shares a preference for Extraversion, Intuition, and Feeling. According to theory, this couple might be expected to be most compatible with respect to the kinds of information they respond to, their value systems from which decisions are made, and their interest in other people and objects. Some differences in time required for decision-making would be predicted.

The interview with this couple revealed a picture very similar to that predicted by their type configuration. Both are extremely interested in activities which involve them with other people and invest themselves heavily in interpersonal relationships. Their value systems reflect a common concern for the welfare of people. The husband finds it more difficult to bring closure to his decision-making process. The wife frequently and overtly summarizes information and suggests conclusions, while the husband very often tries to suggest alternate possibilities and

avoids yielding to her conclusions. Time constraints often force the husband to make a decision. Their decision-making process is very open and observable, as they elicit information from one another and suggest new possibilities. The process has the appearance of being quite competitive at times.

Couple #101:

Wife: psychological type--INTP; dominant function--T

Husband: psychological type--INFJ; dominant function--N

couple: dominant functions are auxiliary
 Homogeneous preferences--Introversion and
 Intuition

The final couple to be discussed represents yet another variety of type configuration. Both prefer Introversion and Intuition, which would suggest a common capacity for imaginative, and relatively private, decision-making ability. Theoretically, they should differ somewhat on their value criteria for decisions and in their need for closure on decisions. They would also be expected to exhibit quite a different style of interacting than the previous couple, based upon their preference for Introversion.

In the interview, it became clear that this couple did, in fact, exhibit much less interest in engaging other people or in sharing their thoughts publicly. The wife presented herself as relatively logical in her decision-making, although somewhat

slower than her husband, who usually came to conclusions very quickly. He was the more reticent of the two to discuss their relationship and contributed little beyond corroboration or slight corrections of his wife's statements. A problem which the wife was willing to mention was a frequent insufficiency in the sharing of information, particularly in the area of their feelings. In this quiet, introverted atmosphere, her relatively underdeveloped Feeling function contributes to her fears about the relationship.

Summary of the Interviews

The following general observations were made during the interviews. The couples described above were presented for the purpose of illustration and are not offered as prototypical examples of their particular type combinations. The observations will also include information obtained from couples not described in the preceding section.

1. Extraversion/Introversion.--Homogeneous Extraverts reported and exhibited a noticeably more "public" decision-making process than did Homogeneous Introverts. The Extraverts participated in discussions by alternating their input, asking questions of one another, and making notable efforts to engage other persons in the conversation.

The Homogeneous Introverts, on the other hand, shared much less information at a public level. They made much less of an attempt to engage the interviewer, or one another, in conversation. One spouse usually initiated conversation more often than the other--giving the appearance that one had a greater preference for Introversion than the other. They also described a relatively greater capacity for silence in their relationship and seemed to exhibit that quality in the interview.

Most Heterogeneous couples demonstrated a marked tendency for the Extravert spouse to take the lead in initiating the couple's conversation, engaging other persons in discussion, and asking the Introvert spouse for opinions. In some cases, the Introvert spouse could remain silent for long periods, without apparent discomfort to either spouse. The Introvert spouse usually remained attentive and could respond to specific requests for information, thus giving every appearance of relatively silent participation in the conversation.

One common complaint which was voiced by couples who had a Heterogeneous preference was an inability to agree on an acceptable level of verbal communication. Often the Extraverted spouse complained of being "left out" of the Introverted spouse's thoughts, of not knowing what he/she was feeling or thinking, and of feeling lonely in the presence of the other spouse.

2. Sensing/Intuition.--Homogeneous Sensing couples differed from Homogeneous Intuitive couples in a single, but rather pronounced, aspect. The Sensors were often engaged in what can only be described as "contests" of recall. There were frequent instances in which one spouse would attempt to correct the other's factual information, each according to his/her own separate recollections of times, places, dates, and incidents. If one or both spouses were also an Extravert, the contest of recall would become quite pronounced. Nevertheless, even couples who both preferred Introversion would sometimes engage in these jousts. Most Homogeneous Intuitors couples, by contrast, exhibited comparatively little need for complete accuracy in recounting past experiences.

It was difficult to discern any special characteristics in the interaction of Heterogeneous couples. Their own self-reports did not suggest ways in which preferences for Sensing and Intuition impacted their relationships.

3. Thinking/Feeling.--Few differences between Homogeneous Feelers and Thinkers were observed in the interviews. It was not a situation which called for problem-solving or much decision-making, and the self-reports of these two groups were not very enlightening in the area of the rational function.

However, a major and recurring theme in discussions with Heterogeneous couples was the difference between a logical approach to problem-solving (Thinking) and a more affective or emotionally based approach (Feeling). Most of these couples reported that they had been working to make allowances for their differences in this area. Moreover, in 85% of the Heterogeneous couples, the wife preferred Feeling and the husband preferred Thinking. Therefore, very often their self-reports included stories of "over-sensitive" wives, "cold" husbands, and many incidents of hurt feelings. People who were attempting to prevent further misunderstandings often spoke about their strategies: avoiding hasty conclusions, waiting for the other spouse to explain a position, and trying to remember to look at both sides--logical and emotional--of each question.

4. Judging/Perceiving.--As in the case of Homogeneous Thinkers and Feelers, those who had Homogeneous preferences for Judging or Perceiving had little to say about this dimension. Behaviorally, the Homogeneous Perceivers tended, as a group, to ask more questions about the test instruments and about the possible nuances in interpretation of their Myers-Briggs Type Indicator results.

The self-reports of the Heterogeneous couples, though, were replete with mild criticisms of the Perceiver

spouse by the Judger spouse for taking too long when making most decisions. This trend was widespread, though not uniform. Again, the spouses who preferred Perception tended to ask more questions during the test interpretation and interviews.

There seemed to be no clinical evidence to support the notion that congruence or lack of congruence between spouses' dominant functions were in any way related to their marital adjustment. The dominant functions did seem to be related in many cases to the type of childhoods led by the subjects.

For example, most dominant Sensors described a childhood in which collecting objects--shells, coins, baseball cards, dolls--was an important activity. They also reported having relatively few "imaginary" friends or activities which relied heavily upon fantasy. Rather, they preferred more realistic games and preferred live pets over inanimate dolls or toys.

Most dominant Intuitors described childhoods vivid with fantasy activities. Many enjoyed reading adventure books and imagining themselves as the characters in the stories. They had more imaginary friends or pets than did the dominant Sensors and often played alone or with a special friend who shared their secret fantasies.

Quite a few of the dominant Thinkers described having had relatively "adult-like" childhoods. They recalled being very inquisitive about adult affairs, sometimes to the annoyance of parents. They remembered being interested in science in school and preferred books dealing with facts over fantasy or adventure books.

Some, but not all dominant Feelers, recalled that as children they had been acutely aware of the conflicts which arose between family members, particularly parents. A striking aspect of their sensitivity to family relationships was the extent to which they attempted to act as peacemakers. Some reported being very afraid of family arguments; some also remembered feeling responsible for the family being upset or angry.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this investigation was to examine Carl Gustav Jung's theory of psychological type and to discover what impact psychological type has upon spouse relationships. If psychological type has a significant impact upon marriage as Jung, and later, Isabel Myers, have suggested, then an understanding of the specific outcomes of various type combinations would provide a useful therapeutic tool. It was the potential viability of such a therapeutically useful concept that provided the impetus for this study.

A review of the literature was conducted in three related areas. The first area was the concept of psychological type. The evidence for real differences in personal styles of perceiving information, making decisions, and interacting with the external environment was not unequivocal. However, a substantial amount of investigation into psychological type had been undertaken by Gray (1949); Gray and Wheelwright (1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948); Bradway (1964); Myers (1962a, 1962b); Stricker

and Ross (1964a, 1964b), Ross (1966), Gorlow, Simonson, and Krauss (1966); Ball (1968); Cook (1970); and others. The concept of psychological type had received theoretical and empirical support, if not universal endorsement.

The second area was more circumscribed. It involved an investigation of the validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1962b). Based upon Carl Jung's theory of psychological type, the M.B.T.I. is designed to identify a person's preferences for an Extraverted or Introverted attitude, Sensing or Intuition as a perceptual function, Thinking or Feeling as a judgment function, and for Perceiving or Judging as a "public" attitude. Just as the support for Jung's typology had been substantial though not unequivocal, so too was the support for the M.B.T.I. Investigations of the M.B.T.I. had been undertaken by Stricker and Ross (1963, 1964b), Webb (1964), Richek (1969), Carlyn (1976), and Ross (1966).

The third area investigated in the literature review was the concept of marital adjustment and the state-of-the-art in measuring marital adjustment. The controversy over symmetry versus complementarity as primary factors in explaining marital attraction and adjustment was reviewed. Proponents of the symmetry explanation for marital adjustment were Newcomb (1956), Tharp (1963), and Cattell and Nesselroade (1967).

Supporters of the complementarity explanation for marital adjustment were Winch, Ktsanes, and Ktsanes (1954); Kerckhoff and Davis (1962); and Levinger (1964). Jackson (Lederer & Jackson, 1968) posited an explanation of marital adjustment which took into account both symmetry and complementarity. The Jungian position on symmetry versus complementarity, though never expressed by him in explicit terms, was interpreted (Lindner, 1972) to be essentially pro-symmetry. Both Jung and Myers assign greater probability of conflict and lack of understanding to those relationships in which spouses' types are dissimilar.

The state-of-the-art in measuring marital adjustment was reviewed. Three main approaches were discussed: (a) the diagnostic approach; (b) an indirect approach which assumes certain indicants of marital adjustment and then measures spouses against these indicants (e.g., self-disclosure or value profiles); and (c) a direct approach which relies primarily upon independent self-report by spouses. The recently developed Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) was deemed most appropriate for use in this study. It was chosen because of its reliance upon classic marital adjustment test instruments, its factor-analytic construction, and its high degree of reliability.

The population sample consisted of 117 married couples from a large university and surrounding community.

Subjects were administered two test instruments, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (M.B.T.I.) and the Marriage Relationship Survey. The M.B.T.I. provided data which permitted the subjects to be classified according to their psychological type--the independent variable. The Marriage Relationship Survey was composed of two sections: (a) a demographic questionnaire and (b) Spanier's Dyadic Adjustment Scale (D.A.S.). This second instrument provided the data for the dependent variable--Dyadic Adjustment.

Only those couples in which both spouses scored at or above a cut-off level of seven Preference Score points on the M.B.T.I. were used in the appropriate hypothesis tests. This criterion was used in order to reduce the likelihood of mis-classification on the independent variable. Type classifications were then constructed on the basis of one, two, or four dimensions on the M.B.T.I., depending upon the nature of the hypothesis being tested. A single arithmetic mean D.A.S. score for each couple was computed by using each spouse's individual D.A.S. score. Two separate one-way analyses of variance using the wives' D.A.S. scores alone and the husbands' D.A.S. scores alone were performed. This procedure revealed that the couples' mean D.A.S. score did not mask significant differences between husbands and wives.

One-way analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences on the D.A.S. score between various sub-groups of the sample. This design was used to test Hypotheses I through VIII and XI. The Pearson product-moment correlation method was employed to test Hypotheses IX and X, which involved the correlation of two continuous variables: D.A.S. score and number of Homeogeneous M.B.T.I. preferences.

Results

Hypotheses I and II were designed to discover differences in dyadic adjustment between groups of married couples with various combinations of preferences for Extraversion and Introversion. Hypotheses III and IV were designed to discover differences in dyadic adjustment between groups of married couples with various combinations of preferences for Sensing and Intuition. Hypotheses V and VI examined the same questions with respect to the Thinking and Feeling dimension of the M.B.T.I. Hypotheses VII and VIII treated the Judging/Perceiving dimension. All eight hypotheses were tested at an experimental alpha level of .05. None of the null hypotheses were rejected. Therefore, there were no significant differences in couples' mean Dyadic Adjustment Scale scores on the basis of preferences for any single dimension of the M.B.T.I.

Hypothesis IX was designed to discover differences in dyadic adjustment between groups of married couples who shared zero, one, two, three, or four Homogeneous M.B.T.I. dimension preferences, respectively. An experimental alpha level of .05 was established, and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that dyadic adjustment increases in direct relation to the number of Homogeneous M.B.T.I. dimension preferences a couple has.

Hypothesis X was designed to discover differences in dyadic adjustment between groups of married couples who shared zero, one, or two Homogeneous M.B.T.I. function preferences, respectively. An experimental alpha level of .05 was established, and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that dyadic adjustment increases in relation to the number of Homogeneous M.B.T.I. function preferences a couple has.

Hypothesis XI was designed to discover differences in dyadic adjustment between three groups of married couples: those whose dominant psychological functions were either identical, auxiliary, or opposed to one another. An experimental alpha level of .05 was established, and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that dyadic adjustment levels are significantly related to the interaction of spouses' dominant functions.

Conclusions and Discussion

There appear to be three major conclusions to be drawn on the basis of the results of the hypothesis tests. First, no relationship was found to exist between dyadic adjustment and couples' preference constellations for any single dimension on the M.B.T.I. Secondly, no relationship was found to exist between dyadic adjustment and the extent of similarity of couples' preferences across all four M.B.T.I. dimensions, or even across their constellations of two preferred functions. Thirdly, no relationship was found to exist between dyadic adjustment and the compatibility of two spouses' dominant functions.

These three related sets of hypotheses which examined the impact of psychological type upon marriage offer no support to Jung's or Myers' contentions that people of similar type will find their relationships to be more harmonious than will people of dissimilar types.

Consequently, some questions arise regarding the relationship between the concepts of psychological type and dyadic adjustment. The first and most obvious question concerns the comprehensiveness of psychological type in accounting for the final outcome of dyadic adjustment. It is very possible that psychological type is only one of several, or many, factors which contribute to overall satisfaction in marriage and that compatible psychological type alone is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for dyadic adjustment.

Another question concerns the range of compatibility encountered in this study. By focusing on married couples only, this study may have sampled only those people who have decided that their compatibility was sufficiently good to maintain a marriage. Thus, two large groups in the population--those who have married and subsequently dissolved that relationship and those who have not married--may represent the portion of the population for whom incompatibility has acted to sever or even prevent their marriages.

A more fundamental question concerns the very construct of psychological type. It is a conceptual model which attempts a comprehensive classification of human perception, judgment, and orientation of psychic energy. These three constructs are themselves subject to the inherent weakness of all constructs--their inevitable inability to account perfectly for observed phenomena. Operational accuracy is sacrificed for the sake of economy when generalizations are made on the basis of clinical observations such as those made by Jung. Therefore, considerable caution should be exercised when using such constructs as psychological type and the subcategories of type theory. Jung's theory must be integrated with incoming evidence, both supportive as well as contradictory, if the theory is to be a viable and accurate model of personality and behavior.

A more ontogenetic theory of interpersonal psychological type interaction is needed at this time in order to move beyond Jung's descriptions. Jung's theory of intrapsychic type development could also be more rigorously defined. At present it contains many unproven assumptions such as the dominance of one function, and the opposition between the two attitudes of Extraversion and Introversion, and among the four functions. To build a theory of interpersonal compatibility upon the current state of Jung's theory of intrapsychic interaction is to accept these assumptions and to compound the lack of rigor.

The other major construct called into question by this study is the notion of marital adjustment. As in the case of psychological type, this construct must be interpreted with caution, as it subsumes a wide range of possible outcomes of dyad interaction. The definition of marital adjustment is an elusive one. While it is true that the definition of marital adjustment has been discussed extensively in the controversy over symmetric versus complementary alignment of needs, strengths, and weaknesses, these arguments tend to rest upon actuarial descriptions of marriages. The more difficult aspect of defining marital adjustment has to do with the process by which adjustment is accomplished, or at least attempted. Although Jung has suggested that interpersonal relationships

between persons of various types will reflect the intrapsychic conflict between the functions, he has not offered a precise model of interpersonal adjustment. Such a model would need to explain the interaction between psychological type and various behavioral or cognitive preferences.

His model of intrapsychic dynamics suggests that the development of the four functions occurs gradually over many years through a process he called "individuation." Nevertheless, he has left it to future researchers to discover in what ways this on-going process of individuation in one spouse interacts with the other spouse's own individuation process.

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is its reliance upon the self-report method for gathering information about the subjects. Both instruments utilized this method, and the opportunity for subjects to manipulate their D.A.S. score was sufficient to require that interpretations of the results be made with caution.

A related limitation is one which is practically unavoidable when conducting research with human subjects. That is the problem of ultimate reliance upon the willingness of people to volunteer their participation in the study. The random selection of departments and subjects within departments was an attempt to partially control for this confounding aspect, but subjects who had been

selected were still free to decline to participate. There is no accurate way to determine whether those who declined did so because of dyadic maladjustment or for some other reason. A conservative assumption is that the pool of subjects who finally agreed to participate was not a purely random sample of the population from which they were drawn.

A third set of limitations lies within the nature of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator itself. First, its ipsative scoring system makes it impossible to discriminate between a person who has a very limited response repertoire and can only utilize one function effectively (e.g., Thinking) and a person who has a full range of functions available but still has a strong preference for one function. In addition, the limited range of dimensions on the M.B.T.I. renders most current statistical tests relatively powerless to detect statistically significant differences. In a separate treatment of this problem of finding appropriate statistical tests for use with the M.B.T.I., Carlyn (1977) has suggested that modifications of existing statistical techniques be employed. At this point, it appears that no current statistical techniques are able to satisfactorily accommodate the peculiarities of the M.B.T.I. The underlying problem may lie more with the M.B.T.I. than with the present state-of-the-art of statistical measurement.

Finally, the sample was largely drawn from a population which is characterized by a strong commitment to, or at least regular contact with, an institution of higher learning. The cultural, economic, and educational profile of such a population cannot be said to represent more than a small segment of this society. To the extent that response styles to the test instruments were influenced by this set of circumstances, the study is limited in its generalizability.

Suggestions for Further Research

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale is a relatively new instrument and although its construction appears to have been rigorous, its use in research has not been widespread. The concurrent validity of the D.A.S. needs to be demonstrated further by systematically comparing it against the older and more generally accepted marital adjustment instruments from which it was derived. An initial step toward re-examining the relationship between psychological type and marital adjustment would entail administration of the D.A.S. and these other instruments to separate groups of subjects matched on the independent variable--psychological type. If the marital adjustment instruments again failed to detect significant differences between the groups, the D.A.S. would have demonstrated its concurrent validity to some degree, and the findings of the present study would have been replicated as well.

A difficult, but perhaps necessary, element to include in further research on this topic is the clearly maladjusted couple. Divorced or separated couples could potentially extend the range of dyadic adjustment scores and thus allow for more powerful statistical analysis of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. In order to receive the cooperation of these groups, it would very likely require additional safeguards against the sharing of test information between the investigator and members of these couples. The problems of self-report data collection methods would have to be obviated at least to some extent for this information to be useful.

In order to overcome the possible effects of socioeconomic homogeneity within the sample, the current study should be replicated with a sample population which has a substantially greater range of education, rate of employment, and domicile. The effects of a sub-culture and community oriented around a large center of higher education possibly had some effect on the kind of subject and response style encountered in the current investigation.

Finally, there are aspects of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator which suggest a need for further research, as described in the previous section on Limitations. There is a pressing need for research which will extricate

the M.B.T.I. from these difficulties in the scoring and interpretation of its preference dimensions.

Discussion of the Interviews

The clinical interviews conducted with subjects were described in Chapter IV. The following is a summary of the observations made during these interviews:

1. Couples did exhibit noticeable differences in communication style that were consistent with theoretical descriptions of preferences for Extraversion and Introversion. Extravert spouses entered more easily into conversation, solicited more information from other people, and expressed more discomfort with silence than did the Introvert spouses. The only common conflict discussed by Heterogeneous Extravert/Introvert couples was their frequent inability to find a mutually comfortable level of verbal communication, with the Extravert desiring more than the Introvert.

2. Sensors and Intuitors exhibited noticeably different needs for accuracy in recounting past situations or aspects of their relationships. The Sensors engaged in regular "fine-tuning" of their spouse's comments, even if the other spouse were also a Sensor. Two Sensors often engaged in minor contests of fact recall until the "truth" finally emerged and was mutually acclaimed.

3. Thinkers and Feelers were difficult to discriminate on the basis of their behaviors during the interview. However, Heterogeneous couples reported many more instances than did Homogeneous couples of logic-affect conflicts. This finding may be confounded by sex differences, as 85% of the Feelers in the Heterogeneous couples were women, and 85% of the Thinkers, men. Nevertheless, the conflict was consistent over couples and congruent with theoretical descriptions of the Thinking/Feeling dimension.

4. Judging and Perceiving as preferred styles yielded noticeable differences in two related respects: (a) on the whole, people who preferred Perceiving asked more questions of the interviewer about the M.B.T.I. interpretation and gave the impression of trying to understand how they could apply the printed type descriptions to themselves, while Judgers more quickly accepted or rejected the descriptions; (b) secondly, many Heterogeneous couples described differences in their rates of making decisions, with the Judger spouse expressing some level of frustration at having to wait for the Perceiver spouse.

In the course of the interviews, then, the investigator did in fact encounter the same styles of interaction that Jung's type theory predicts. The general characteristics of Extraversion, Introversion, Sensing,

Intuition, Thinking, and Feeling were observed in many cases. Even Myers' additional dimension of Judging/Perceiving appears to have some face validity on the basis of the investigator's interaction with the subjects. Moreover, the M.B.T.I. seems to have been able to identify type categories which met with general agreement of subjects during their interpretation sessions. Discrepancies between a subject's self-image and the type description offered by Myers (1962b) usually occurred in those instances where a subject's Preference Score was close to zero and, therefore, possibly misclassified because of inevitable error in measurement.

This congruence between Jung's typology and the clinical observations made in this study suggest a means by which such behavior might be measured. Trained observers could take frequency counts of such behavioral criteria as speech, orientation to spouse or interviewer, feeling versus logical speech content, and other dimensions related to the typology. Refinements of such behavioral checklists could eventually evolve into self-report instruments which couples could use to identify, in a more direct way than the M.B.T.I. does, the specific interaction style which they exhibit in their relationship.

Implications for Clinical Work with Couples

The empirical investigation of psychological type and marital adjustment has indicated no significant

differences in overall marital adjustment among couples when compared solely on the basis of their type combinations. Therefore, there is no justification for declaring any particular combination of psychological type to be more or less compatible than any other. It would be inappropriate to suggest to couples that there are, a priori, varying probabilities of well-adjusted relationships when all that is known about the individuals are the results from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Nevertheless, a more subtle relationship between psychological type and marital adjustment appears to have emerged from the clinical interviews conducted as an adjunct to the empirical study. It was discovered that subjects reported a wide range of styles and stresses in their marriages that appeared to be type-related. On the whole, Homogeneous preferences seemed to be associated with fewer overt conflicts. The couples with one or more Heterogeneous preferences reported more differences in style but also demonstrated some very imaginative and adaptive coping strategies. The couples interviewed in this study gave evidence that they were purposefully utilizing many different coping strategies to compensate for their differences in preferred styles of operating.

Therefore, it may well be that marriages of similar levels of dyadic adjustment arrive at that point by very different routes and that these routes are

characteristically type-related. This suggests a legitimate area of investigation when working with couples who seek professional assistance in dealing with their conflict. Testing for psychological type can be a valid and useful way of identifying spouses' preferred styles of behaving. It can also be of heuristic value in locating potential areas of conflict. Once the characteristic styles and the couple's conflicts have been identified and corroborated, the next step is to explore coping strategies.

Appropriate coping strategies should take into consideration the historical role which a couple's similarities and differences have played in the relationship. For example, if a difference in preference on the Extraversion/Introversion dimension was at one time an attractive aspect of the relationship, but has now become an irritation, the original attraction can be explored. Then the development of the conflict can be traced chronologically and can lead to identification of situations in which alternate strategies need to be developed. The Introvert spouse, for instance, may need to make a special effort to share his/her thoughts more often when the couple is trying to make an important decision. The Extravert spouse may need to become more sensitive to the Introvert's need for privacy at certain times.

Thus, the construct of psychological type may prove to be a valuable tool in finding solutions to marital stress. The clinician must guard against reifying the typology and must constantly verify clinical impressions with the couple's own perceptions and actual experiences. Myers, in interpreting Jung's typology, has indicated very clearly that all combinations of psychological type are associated with healthy and productive characteristics, each with its own special potentials and possible weaknesses. None of the preference combinations have been associated with pathology in the M.B.T.I. This is a selective interpretation of Jung's own observations. However, it seems to be a prudent interpretation in the absence of more powerful evidence to the contrary. The existing empirical and clinical evidence suggests that such factors as the ability and willingness to construct imaginative type-related compromises in the marriage may be of equal or greater moment than psychological type.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SOLICITATION LETTER SENT TO
POTENTIAL SUBJECTS

APPENDIX A

SOLICITATION LETTER SENT TO POTENTIAL SUBJECTS

Dear Members of the M.S.U./East Lansing community:

I am currently engaged in research on the topics of marriage and personality. This research is for my doctoral dissertation for my degree in Counseling Psychology at Michigan State University. The research plan has been approved by the M.S.U. Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects and is being supervised by Professor William Hinds. In order to test several hypotheses important to this research, I must obtain responses from married couples to two surveys. I am writing to you to ask for your assistance.

The two surveys together require about 1 to 1½ hours to complete, and can either be taken in a group setting or they can be mailed to your home. Your responses to the two surveys will be held in the strictest confidence. You will be invited to attend a program at a later date at which the research will be explained and limited interpretations of survey results can be given. You will be the only person permitted to receive results from your own survey responses.

You will find enclosed a pre-addressed, stamped postcard. On this postcard you can indicate your willingness to participate in my research. You may also indicate your preference for either a group test administration, or for a packet to be self-administered at your home. Please mail the postcard as soon as possible so that I can promptly send you the necessary materials. The times, dates, and locations of administrations and interpretations are listed at the bottom of this letter. Please make a note for your calendar.

Thanking you in anticipation of your kind cooperation, I am . . .

Sincerely yours,

James M. Gosse
Apt. #130, East Akers Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Mich. 48824
phone: (517) 353-2226

GROUP SURVEY ADMINISTRATIONS:

Monday, Feb. 27, 1978
Tuesday, Feb. 28, 1978
Wednesday, Mar. 1, 1978
Thursday, Mar. 2, 1978
time: 7:00 p.m.
place: room #137 Akers Hall
(Auditorium)

SURVEY INTERPRETATIONS:

Monday, April 10, 1978
Tuesday, April 11, 1978

time: 8:00 - 10:00 p.m.
place: "1964 Room" in Akers Hall
(private dining room)

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Please read the Consent Form for Marriage Study. If you agree to the terms, please sign and date the form. Have your spouse or some other adult sign and date the form as the witness.
2. Take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator first. Use the green answer sheet to record your responses. Please be sure to use only a #2 pencil. Be sure to use the appropriate answer sheet ("WIFE" if you are the wife, and "HUSBAND" if you are the husband). Do not identify yourself in any other way on the answer sheet. PLEASE DO NOT HELP EACH OTHER ANSWER EITHER QUESTIONNAIRE.
3. Take the Marriage Relationship Survey second. Use the purple answer sheet to record your responses. Again, please use only a #2 pencil, use the appropriate "HUSBAND" or "WIFE" form, and do not otherwise identify yourself.
4. When both of you have completed both questionnaires, please return the following materials in the enclosed envelope addressed to me:
 - a. both Consent Forms,
 - b. the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator booklet,
 - c. both Myers-Briggs Type Indicator answer sheets (green),
 - d. the Marriage Relationship Survey booklet, and
 - e. both Marriage Relationship Survey answer sheets (purple).

Thank you very much for your participation. You are invited to attend an interpretation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator results and a discussion of the Marriage Relationship Survey.

Dates: Monday, April 10, 1978
Tuesday, April 11, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m. until approximately 10:00

Place: "1964 Room" (private dining room) of Akers Hall, on the Michigan State University campus.

Your attendance is entirely optional and entirely welcomed!

Sincerely,

James M. Gosse
130 E. Akers Hall, M.S.U.
Phone: 353-2226

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR MARRIAGE STUDY

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR MARRIAGE STUDY

1. I have freely consented to take part in a scientific study being conducted by: James M. Gosse
under the supervision of: William Hinds, Ph.D.
Academic title: Professor of Counseling, Personnel Services, and Educational Psychology.
2. I understand that to participate in this study, I will fill out two (2) questionnaires, which should take about one-and-a-half (1½) hours, total time.
3. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in the study at any time without penalty.
4. I understand that the results of the study will be treated in strict confidence and that I will remain anonymous. A confidential record of my name and code number will be kept by the researcher so that only I may receive my own questionnaire results. This record will be kept in a locked file cabinet to which only the researcher has access until December 1, 1978, at which time the record will be destroyed by incineration. Within these restrictions, results of my own questionnaire responses will be made available to me at my request.
5. I understand that I may be contacted by the researcher at a later date in connection with a possible follow-up study. However, I am in no way obligating myself to participate in such a follow-up study.
6. I understand that my participation in the study does not guarantee any beneficial results to me.
7. I understand that, at my request, I can receive additional explanation of the study after my participation is completed.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Witness: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX D

MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP SURVEY

APPENDIX D

MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP SURVEY*

Please mark your responses to this survey on the purple-and-white mechanically scored answer sheet provided (it has 4 columns of bold type numbers with answer boxes ranging from 1 to 10). Be sure that your responses correspond with the number of the question, and that your marks are heavy and black. A #2 pencil should be used to record your answers.

1. What is your sex?
(1) female (2) male
2. What is your age?
(1) 16-18 (2) 19-22 (3) 23-30 (4) 31-40 (5) 41-50 (6) over 50
3. How many hours per week do you work for pay?
(1) 0 (2) 1-10 (3) 11-20 (4) 21-30 (5) 31-40 (6) over 40
4. For how many college course credits are you currently enrolled?
(1) 0 (2) 1-4 (3) 5-8 (4) 9-12 (5) 13-16 (6) 17 or more
5. How many years of formal education do you have (not including kindergarten)?
(1) 0-6 (2) 7-12 (3) 13-16 (4) 17-18 (5) 19-22 (6) more than 22
6. How many times have you been married?
(1) 1 time (2) 2 times (3) 3 times (4) more than 3 times
7. For how many years have you been married to your present spouse?
(1) 0-2 (2) 3-5 (3) 6-10 (4) 11-15 (5) 16-20 (6) more than 20
8. For how many years prior to marriage did you live with your spouse?
(1) 0 (2) $\frac{1}{4}$ (3) $\frac{1}{2}$ (4) 1 (5) 2 (6) more than 2
9. Do you think your parents approved of your present marriage?
(1) yes (2) no (3) they were not in a position to have an opinion
10. How many children do you have?
(1) none (2) 1 (3) 2 (4) 3 (5) 4 (6) more than 4

(If you indicated that you have no children, please go on to item #14; please be sure to skip items #11, 12, and 13 on the answer sheet.)

11. What is the age of your oldest child? (or only child if you have only one)
(1) 0-4 (2) 5-9 (3) 10-14 (4) 15-19 (5) 20-24 (6) 25 or older
12. What is the age of your youngest child? (or only child)
(1) 0-4 (2) 5-9 (3) 10-14 (4) 15-19 (5) 20-24 (6) 25 or older
13. Have any of your children ever had what you would consider to be a serious behavioral difficulty?
(1) yes (2) no

Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------|
| | Always | Almost
Always | Occa-
sionally | Fre-
quently | Almost
Always | Always |
| (1) AGREE | (2) AGREE | (3) DISAGREE | (4) DISAGREE | (5) DISAGREE | (6) DISAGREE | |

14. Handling family finances
15. Matters of recreation
16. Religious matters
17. Demonstrations of affection
18. Friends
19. Sex relations
20. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)
21. Philosophy of life
22. Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws
23. Aims, goals, and things believed important
24. Amount of time spent together
25. Making major decisions
26. Household tasks
27. Leisure time interests and activities
28. Career decisions

- | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|------------|-----------|
| | All | Most of | More
often | Occa-
sionally | (5) Rarely | (6) Never |
| (1) the time | (2) the time | (3) than not | (4) sionally | (5) Rarely | (6) Never | |

29. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?
30. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?
31. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?
32. Do you confide in your mate?
33. Do you ever regret that you married?
34. How often do you and your partner quarrel?
35. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"?

36. Do you kiss your mate?
(1) every day (2) almost every day (3) occasionally (4) rarely
(5) never

37. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?
(1) all of them (2) most of them (3) some of them (4) very few
of them (5) none

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

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Less than
once a | Once or
twice a | Once or
twice a | Once | More |
| (1) Never | (2) month | (3) month | (4) week | (5) a day | (6) often |

38. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas
 39. Laugh together
 40. Calmly discuss something
 41. Work together on a project

These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinion or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks.

42. Being too tired for sex. (1) yes (2) no
 43. Not showing love. (1) yes (2) no

44. The points on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please blacken the blank on the answer sheet corresponding to the point which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Extremely UNHAPPY	Fairly UNHAPPY	A little UNHAPPY	HAPPY	Very HAPPY	Extremely HAPPY	PERFECT

45. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

- (1) I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.
 (2) I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.
 (3) I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.
 (4) It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.
 (5) It would be nice if it succeeded but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.
 (6) My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

* Modified and reprinted by permission of Graham Spanier, author of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

APPENDIX E

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TYPE TABLE FOR
117 WIVES PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TYPE TABLE FOR
117 WIVES PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

WIVES

N=117

SENSING TYPES INTUITIVE TYPES
with THINKING with FEELING with FEELING with THINKING

ISTJ N= 5 %= 4.3	ISFJ N=18 %=15.4	INFJ N= 8 %= 6.8	INTJ N= 3 %= 2.6
ISTP N= 2 %= 1.7	ISFP N= 9 %= 7.7	INFP N=10 %= 8.5	INTP N= 9 %= 7.7
ESTP N= 3 %= 2.6	ESFP N= 2 %= 1.7	ENFP N=12 %=10.3	ENTP N= 1 %= 0.9
ESTJ N= 4 %= 3.4	ESFJ N=16 %=13.4	ENFJ N=12 %=13.7	ENTJ N= 3 %= 2.6

JUDGING

INTROVERTS

PERCEPTIVE

PERCEPTIVE

EXTRAVERTS

JUDGING

E =53; 45.3%
I =64; 54.7%

S =59; 50.4%
N =58; 49.6%

T =30; 25.6%
F =87; 74.4%

J =69; 59.0%
P =48; 41.0%

IJ =34; 29.1%
IP =30; 25.6%
EP =18; 15.4%
EJ =35; 29.9%

ST =14; 12.0%
SF =45; 38.5%
NF =42; 35.9%
NT =16; 13.7%

SJ =43; 36.8%
SP =16; 13.7%
NP =32; 27.4%
NJ =26; 22.2%

TJ =15; 12.8%
TP =15; 12.8%
FP =33; 28.2%
FJ =54; 46.2%

IN =30; 25.6%
EN =28; 23.9%
IS =34; 29.1%
ES =25; 21.4%

NOTES:

APPENDIX F

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TYPE TABLE FOR
117 HUSBANDS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

**MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR TYPE TABLE FOR
117 HUSBANDS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY**

HUSBANDS

N=117

SENSING TYPES INTUITIVE TYPES
with THINKING with FEELING with FEELING with THINKING

ISTJ N=14 %=12.0	ISFJ N= 6 %= 5.1	INFJ N= 9 %= 7.7	INTJ N=12 %=10.3
ISTP N= 2 %= 1.7	ISFP N= 5 %= 4.3	INFP N= 4 %= 3.4	INTP N= 6 %= 5.1
ESTP N= 2 %= 1.7	ESFP N= 4 %= 3.4	ENFP N=12 %=10.3	ENTP N= 7 %= 6.0
ESTJ N=16 %=13.4	ESFJ N= 4 %= 3.4	ENFJ N= 4 %= 3.4	ENTJ N=10 %= 8.5

JUDGING

INTROVERTS

PERCEPTIVE

PERCEPTIVE

EXTRAVERTS

JUDGING

E =59; 50.4%	I =58; 49.6%
S =53; 45.3%	N =64; 54.7%
T =69; 59.0%	F =48; 41.0%
J =75; 64.1%	P =42; 35.9%
IJ =41; 35.0%	IP =17; 14.5%
EP =25; 21.4%	EJ =34; 29.1%
ST =34; 29.1%	SF =19; 16.2%
NF =29; 24.8%	NT =35; 29.9%
SJ =40; 34.2%	SP =13; 11.1%
NP =29; 24.8%	NJ =35; 29.9%
TJ =52; 44.4%	TP =17; 14.5%
FP =25; 21.4%	FJ =23; 19.7%
IN =31; 26.5%	EN =33; 28.2%
IS =27; 23.1%	ES =26; 22.2%

NOTES:

APPENDIX G

TYPE TABLE: COMBINATIONS OF COUPLES

APPENDIX G

TYPE TABLE: COMBINATIONS OF COUPLES

		Husbands							
Wives		ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ	ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
	ISTJ	x		x					
	ISFJ	xx	xx	xx	x		x		
	INFJ						x		x
	INTJ	x	x						
	ISTP	x			x				
	ISFP	x		x	xx				x
	INFP	x		x	xx		xx		x
	INTP	x		x	x			x	xx
	ESTP								
	ESFP				x				
	ENFP	x		x	xxx				x
	ENTP				x				
	ESTJ			x			x		
	ESFJ	xxx	x			xx		xx	
	ENFJ	xx	x					x	x
	ENTJ			x					

Note: Each "x" represents one couple.

APPENDIX G (Continued)

		Husbands							
		ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP	ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
Wives	ISTJ	x			x	x			
	ISFJ	x		x	x	xxx	xx		xx
	INFJ			xx	xx	x			
	INTJ								x
	ISTP								
	ISFP		x	x		x		x	
	INFP			x	x				x
	INTP					xx			x
	ESTP		x			x			x
	ESFP		x						
	ENFP			xx	x			x	x
	ENTP								x
	ESTJ					x			x
	ESFJ			xxx		xx	xx	x	
	ENFJ		x	xx		xxx		x	x
	ENTJ							x	x

Note: Each "x" represents one couple.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Arnold, P. D. Marriage counsellor M.M.P.I. profile characteristics with objective signs that discriminate them from married couples in general. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1970.
- Ball, E. D. A factor analytic investigation of the personality typology of C. G. Jung (Doctoral dissertation, Penn State University, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 4277-B. (University Microfilms No. 68-3524)
- Bateson, G. Naven. London: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Bradway, K. Jung's psychological types. Journal of Analytical Psychology, 1964, 9, 129-135.
- Burgess, E. W., & Wallin, P. Engagement and marriage. Chicago: Lippincott, 1953.
- Burke, R. J., & Weir, T. Some personality differences between members of one-career and two-career families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 3, 453-459.
- Campbell, J. (Ed.). [The portable Jung] (R. F. C. Hull, trans.). New York: Penguin, 1971.
- Carlyn, M. Current research practices involving the MBTI; design and methodology. Unpublished paper presented at the Second National Conference on the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, East Lansing, Mich., November, 1977.

- Carlyn, M. The relationship between Myers-Briggs personality characteristics and teaching preferences of prospective teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 3493-A. (University Microfilms No. 76-27, 081)
- Carrigan, P. Extraversion-introversion as a dimension of personality: A reappraisal. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 57, 329-360.
- Cattell, R. B., & Nesselroade, J. R. Likeness and completeness theories examined by 16 personality factor measures on stably and unstably married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 351-361.
- Chadwick, B. S., Albrecht, S. L., & Kunz, P. R. Marital and family role satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 3, 431-440.
- Clark, F. P. Interpersonal communication variables as predictors of marital satisfaction-attraction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1973.
- Cook, D. A. Is Jung's typology true? A theoretical and experimental study of some assumptions implicit in a theory of personality types (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 2979-B. (University Microfilms No. 70-21,987)
- DiTiberio, J., & Hammer, A. Model for a couples workshop using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Unpublished paper presented at the Second National Conference on the Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, East Lansing, Mich., 1977.
- Eigenbrod, F. A., Jr. The effect of territory and personality compatibility on identity and security (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 2329-A. (University Microfilms No. 69-20, 849)
- Eysenck, H. J. The structure of human personality. London: Methuen, 1953.
- Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: Norton, 1945.

- Gilbert, S. J. Self-disclosure, intimacy, and communication in families. The Family Coordinator, 1976, 3, 221-231.
- Glover, E. Freud or Jung? Cleveland: World, 1956.
- Gorlow, L., Simonson, N. R., & Krauss, H. An empirical investigation of the Jungian typology. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1966, 5, 108-117.
- Gray, H. Psychological types in married people. Journal of Social Psychology, 1949, 29, 189-200.
- Gray, H., & Wheelwright, J. B. Psychological types and changes with age. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1947, 3, 273-277.
- Gray, H., & Wheelwright, J. B. Jung's psychological types and marriage. Stanford Medical Bulletin, 1944, 2, 37-39.
- Gray, H., & Wheelwright, J. B. Jung's psychological types, including the four functions. Journal of General Psychology, 1945, 33, 265-284.
- Gray, H., & Wheelwright, J. B. Jung's psychological types in men and women. Stanford Medical Bulletin, 1948, 6, 29-36.
- Gray, H., & Wheelwright, J. B. Jung's psychological types, their frequency of occurrence. Journal of General Psychology, 1946, 34, 3-17.
- Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. Theories of personality. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Hall, C. S., & Nordby, V. J. A primer of Jungian psychology. New York: Mentor, 1973.
- Jones, W. P. Some implications of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire for marital guidance. The Family Coordinator, 1976, 2, 189-192.
- Jung, C. G. [Psychological types] (H. G. Baynes, Ed. and trans.). London: Kegan Paul, 1923. (Originally published, 1921.)
- Jung, C. G. [Memories, dreams, reflections] (A. Jaffe, Ed.; R. Winston & C. Winston, trans.). New York: Vintage, 1961.

- Jung, C. G. [The archetypes and the collective unconscious] (R. F. C. Hull, Ed. and trans.). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Kerckhoff, A. C., & Davis, K. E. Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.
- Kimmel, D., & Van der Veen, F. Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's Marital Adjustment Test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 57.
- Lederer, W. J., & Jackson, D. D. The mirages of marriage. New York: Norton, 1968.
- Lefkowitz, M. B. Statistical and clinical approaches to the identification of couples at risk in marriage (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 5199-B. (University Microfilms No. 74-9606)
- Levinger, G. Note on need complementarity in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 61, 153-157.
- Lindner, B. J. Patterning of psychological type, interpersonal understanding, and marital happiness (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 417-B. (University Microfilms No. 73-15, 517)
- Locke, H. J. Predicting adjustment in marriage: A comparison of a divorced and a happily married group. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.
- Marini, M. M. Dimensions of marriage happiness: A research note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 3, 443-448.
- McCaulley, M. H., Lewis, R. A., Van Duzee, B., Falgout, J., Irving, B. L., & Morgan, C. Bibliography for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Center for Applications of Psychological Type. Gainesville, Florida, 1977.

- Mehrens, W. A., & Lehmann, I. J. Standardized tests in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Mendelsohn, G. A. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), Personality tests and reviews. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon, 1970.
- Myers, I. B. Inferences as to the dichotomous nature of Jung's types. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 364. (a)
- Myers, I. B. Introduction to type (2nd ed.). Gainesville, Fla.: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, 1976.
- Myers, I. B. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962. (b)
- Neville, W. G. An analysis of personality types and their differential responses to marital enrichment groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6766-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-16, 640)
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.
- Norton, W. K., Jr. Empathic ability and adjustment in marriage (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6571-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-13, 547)
- Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. Dimension of marriage happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, May, 715-731.
- Osgood, J. A. The relationship between friendship bonds and Jung's psychological types (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6625-B. (University Microfilms No. 72-16, 284)
- Philips, C. E. Some useful tests for marriage counseling. The Family Coordinator, 1973, 1, 43-53.
- Richek, H. G. Note on intercorrelations of scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 22-30.

- Ross, J. The relationship between a Jungian personality inventory and tests of ability, personality, and interest. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1966, 18, 1-17.
- Singer, J. Boundaries of the soul; The practice of Jung's psychology. Garden City: Doubleday, 1972.
- Spanier, G. B. Further evidence on methodological weaknesses in the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale and other measures of adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, Aug., 403-404.
- Spanier, G. B. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, Feb., 14-18.
- Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. An assessment of some structural properties of the Jungian personality typology. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 62-71. (a)
- Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. Some correlates of a Jungian personality inventory. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 623-643. (b)
- Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. Intercorrelations and reliability of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator scales. Psychological Reports, 1963, 12, 287-293.
- Sundberg, N. D. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), Personality tests and reviews. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon, 1970, pp. 1127-1130.
- Tharp, R. G. Psychological patterning in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 1963, 60, 97-117.
- Thomas, E. A. Value analysis applied to marriage relationships (Doctoral dissertation, U.S. International University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 4030-B. (University Microfilms No. 74-1116)
- Webb, S. C. An analysis of the scoring system of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Educational Psychology and Measurement, 1964, 24, 765-781.
- Whitmont, E. C., & Kaufmann, Y. Analytical Psychotherapy. In R. Corsini (Ed.), Current psychotherapies. Itasca, Ill.: Peach, 1973.

- Williams, A. M. Personality typology as a factor in mate-selection and marital adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, 1971.
- Winch, R. F., Ktsanes, T., & Ktsanes, V. The theory of complementary needs in mate selection: An analytic and descriptive study. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 241-249.