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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Interest in research and investigation of personality types and its relationship to marital compatibility has increased over the past two decades (Blood, 1969; DiLoreto, 1971; Eysenck, 1960; Guerin, 1976; Kleinmuntz, 1967; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Lewis, 1973; McCarey, 1975; Minuchin, 1974; Murstein, 1968, 1974; Myers, 1962; Sindberg, Roberts, & McClain, 1972; Whipple & Whittle, 1976). Investigators have used several different methods in their research with the main thrust directed towards understanding the various aspects of the relationship of the couple dyad. The effort to predict success of mate-selection, as measured by longevity, was the subject of several studies (Lewis, 1973; Murstein, 1974; Sindberg, et al., 1972) which demonstrated the wide variance of identifiable variables that were reflected in mate-selection, personality, and compatibility factors. Murstein (1974), in a study of compatibility, courtship progress, and the effect of sex drive on marital choice developed several hypotheses concerning person perception, sex drive, and marital choice. The results supported the hypothesis relating to male and female sex drive and supported those relating to couple discrepancy. Earlier, in a longitudinal study (Lewis, 1973), 316 pair relationships were examined for interrelations between social reaction and dyadic formation. The
study revealed that when social reaction is withheld or denied by significant others, pair relationships tend to be transitory and few develop into comprehensive dyads.

In another effort to isolate compatibility factors Sindberg et al. (1972) studied the comparison of computer matched and subsequently married and computer matched but not married couples. Mate selection factors were studied and no differences were found on a broad range of demographic variables or in expressed preferences for partner characteristics. However, a hypothesis was supported for a number of personality traits. These personality traits, i.e., outgoingness, seclusiveness, risk taking, defensiveness, appear in the study to cluster around specific personality types. The study concludes that conscious and overt motivation to marry appears to play an important role, but in complex relationship with several other variables.

A series of studies (Murstein, 1968; Winch, 1967) attempted to test the theory of complimentary needs in mate-selection. It was then hypothesized and supported that couples chose each other on the basis of role compatibility as seen by members of the couples. Winch (1967) remarked in a later essay that the theory demonstrated a lack of principle of specification as to which needs should inter-correlate and in which direction, positively or negatively. He also stated that later studies using the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS) did not support the theory of complimentary needs as none of the needs or compatibility factors were isolated and treated in an experimental fashion.
Overall, the studies reflect ambiguity and confusion with respect to isolating and studying specific variables responsible for relationship dyads and their success. Demographic, socio-politic-economic and other characteristics of couples do not appear to be salient or make up enough of the variance to be statistically significant. Personality type, although an admittedly elusive and somewhat arbitrary choice in terms of the available empirical evidence on personal-social characteristics, may be the most important prognostic construct in the minds of many experienced researchers (Blocher, 1967; Gelder & Wolff, 1967; Jung, 1921; Lang, Lazovik, & Reynolds, 1955; Lazarus, 1963; Myers, 1962; Sargent, 1961; Sprinthall, 1967). In a study related to personality types, DiLoreto (1971) reported that client selection of therapist and client growth most probably is related to patient-therapist personality types. Luborsky (1962) noted "Of all the influences which are thought to determine the change a patient can make through treatment, the patient's personality is most often thought to be predominant" (p. 123).

A major personality theorist, Carl G. Jung, identified the dimension of introversion-extroversion, and felt that this bipolar dimension had many attributes which warranted research and interest (Jung, 1921). Likewise, a number of more recent investigators (Cattell, 1936; Eysenck, 1960; Guilford, 1959; Myers, 1962) have identified these two continuous bipolar personality types as accounting for the majority of variance on nearly all self-reporting personality questionnaires. This dimension of personality is
accessible, has high empirical validity and is independent of any one, idiosyncratic operational definition. DiLoreto (1971) pointed out, "Personality attributes with such high construct validity are a rarity in this field and command further inquiry on that basis alone" (p. 12). Consistent with these findings, introversion-extroversion are two personality type variables easy to isolate and make up a significant portion of the variance of personality types. Is it logical, then, to assume that because these two variables are easy to isolate, that they also differ on a number of qualities which may be predictive of couple compatibility?

Several investigators identified by DiLoreto (1971), cited differences in the bipolar dichotomy that serve as a basis for classification and identification of individuals and their compatibility factors (Eysenck, 1961; Eysenck & Rachman, 1965; Fenichel, 1941; Franks, 1961; Hoskisson, 1965; Myers, 1962; Singer, 1968; Wolpin & Raines, 1966; Wolpe, 1958, 1966). Eysenck (1961) and Wolpe (1958, 1966) hypothesized that individuals differ with regard to conditionability and this can serve as a basis for classifying individuals along one of two dimensions—normal-neuroticism or introversion-extroversion. Wolpin and Raines (1966) suggest that introverts may have better imagery than extroverts, as they are more likely to live in fantasy and thus have more practice with visual imagery. It was also noted here that introverts are more dependent, suggestible and conforming. Franks (1961) points out that the introvert is a "thinking," "planning," or "ideational" type whereas the extrovert is a "doing" or "acting" type. Consistent with these...
descriptions, Eysenck and Rachman (1965) have characterized the extrovert as "sociable . . . needs to have people to talk to and does not like to read or study by himself . . . he prefers to keep moving and doing things" (p. 19). Experimental studies using the concept of introversion-extroversion (Eysenck & Rachman, 1965) indicate that, as compared to introverts, extroverts have a higher IQ and vocabulary ratio and higher sociability.

All of these considerations taken together suggest a more than casual relationship between personality types and specific traits peculiar to the personality types themselves. Some interesting questions are now raised: Do compatibility factors really constellate or group around specific personality types and are there sex differences between personality types and compatibility factors and is one kind of personality more suitable or compatible with another personality type? More specifically focused, are extroverts really more sociable and introverts more seclusive and does this effect mate-selection success? Myers (1962) points out, "... a modern personality theory must take into account the fact that individuals are the unique product of their heredity and environment, and are, therefore, different" (p. 2). It is not easy, however, to account for all the complex propositions by which people accept and reject their environment and develop their own brand of bias, values, reason, intelligence, interests, drives and goals which help to satisfy them. An abstract, theoretical presentation of personality was alien to Jung who strove to engage the responses of the whole of man, not just the intellect, or for that matter,
any fragmented part of personality (Myers, 1962). However, it is
important to briefly review the history of structured personality
assessment.

Modern personality assessment dates back to World War I
when Woodworth published the Personality Data Sheet. His creation
was designed to meet the needs of the military in an attempt to
screen large numbers of personnel. The development and publication
of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (Hathaway
& McKinley, 1940) and Meehl's (1945) "incisive and lucid account of
the method of empirical item selection against external criteria"
(Jackson, 1973) saw a new era of psychometric testing and the develop­
ment of the self-reporting inventory. During this period, the con­
struction of personality inventories developed from primitive attempts
at gaining footholds for deriving scientific generalizations to the
present, a time of innovation in both methodology and statistical
treatment of the data (Jackson, 1973). As a result, the field has
become increasingly more specialized and more quantitative, requiring
a blend of substantive and methodological research, in that neither
is sufficient in itself to deal with the problems of assessment
(Jackson, 1973). However, what was of importance was "that it was
possible to adapt the approach used in achievement of aptitude testing;
items could be added to yield a total score which in turn could be
analyzed for reliability and validity" (Jackson, 1973).

Personality, here, refers to a "unique organization of traits
characterizing an individual, and influencing his interaction with
his environment, social and nonsocial" (Kleinmuntz, 1967). The
nature of a definition of personality more specific than this would result in a theoretical predilection, i.e., psychoanalytic, Skinnerian, social learning, theory, and the like. Each theoretical vantage point involves focusing on certain facets of personality to the exclusion of others. In this paper, the research will focus on Jung's personality types.

A typology is reflected in an individual manifesting an extreme of one or more traits. Several authors have argued that typologists, i.e., Jung, ought to consider personality type as a combination of several personality traits. It is argued here that typology does present some statistical problems for the researcher. As Jackson (1973) pointed out:

A type is difficult to deal with from the standpoint of measurement. One must define some rule for establishing discreet nonoverlapping categories. A number of statistical procedures are available for approaching this problem from different directions but each of these must cope with the difficulty that test scores are distributed continuously. Empirical and theoretical work by Lorr (1966) and his associates comparing alternative grouping and typing methods has advanced our knowledge but there are as yet no universally accepted definitive procedures for establishing types (p. 787).
However, research methods have advanced the experimentation with types, enough so that the construction of several personality-type inventories were created in the 1960's and 70's (Jackson, 1973), including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which is based on Carl Jung's theoretical propositions on personality types (Myers, 1962).

Carl Jung was a pioneer in developing a theory of personality types. He distinguished initially between the extroverted type of personality—social, outgoing, and optimistic—and the introverted type—more apt to withdraw from external reality, less sociable, more absorbed in his own inner life. This initial distinction was accompanied by an explanation of four functions of personality, namely, sensation, thinking, feeling and intuition. By sensation Jung (1921) meant all that we acquire through sense perception. Thinking is used with common sense meaning in its usage. Feeling is the capacity for making evaluations of oneself and others. Intuition is the perception of realities which are not consciously perceived; it works spontaneously for the solution of problems which cannot be grasped rationally (Jung, 1921).

Types of personalities are differentiated in terms of which function is dominant and whether the person is extroverted or introverted (Jung, 1921). For example, the extroverted person, in whom thinking is dominant, will be fascinated by facts and concerned to order them rationally. He will tend to underplay the emotions and thus be subject, now and again, to uncontrolled and unrecognized outbursts of emotions. The introverted thinking type, on the other
hand, is one in whom facts are never valued for their own sake but only in relation to the creative inner theorizing of the thinker. Both types of thinking are accompanied by an undeveloped feeling function, for, in Jung's terms, thinking and feeling are essentially opposite. Sensation and intuition are paired in the same way, namely, in opposite functions (Jung, 1921).

Perception is understood to include the processes of becoming aware of things or people or occurrences or ideas (Jung, 1921). Judgment is to include the processes of coming-to-conclusions; they may, as a result, show corresponding differences in their reactions, in their interests, values, needs and motivations, in what they do best and in what they like best to do. The four basic preferences which, according to Myers (1962) structure an individual's personality. Preference between extroversion and introversion affects an individual's choice as to whether to direct perception and judgment upon the environment or the world of ideas. The Extrovert-Introvert (E-I) index is designed to reflect whether a person is an extrovert or introvert in the sense intended by Jung, who coined the terms. The extroverted attitude is demonstrated when orientation by the object predominates in such a way that decisions and actions are determined not by subjective or inner views but by objective conditions. If a person "... thinks, feels, acts, and actually lives in a way that is directly correlated with the objective conditions, and their demands, the person is extroverted ... the object can never have enough value for him and its importance
must always be increased" (Jung, 1921, p. 179 & p. 330). Jung (1921) goes on to say

Everyone knows those reserved, inscrutable, rather shy people who form the strongest possible contrast to the open, sociable, jovial, or at least friendly and approachable characters who are on good terms with everybody, or quarrel with everybody, but always related to them in some way and in turn are affected by them (p. 330).

The introvert, on the other hand, is oriented primarily to the inner world and tends to focus his perception and judgment upon concepts and ideas. Singer (1972) states,

The introverted nature is Platonic in that it is mystical, spiritualized, and perceives in symbolic forms, while the extroverted nature is Aristotelian in that it is practical, a builder of solid system from the Platonic idea. The introvert is directed primarily towards an understanding of what he perceives . . . in the introvert, the subject, his own being, is the center of every interest and the importance of the object (so important to the extrovert) lies in the way in which it affects the subject (p. 187-188).
The introvert's attitude is an abstracting one; at bottom, he is always intent on withdrawing Libido from the object, as though he has to prevent the object from gaining power over him (p. 311).

Jung (1921) also developed four theoretical functions: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. The Sensing-Intuition (S-N) index, used by Myers (1962), is designed to reflect a person's preference between two opposite ways of perceiving, i.e., whether the person relies primarily on the familiar process of sensing, by which the person is made aware of things directly through one or another of his five senses, or by the less obvious process of intuition, which is understood as indirect perception by way of the unconscious, with the emphasis on ideas or associations which the unconscious tacks on to the outside environment and perceived objects. Sensation, on the other hand, is quite dissimilar in its own orientation as well as within the extroverted and introverted attitudes. Sensation, in the extroverted attitude, is preeminently conditioned by the object and as far as conscious application is concerned, is either inhibited or repressed. In the introverted attitude, sensation is based predominantly on the subjective component of perception. What is perceived in reality, after modification by the introvert, becomes a symbolic representation of reality, i.e., as in the artist. Jung (1921) states, "it is an unconscious disposition which alters the sense-perception as its source, thus depriving it of the character of a purely objective influence" (p. 253).
Likewise, intuition in the introvert is directed to the "inner object," a term that might be applied to the contents of the unconscious. "Like sensation," Jung (1921) states, "intuition has its subjective factor, which is suppressed as much as possible in the extroverted attitude but is the decisive factor in the intuition of the introvert" (p. 232). We might say that an introverted intuitive is full of fantasies or chasing rainbows, making very little contact with reality while the extroverted intuitive demands perpetual change, never heeding what has already been done or taking time to evaluate reality.

The Thinking-Feeling (T-F) function is designed to reflect the person's preference between two opposite types of judgment. The person who relies primarily upon thinking discriminates between what he or she values and nonvalues. Thinking in general is based on one hand on subjective and unconscious sources, and on the other hand on object data transmitted by sense-perception. The extrovert uses criteria supplied by external conditions; thinking is oriented by the object and objective data.

Extroverted thinking is not necessarily concretistic thinking; it can just as well be purely ideal thinking. The ideas it operates with are largely borrowed from the outside world, i.e., have been learned through experience and formal education. The crucial question in deciding extroverted thinking is: by what
criteria does it judge—outside or inside
(Jung, 1921, p. 379).

Introverted thinking is primarily oriented by the subjective factor. "At the very least the subjective factor expresses itself as a feeling of guidance which ultimately determines judgment" (Jung, 1921, p. 380). To Jung (1921), the introverted thinker was best exemplified by Nietzsche. "Like his extroverted counterpart, he is strongly influenced by ideas . . . he will follow his ideas like the extrovert, but in the reverse direction; inwards and not outward" (p. 383).

Feeling is primarily value oriented and is the general state of consciousness considered independent of particular sensations. Jung (1921) drawing on earlier ideas on feelings from Wundt, Nahlowsky, Ribot, Lehmann and Villa, states the following:

Feeling is primarily a process that takes place between the ego (q.v.) and a given content, a process, moreover, that imparts to the content of a definite value in the sense of acceptance or rejection ("like" or "dislike"). Feeling, therefore, is an entirely subjective process, which may be in every respect independent of external stimuli, though it allies itself with every sensation. Hence feeling is kind of a judgment, differing from intellectual judgment in that its aim is not to establish conceptual
relations but to set up a subjective criterion
of acceptance or rejection (pp. 434-435).

Singer (1972) calls feeling "... coming to a point of
view" about an event. Like feeling, judgment includes some kind
of value orientation: is it acceptable or nonacceptable, good or
bad, painful or pleasurable and so on. Since the act or behavior
of feeling is an evaluative process, Jung (1921) stipulates that
thinking and feeling must be seen as mutually exclusive functions.
Thus, feeling in the extroverted attitude is oriented to objective
data, the object being the determiner of the feeling. Jung (1921)
states:

I may feel moved, for instance, to say something
is "beautiful" or "good," not because I find it
"beautiful" or "good" from my own subjective
feeling about it, but because it is fitting and
polite to call it so, since a contrary judgment
would upset the general feeling situation ... 
a feeling judgment of this kind is not by any
means a pretense or a lie, it is simply an act
of adjustment (p. 207).

Introverted feeling is more difficult to assess. Intro­
verted feeling is determined, like thinking, principally by the
subjective factor. Jung (1921) states this is because
It is a feeling which seems to devalue the
objective and it, therefore, manifests itself
for the most part negatively ... it seldom
appears on the surface and is generally mis-
understood . . . continually seeking an image
which has no existence in reality, but which
it has seen in a kind of vision (p. 387).

The object is not to understand or appreciate reality but
rather "to subordinate it in an unconscious effort to realize the
underlying images" (Jung, 1921, p. 247). Jung (1921) sees this as
a striving after inner intensity for which the object serves at
most as a stimulus. In the last analysis, it is difficult to grasp:
"it makes people silent and difficult of access; it shrinks back
like a violet from the brute nature of the object in order to fill
the depths of the subject" (p. 208).

In considering the final basic difference which completes
the structure of personality under Jung's typology, the difference
concerns the relationship between perception and judgment. In
regards to the previous three basic differences of the use of per-
ception and judgment the choice is between two rival ways of judging
and the choice between two rival fields for their use. The last
preference is between perception and judgment as a way of life, a
method of dealing with the surrounding world. Both must be used
but not at the same time. Individuals, therefore, alternate between
the perceptual and judgmental attitudes.

The fundamental difference between the two attitudes, notes
Myers (1962), is that "in the judging attitude, in order to come to
a conclusion, perception must be shut off for the time being. The
evidence is all in. One now arrives at a verdict and gets things
settled" (p. 58). Just the opposite, in the perceptual attitude the door is open, all the evidence is not in and it is too soon to come to any decision.

In terms of Jung's theory, a person may reasonably be expected to develop most skill with the type preferentially used in areas where the person prefers to use them. The products of all functions can be conscious. However, even though there is a predominant function of type, there is also a secondary or auxiliary functional process. The auxiliary function is possible and useful only in so far as it serves the dominant type. For example, thinking (a type) as the primary process can be readily paired with intuition or sensation but never with feeling, which is bipolar or oppositional. Thus, there cannot be two kinds of evaluative processes or function of type at the same time, i.e., thinking-feeling, sensing-intuition, judgment or perception (Myers, 1962; Singer, 1972).

Few people conform to the ideal personality types proposed by Jung. There is nothing wrong with this, however, because it is the nature of scientific inquiry to postulate "ideal" types. Philosophers of science (Popper, 1959, 1962; Suppe, 1977) have shown how "idealization" is an inevitable aspect of scientific theory. Hence, the psychology of personality type is at no more disadvantage than the natural sciences on this goal. Idealization is necessary for two immediate reasons: first, a pragmatic consideration of setting a goal, a standard of comparison, and criteria for explanation and definition of the basic propositions of the theory. The
second reason being one of philosophical consideration, i.e., what do we "mean" by personality, that is, how do we best or ideally describe the abstract notion of personality, and in this particular case, personality typology? (Popper, 1959, 1962; Suppe, 1977).

Myers (1962) sets the purpose of the MBTI to "implement Jung's theory of (personality) type" (p. 1). Simply, Myers (1962) points out, Jung (1921) devised a system of differences or opposites as a method by which people base their acceptance or rejection of various environmental stimuli, their behavior, the manner in which they reason and the highly individual differences in the interests, values, and satisfactions that motivate them. The merit of Jung's personality theory, according to Myers (1962) "... is that it accounts for many of the differences which other theoretical frameworks leave to random variation" (p. 51). All science, then, including psychology, needs to develop "ideals" and "ideal types" from which an attempt can be made to measure a portion of reality in an experimental form and to develop the necessary and sufficient conditions from which comparison of criteria can be established.

The interpretation of the results of the MBTI, under the theory presented here, is seen as a compilation of preferences by which the personality is structured as to the use of perception and judgment. As Myers (1962) explains:

Each of these choices is regarded as a fork in the road of human development, offering
divergent paths which lead to different kinds of excellence. Any preference, however slight, suffices to start the individual along one path rather than its opposite. How far he (she) will go, how much excellence he (she) will actually achieve, depends of course upon the individual, his (her) energy, aspirations and perhaps, the intrinsic strength of his (her) preference. But the kind of excellence he (she) is headed for is determined by the individual's very early choice as to which fork of the road to take. What is called "type" is that portion, then, of the personality which people create in themselves by their exercise of the four preferences (p. 62).

It is important to note that each of these four combinations of type and function produces a different kind of personality, characterized, according to Myers (1962), by "whatever interests, values, needs, habits of mind and surface traits naturally result from that combination" (p. 53). Where two combinations have a preference in common, they will have some qualities in common. But, each combination has qualities all its own, arising from the interaction of the preferred way of looking at life and the preferred way of judging what is viewed in his/her environment. Whatever a person's particular combination of preferences is, others that have the same combination will get along with them the easiest (Myers, 1962).
Preference type is the function of the individual's conscious orientation to life, their habitual, purposeful ways of using their mind, chosen because it seems good, interesting, and safe. The Indicator, according to Myers (1962) "provides information on personality differences postulated as basic and affecting many spheres of human activity . . . (it) has its origin in a theory (Jungian) directed primarily towards explaining the valuable differences among normal people; it represents a systematic attempt to construct a set of measurements which relate directly to that theory" (pp. 76-77). Myers (1962) goes on to point out that the Indicator has its usefulness in providing information on personality types and has been applied to educational, vocational, and personal counseling as well as in selection and placement in business and industry.

Today's researchers and psychologists appear to agree with Jung (1921) that selection and choice of a good mate presupposes similarity in personality types and compatibility factors (Ellis, 1964; Minuchin, 1974; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Guerin, 1976; Whipple & Whittle, 1976). However, there has been little attempt at measuring the actual compatibility factors in marriage and comparing these factors to specific personality types. Marriage counselors in the field today see more and more partners who base their decision for a mate on "wishful thinking" or "being in love," both notions highly supported in our culture, only to find out later that the halo effect developed during courtship, has worn off.
(McCary, 1975). Most marital problems are brought into the marriage by the participants; they do not occur after the marriage vows have been said (Whipple & Whipple, 1976). Likewise, research has also shown that relationship compatibility is an absolute essential to lasting family success (Blood, 1969; Erikson, 1963).

It is apparent, then, that some part of the success or failure of a relationship depends upon the inner resources and the personality orientation of the marriage partners as individuals. According to Jung (1921), the developing male assimilates in the unconscious the archetype of the mother, sisters, female companions, etc., and develops the unconscious notion of "woman" (Singer, 1972).

By the time he is a young adult he has a "contellation" (collection of images) of woman within his unconscious. Jung (1921) states:

The young person of marriageable age . . . is certain to have wide areas which lie in the shadow and preclude the formation of a psychological relationship . . . the motives he acts from are largely unconscious and . . . the greater the area of unconsciousness, the less is marriage a matter of free choice (pp. 164-165).

In his selection of a mate he projects his unconscious notions of "woman" onto his chosen one, never seeing her as she is in reality. When the projection diminishes, he is faced with a woman he doesn't know at all. Jacobi (1973) writes:
The attitudinal habitus of consciousness is maintained until the individual gets into a situation where his one-sidedness prevents him from adapting to reality. In a relationship with an object of the opposite type, the individual puts the blame on the other when the opposing clash and misunderstandings arise, because the other possesses the qualities which he does not find in himself, which he has not yet developed, and which are, therefore, presented in him only in inferior force. This difference in types is often the real psychological basis of marriage problems, of difficulties between parents and children, of friction among friends and business associates, and even of social and political differences (p. 21).

A discussion of compatibility and its relationship to psychological types is necessary in order to understand more fully the design of this research. Therefore, compatibility, as discussed here, is a deep-rooted, permanent, goodness-of-fit between two partners' intrinsic personality characteristic (Whipple & Whittle, 1976). These characteristics develop early in a person's life and become a part of the personality of the individual through interaction with the environment and that percentage of personality which is based on hereditary factors (Wilson, 1975).
A person's compatibility matrix can be seen at various levels of structure, i.e., intellectual, creative, level of psychological confidence, physical abilities of all sorts and so on. Whipple and Whittle (1976) chose to measure the level of six marriage compatibility factors of persons involved in a relationship: I. Sociability; II. Emotional Stability; III. Dominance; IV. Intellectual and Educational Level; V. Heterosexual Need; and VI. Drive Level.

The following, then, is an explanation of the Whipple and Whittle (1976) marriage compatibility factors:

Factor A. Sociability. One of the most important traits which affects marital relationship adjustment is sociability. Sociability is the quality of being social, having the desire and inclination to make friends, to be outgoing and liking to be around people. Words which describe sociability are: friendly, being social, intimacy, fellowship, conviviality, hospitable, and a hundred more. Whipple and Whittle (1976) identify two aspects of sociability that they attempt to account for in the MCI: (1) The need for people and (2) the liking for people. The need for people is an active aggressive trait which can cause trouble in marriage, especially when the need for people is high in one person and not the other. Liking people is a more passive aspect of sociability and not as likely to cause harm in a marriage. Having a strong need for people betrays insecurity; this means the person must be around people (Whipple & Whittle, 1976).
The opposite is the person who likes to be alone or with one or two people while, at the same time, he/she can be social and outgoing when the situation demands it. These people tend to gravitate towards jobs that do not demand great social contact: artist, bookkeeper, copywriter, librarian, researcher, and typist (Myers, 1962).

Factor B. Emotional Stability. The definition of emotional stability, in today's world, requires a great deal of explanation. Many behaviors now exhibited by participants in our society would not have been condoned, in fact, probably would have been severely sanctioned only a few years ago (i.e., sexual behavior, drugs, adolescent behavior, etc.). As difficult as it is to determine, most physicians feel that forty to fifty percent of the people coming into a medical doctor's office for treatment do so because of symptoms arising from emotional and mental instability (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979). Whipple and Whittle (1976) state that unstable people are "people who try to change the deeper desires within from those they think are not socially acceptable into some form of what they conceive as being acceptable behavior for that which their desires prompt" (p. 24).

However, what does and does not belong in the category of emotion is the subject of controversy between several schools of thought. Generally, however, in current usage, emotion and affect are used interchangeably. Emotion is used to refer primarily to consciously perceived feelings and their object manifestations and
affect to include the drive energies (i.e., towards a stimulus or goal) that are preserved to generate both conscious and unconscious feelings (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979). But, for an example of disagreement, Adler refers to emotions as nondeterministic, e.g., they do not determine goals (Brenner, 1955). For Adler, people are disturbed when they are deficient in their social movement, social integration and because they have the wrong concept of themselves (Brenner, 1955). At the same time, the James-Lange theory of emotions states that so-called expressions or bodily changes are direct results of the perception of the exciting object, and that the emotion is just the feeling of these physiological changes as they occur (Wolman, 1973).

Differing in opinion as to the etiology and structure of emotions and what constitutes stability thereof, psychologists do tend to agree that defenses are resistances rooted in character and manifested in the emotional sources of the symptoms of rationalization, self-delusion, self-deception, intellectualization, distortion and denial (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979). All are ways in which people deal with emotions (symptomatically), sometimes causing neurosis and, in some cases, psychosis (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979; Wolman, 1973).

Whipple and Whittle (1976) claim that it is important for a person considering marriage to "be able to spot some apparent symptoms" of maladaptive emotions and suggest that "if one should find these (symptoms) in themselves or the person they intend to marry . . . (they) are urged to consult a psychiatrist or
consulting psychologist" (p. 11). In some marriages the couple's relationship is symbiotic, i.e., a healthy, sufficient person to whom an unstable, inadequate person is attracted (Lederer & Jackson, 1968). Under the cloud of "love," rational, objective assessment is left behind. Thus, it is extremely important, no matter what the personality profile appears to be, that the emotional stability of each person involved in a relationship be at least moderately stable to insure some measure of domestic tranquility (Whipple & Whittle, 1976).

Factor C. Dominance. The word dominance can be said to mean exerting authority, influence and control. Developmental psychologists use the word "dominance" to describe both biological genes and psychological personalities (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979). In genetics, there are dominant and recessive physical characteristics which are hereditary. In the case of personality, dominance means exercising (or attempting to exercise) control over another person, in this case, one spouse over another.

Briefly, the history of dominance in relationships is a history of male and female roles, both within and outside the family. Since the 1880's and the Victorian Age, the patriarchal family structure has been in decline (Minuchin, 1974). With the advent of WW II, total rule by the senior male member was all but gone. Women were employed by industry and had achieved a sense of equality. Today, there is a greater sense of democracy within the family with most couples participating together in decision.
making at all levels of family responsibility (McCary, 1975; Minuchin, 1974).

At the same time, rational dominance is associated with leadership. Men and women have a need to be confident and secure when placed in a position of leadership. When decisions are made, the asset of rational dominance means awareness. Knowledge of the facts, entertaining a certain amount of risk, and the ability to direct, yes, even control people and programs to their chosen goal are a part of rational dominance (Ellis, 1964; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Minuchin, 1974; Whipple & Whittle, 1976).

In a relationship, dominance, when coupled with emotional stability and adequate knowledge of their environment, is a tremendous asset. In today's world both men and women are being encouraged to make individual and cooperative decisions and to act on them. This is not to say that the concept of "equal partnership" and "dominance" are synonymous. Equal sharing of decisions and tasks does not mean that dominance is not present within a relationship. Even in the day and age of the "adrogynous" type, the varying roles and tasks of a marriage relationship means that a man and a woman, when the circumstances dictate, are dominant in their own right (Singer, 1972). What is important to the marriage is that the decision-making process becomes more democratic and sharing (Lederer & Jackson, 1968). Well-adjusted wives have "'deference and respect for the husband's judgment', and well-adjusted husbands show 'respect and deference for the judgment of the wife'" (Whipple & Whittle, 1976, p. 35). In a healthy marriage the partners
develop their own spheres of decision making but cooperate in making decisions which affect the couple's relationship. If two people are compatible they tend to be able to satisfy their own individual needs and, at the same time, they may be able to satisfy many of their partner's needs. However, dominance is relative and its place in a relationship is affected by other variables. Intelligence, emotional stability and sex are intimately connected to dominance and may be used in a "power struggle" to secure the position of "boss." What appears to be important, in the end, is that each partner has his or her areas of dominance without being domineering. Two highly dominant persons can marry and, with proper understanding and inventiveness, can reach intelligent decisions without losing their autonomy and ability to be decisive (Whipple & Whittle, 1976).

Partnership "equality" is a relationship goal both as a method for sharing responsibility and for allowing assertion of individuality. Both reasons serve to preclude the old, dominant, authoritarian domestic rule (Lederer & Jackson, 1968).

Ideally, during courtship, men and women attempt to "check each other out" about how strong the person is, can she/he make phone calls for reservations, ask a waiter to take a poor plate of food back, etc. (Whipple & Whittle, 1976). At the same time, it is necessary to see how many decisions are made, becoming aware of subtle manipulation or overt ruling, trying to change the other person's habit of dress, speech or behavior by critical comments (Miller & Steinberg, 1975). What seems to be most important here
is the method by which two people work out their dominant-submissive behavior. In other words, is it comfortable for each person to be submissive when their partner wishes to be dominant and vice-versa. Communication, both active and passive, feedback and listening, is essential to allow each person time to adjust to novel situations (Miller & Steinberg, 1975). Sacrifice and giving with tolerance, grace, and style, all acts of submission, are important. Compromise is necessary to reach accord on major issues. This whole process involves understanding each person's areas and methods for dominance and submission. The area of dominance and submission is an important characteristic for relationships to consider and about which to come to reasonable conclusions (Minuchin, 1974; Whipple & Whittle, 1976).

Factor D. Intellectual and Educational Level. Intelligence has been discussed, argued, defined, and questioned since Plato (Wechsler, 1958) points out that in Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, the world intelligence . . . "did not rate a separate entry but was merely given as an alternate to or synonym of intellect" (p. 21). Although intelligence, per se, can be divided into many qualities (or functions) as well as separate processes (i.e., short term, long term memory), the world intelligence will be referred to as "global intelligence" in this paper. Intelligence, operationally defined by Wechsler (1958) "is the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment"
The total picture of intelligence is composed of more than 120 separate functions that are qualitatively differentiable (Wechsler, 1958). But psychologists argue that one cannot add up each function and gain a total sum to reflect intelligence (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979; Wechsler, 1958; Wolman, 1973). The functional configuration, the way in which each quality is combined with another, is extremely important (Wechsler, 1958). Secondly, motivation and drive are influential in determining the use of intelligence (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979). Third, one may have an over-abundance of a special quality and little of anything else with which to effectively deal with the environment. Therefore, it seems necessary that a certain intellectual ability be present at base level. What is important for this study is that intellectual and educational levels must be seen in combination with other factors, i.e., dominance, drive level, emotional stability, communication as well as personality, attitude, and function. These and other factors intricately combine to form personality (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Miller & Steinberg, 1975; Wechsler, 1958; Whipple & Whittle, 1976).

Developing a warm, close, and intimate relationship as a couple is predicated on communication and the ability to solve problems, discuss issues rationally, and provide each partner with sufficient stimulation to keep a relationship going (Miller & Steinberg, 1975). Communication in marriage is a constant exchange of information—of messages—between two partners by speech, letter writing, talking on the phone, the exhibition of bodily or facial
expression, and other methods as well. A great many communications that pass between a husband and wife will be misunderstood if the level of understanding—intelligence, memory, perception—does not correspond with the ability to communicate in a rational, intelligible manner. Many therapists and researchers have noticed a circular or multidimensional effect by which dysfunctional communication plays an important role in contributing seriously to marital difficulties (Miller & Steinberg, 1975). This, then, as well as other facets of intelligence, corresponds with a base level intellectual compatibility to provide successful marriages.

**Factor E. Heterosexual Needs.** Most researchers agree that in order to have a successful marriage two people must make a satisfactory sexual adjustment. It is important to note that adjustment for two mates is not sexual performance based on pseudo—or other-directed criteria. Lederer and Jackson (1968) described the role of sex in marriage:

> Given adequate physiological and anatomical equipment (which nature rarely fails to provide) and a modicum of knowledge of sexual techniques, the spouses will enjoy sexual union when both are in a collaborative mood. The collaborative mood exists when each is adding something to the sexual act, not just submitting (p. 96).
Like the previous factors, sex is not the total cause of a good or bad marriage. Like other variables in the relationship, sex shares a bond within the structure of the relationship to every other variable. When coupled with emotional instability (i.e., feelings of inferiority or neurotic anxiety), inability to articulate sexual preference, or caught in one of many cultural traps (i.e., status, performance, bravado, roles, etc.), then poor sexual performance and ability become symptoms for an underlying conflict. In many cases, sex can be a cause for a good or bad marriage or relationship (McCary, 1975). There is no set standard against which success of sex can be measured. The important question is: is sex pleasurable in the opinion and judgment of the partners themselves? Emotional maturity and sexual openness are felt by most marital researchers to be part of the total picture for marital success (Blood, 1969; Guerin, 1976; McCary, 1975).

Whipple and Whittle (1976) state three factors conducive to sexual compatibility: (1) the couple must be emotionally mature, know themselves and their partners, and have mutual respect and trust for each other; (2) both of the partners should feel comfortable about the level of sex (i.e., method, times, length, variety of acts, etc.) in which they are engaged; and (3) there should be adequate verbal and nonverbal communication.

Marital therapists conclude that no couple can make a successful adjustment where the drive of one is high and the other low, regardless of educational level, social or religious background,
nor how hard they try (Blood, 1969; Guerin, 1976; Whipple & Whittle, 1976). Also, the age of a partnership is important. Some studies suggest that the female does not reach sexual maturity until her late twenties or thirties (Blood, 1969; Guerin, 1976; McCary, 1968). With the avoidance of sex and noncommunication of sexual needs (and inadequacies) comes the cessation of sexual activity (Miller & Steinberg, 1975). The lack of meeting sexual needs shows itself in other areas of the marriage; namely, dominance and emotional instability. Whipple and Whittle (1976) consider heterosexual compatibility the most important factor in marital compatibility: "Without (sexual) compatibility here, the chances of marital happiness are greatly reduced" (p. 59).

**Factor F. Drive Level.** Action, energy, activity, enthusiasm, passion, spirit, whatever synonym is used, drive (or motivation) is an integral part of the structure of personality. All people have some energy level and it affects the performance of all other factors and combinations of factors. We speak of high sociability, high sex drive, exemplary academic ability, all of which involve some form of high-level motivation. However, the idea of one drive pushing behind all behavior is simplistic. Drives overlap as do needs. Motivation is the force or energy that propels an organism to seek a goal and/or to satisfy a need. Sullivan (1953) termed conjunctive those strivings directed to long range satisfaction of real needs, and disjunctive those substitute strivings that afford only immediate gratification.
Drives are theorized to be genetically determined in a general way, and are psychic constituents which, where operative, produce a state of psychic excitation or tension (Bourne & Ekstrand, 1979). This excitation or tension impels the individual to activity (Brenner, 1955). In present day psychoanalytic psychology, two main drives are distinguished—the sexual or erotic (the energy of which is the libido), and the aggressive or destructive (energy of which is the aggressive energy) (Jacobi, 1973).

In terms of drive level and mate selection, it is assumed by Whipple and Whittle (1976) that (1) a person who engages in a great deal of activity has a high drive level, and (2) that mates ought to have similar activity levels in order to be compatible. In the matter of energy, the man or woman with low energy level is content with fewer activities and most often seems to accomplish what he or she needs to get done. The highly energetic individual often complains that he never has time to get things done. It may be that the most comfortable mate is the one with average or a little lower energy with whom a person does not have to compete in every day living (Whipple & Whittle, 1976).
CHAPTER II

METHODS

Subjects

The sample was composed of three groups of 30 couples. The first group (Group I) consisted of 30 couples who were engaged (formally or informally), or who had a "steady" relationship of more than 60 days. Sixty days was felt by the writer to be an adequate period of time for a couple to initiate a courtship pattern and to assimilate a minimal understanding of their partner's likes and dislikes. These subjects were volunteers from the West Michigan area. Several churches and social agencies cooperated in the collection of the data. The second group (Group II) consisted of 30 couples who were married, had not previously been divorced, and who attested to the fact that, at this time, they were not seeking to separate or divorce. These subjects were volunteers from several local churches in the Grand Haven-Spring Lake, Michigan area. The third and last group (Group III) consisted of 30 couples who, at the time of testing, had either filed for divorce, had been separated from their spouses for more than three months and held the expectation of pursuing a divorce, or were actually divorced. These subjects were volunteers from several sources in the West Michigan area (Muskegon, Ottawa, Kent, and Kalamazoo Counties) which
includes the Circuit Court of Ottawa, Kent, and Muskegon Counties; and several family and children service agencies in Ottawa, Kent, and Muskegon Counties; and persons I knew as a result of practicing, under supervision, as a therapist in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and Grand Haven, Michigan. There were no demographic restrictions other than a lower age limit of 16.

Nonprobability "purposive" sampling was used to construct groups (30 pairs each) based on characteristics of married, not married, separated or divorced. Every effort was made to insure that each participant had the specific qualities for inclusion in their respective group and the goal of selecting "typical" representation from the general population was achieved (Kerlinger, 1973). Kerlinger (1973) points out "... if random sampling cannot be used, and if there is doubt about the independence of observations, calculate the statistics and interpret them. But be circumspect about interpretations and conclusions" (p. 197).

Measuring Instruments

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (1962), a self-reporting instrument primarily based on Jungian personality typology, had two main periods of construction, 1942 to 1944 and 1956 to 1958. The first period "began with the writing of a quantity of responses of some 20 friends and relatives whose type preferences seemed to the authors clearly evident from long term acquaintance" (Myers, 1962). The items were developed into Form A, later rearranged in
Form B, and subjected to a series of internal-consistency analyses, using mainly adult samples.

During the second period "over 200 new items, including word-pairs, were submitted to a small group of people of known type who were familiar with the Indicator" (p. 83). An internal-consistency analysis was done with 385 graduate students analyzing each item for all four indices. The weakest items were deleted. Later, a massive internal consistency analysis was performed using 2,573 Pennsylvania high school students in college preparatory 11th and 12th grades. Item-Test Correlation of phrase questions for each index (bipolar personality continuous type) shows as follows: Extrovert-Introvert = .60; Sensation-Intuition = .57; Judgment-Perception = .55. To prevent distortion from correlations, no item is scored for more than one index. When biserial r's were computed between each item and the scores of other indices, the median absolute r's with those scores ranged only .07 to .12 (Myers, 1962).

According to Myers, what had been done was to investigate reliability on various levels by the use of a logically-split-half procedure. Each index has been split into halves, taking all available item statistics into consideration and pairing items that most resemble each other and correlate most highly. The split-half reliability was obtained by applying the Spearman-Brown formula to obtain correlations between halves. For an initial random population of 727 persons from ages 12 through 30, the following
results are reported: Extrovert-Introvert = .82; Sensation-Intuition = .81; Thinking-Feeling = .76; and Judgment-Perception = .83 (Myers, 1962, p. 20).

The crucial question with regard to scoring is the correctness of the division-points. Since the indices are designed to separate the people holding one preference from those holding the opposite preference, there must be on each index an optimum cutting-point, at which two kinds of people can be clearly divided. A series of disparate regressions to assess the bipolarity of Jungian types was computed and the evidence provided "not-too-steep regressions" with a significant break at the division points (Myers, 1962).

The main purpose of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is to implement Jung's theory of personality typing. The essence of this theory is that much apparently random variation in human behavior is, according to Jung, actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment (Myers, 1962).

The Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (Myers, 1962) was administered as the measure of Jungian personality type. The MBTI consists of 166 questions and word pairs and is virtually self-administering. Scoring the MBTI produces four preferences, bipolar scores, one for each of the four indices: Extrovert-Introvert (E-I); Sensation-Intuition (S-N); Thinking-Feeling (T-F); and Judgment-Perception (J-P). Each index reflects one of the four preferences which, according to theory, determine personality type. The score for each index consists of a letter showing direction of the preference.
the testee reported, followed by a number showing its reported strength (Myers, 1962).

The MBTI provided the data for analysis on the interaction of four bipolar personality preferences, i.e., extrovert-introvert, sensation-intuition, thinking-feeling, judgment-perception. Six compatibility factors were elicited from the MCI. These are sociability, emotional stability, dominance, educational level, heterosexual need, and drive level.

The MBTI was hand scored and, for each bipolar preference given, a "preferred" score was converted to a continuous score (Appendix D) for statistical purposes. For each couple a score was derived by taking the absolute difference between each of the traits on the MBTI.

The Marriage Compatibility Inventory (MCI) (Whipple & Whittle, 1976) was self-administered and hand scored by templates. The items were made up of 208 true and false and multiple choice questions. Scoring was a rating of one, two, three, four, or five for each of the six compatibility factors: (A) Sociability, (B) Emotional Stability, (C) Dominance, (D) Intellectual Level, (E) Heterosexual Need, and (F) Drive Level. In the Analysis Sheet of each person, the partner's scores were paired so that a comparison could be made for each relationship.

The construction of the MCI began with approximately 500 items sorted from several sources: interviews with individuals seeking marriage counseling, marriage and family counselors, psychologists, psychiatrists and other professionals; books and publications dealing with marriage and divorce; psychological tests,
inventories, and questionnaires. A frequency matrix developed six clusters and were incorporated into the MCI. Test-retest reliability coefficients for 145 couples at approximately one week intervals were the following: Sociability: .79; Emotional Stability: .71; Dominance: .82; Educational Level: .87; Heterosexual Need Level: .86; and Drive Level: .77. A follow-up correlation was performed with 120 college students with similar results. Validity measures were performed by requiring the 145 couples to rate the degree of adjustment of his/her marriage on a five-point scale. Those couples who felt their marriage to be adjusted evidenced profile similarity in 78% of the cases. The profile of the unadjusted group of couples showed 82% dissimilarity. A follow-up study revealed similar findings (Whipple, 1976).

The MCI was also hand scored. Permission was received by letter from C. M. Whipple, Jr., to reproduce the test as he published it in his text (Whipple & Whittle, 1976) and to mimeograph enough copies for this study. This was done and scoring templates were made by the investigator. Raw scores were computed as well as a composite score for each couple to indicate degree of compatibility.

Procedure

The testing procedures were developed to both facilitate collecting the data and assist each couple, either together or separately, to gain some insight and understanding of their own personality preferences and compatibilities. Prior to testing,
each group or couple was given an Informed Consent Form (see Appendix D) and a discussion of the scientific aspects of the research was held. All procedures outlined by the Department of Education's Committee on Human Subject Research, Western Michigan University, were followed.

Standard test instructions were used to administer the MBTI and the MCI. The instructions were read aloud to each group.

After the subjects had completed the testing they were invited to a second session. Here they would receive a copy of their individual results of the MBTI and the MCI. A brief explanation of the results of the research was stated. If further requests for either more information or apparent difficulties resulted from the testing were made known, each couple, or individual, was offered one hour of consultation time with no assessed fee. At that time, if it were determined that further therapy was needed, appropriate disengagement and referral was made to insure continuity of care.

Four one-way analyses of variance tests were computed to test the different scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory, i.e., MBTI ... MBT4, for both sexes, to see if there is a difference in the means for the three groups. The analysis of variance was used to test the relationship between the means of the four bipolar personality preferences on the three groups, by male and female, as recorded from the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory.

In all, there were 25 primary variables created, i.e., group designer (1), identification (2), male-female age (3-4),
length of relationship (5), four male-female bipolar personality preferences (6-13) and six male-female marriage compatibility factors (14-25). From the original variables, then, were created several new variables. Four variables reflecting the differences between the males and females means on the MBTI are stated as such: $D_{MBTI1} = M_{MBTI1} - F_{MBTI1}$, $D_{MBTI2} = M_{MBTI2} - F_{MBTI2}$, $D_{MBTI3} = M_{MBTI3} - F_{MBTI3}$, $D_{MBTI4} = M_{MBTI4} - F_{MBTI4}$. This formula was arrived at by subtracting the male score from the female score for each of the four bipolar personality traits to create a "difference" variable or an indicator of the closeness or distance in personality types of each couple. Likewise, six variables were created from the MCI stating the difference of means: $D_{F1} = M_{F1} - F_{F1}$, $D_{F2} = M_{F2} - F_{F2}$, $D_{F3} = M_{F3} - F_{F3}$, $D_{F4} = M_{F4} - F_{F4}$, $D_{F5} = M_{F5} - F_{F5}$, $D_{F6} = M_{F6} - F_{F6}$. The difference variable here reflects the closeness or distance in each compatibility factor for each couple. Thus, $DV_{M1} \ldots$ four dichotomous variables from the male MPTI were computed with values of one if $M_{MBT_i} = 99$, two if $M_{MBT_i} = 99$, where $x$ takes on the values one to four accordingly. Likewise, $DV_{F1}$ through $DV_{F4}$ were the equivalent variables for the female on the four bipolar personality preferences. A total measurement of differences was created, a couple score (CS) where $CS = /D_{MBTI1}/ + /D_{MBTI2}/ + /D_{MBTI3}/ + /D_{MBTI4}/$. Here, $D_{MBTx}/$ stands for the absolute value of $/D_{MBTx}/$ where $x$ takes on the values of one to four. The CS was created to ascertain a person's total personality type in one number value to assist in the statistical computation.
Lastly, a design was achieved by rank ordering all 90 couples and forming two groups by taking the top third and bottom third. This created two new groups, the most compatible and least compatible. A Pearson product moment correlation was performed. In case of ties at the division points, random numbers were assigned to those individuals to insure each group had an $N = 30$ pairs (Kerlinger, 1973).

The level of significance chosen for this study to reject a null hypothesis was $p$ is equal to or less than .05 on a $t$ or $F$ test and $p$ was equal to or less than .005 for the correlations. The rationale for these levels are found in two sources (Edwards, 1950; Kerlinger, 1973).

The limits of this study are seen mainly in the small and purposive sampling. Since this is an exploratory study into the relationship of compatibility and personality types, due to the lack of randomness the results of this study can only be generalized to the groups studied (Kerlinger, 1973).

Hypotheses

The present study was organized in an attempt to explore the relationship of personality types and several marriage compatibility factors. Using Jung's theory of personality types, i.e., the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, as a measure of personality type and the Marriage Compatibility Inventory as a measure of couple compatibility, these hypotheses are stated in the null form:
1. There are no significant differences among the four bipolar personality types as measured by the Myer-Briggs Type Indicator across the groups of married, dating, or separated/divorced couples.

2. There are no significant differences among the six marriage compatibility factors as measured by the Whipple-Whittle Marriage Compatibility Inventory across the groups of married, dating or separated/divorced couples.

3. There are no significant differences among the difference variables, i.e., $DV_l = MF_l - FF_l$, where $DV_l$ is the expression used for male compatibility factor minus the female compatibility factor, for each of the compatibility factors, one through six, across the groups of married, dating or separated/divorced couples.

4. There are no significant differences among the six compatibility factors and the eight specific personality types as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Whipple-Whittle Marriage Compatibility Inventory.

5. There is no significant relationship between couple compatibility and the four bipolar personality types.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Analyses of the demographic variables, sex, age, length of relationship, and statistical description of the MBTI four bipolar preferences by male and female and the MCI's six compatibility factors by male and female were carried out. Table 1 summarized the mean, and standard deviation by sex, for age, and length of relationship for all 90 couples.

Table 1
Age and Length of Relationship of All Couples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (Age)</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (Age)</td>
<td>30.92</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship of all couples expressed in years</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n.s.

The demographic data for the two instruments, the MBTI and the MCI, is revealed in Tables 2 and 3. The data is broken down by sex on each bipolar personality preference (Table 2) and the six compatibility factors (Table 3). On the preference Thinking-Feeling there is a significant difference between the means of the males.
and females. The females preferred feeling and males used the preference of thinking.

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations and t Ratios for the Four Bipolar Personality Preferences on the MBTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Personality Preference</th>
<th>Males M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Females M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert-Introvert</td>
<td>101.11</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>100.06</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation-Intuition</td>
<td>99.47</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking-Feeling</td>
<td>101.53</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>107.36</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment-Perception</td>
<td>95.85</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .005

Table 3 provides mean, standard deviation, and t-values for the independent variables on all 90 couples (Groups I, II, and III). Although no predictions were made, mean differences were significant at the p < .005 level between the means on males and females on the four compatibility factors, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Dominance, and Heterosexual Level. On both the Intellectual/Education Level and Drive Level there is no significant difference among the means between the males and females.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to show the difference among the three group means on the compatibility factors.
### Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations and t-Ratios for the Six Marriage Compatibility Factors on the MCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriage Compatibility Factor</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M 3.28 SD 1.44</td>
<td>M 3.81 SD 1.09</td>
<td>17.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>M 2.97 SD 1.40</td>
<td>M 3.68 SD 1.35</td>
<td>17.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M 2.72 SD 3.00</td>
<td>M 2.44 SD 1.10</td>
<td>14.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M 2.41 SD 0.08</td>
<td>M 2.59 SD 0.76</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Need Level</td>
<td>M 2.44 SD 1.26</td>
<td>M 3.56 SD 1.18</td>
<td>37.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M 2.67 SD 0.87</td>
<td>M 2.56 SD 1.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .005

MFI . . . MF6, FF1 . . . FF6, for both sexes (see Appendix A, Table 1). Again, there is no significant difference among the means for groups I, II, and III, for both males and females, on all six marriage compatibility factors as recorded by the Marriage Compatibility Inventory (see Appendix A, Table 2).

The _F_ ratio for Groups I, II, and III were computed by sex for the four bipolar personality preferences and showed no significant differences among group means on all four bipolar personality preferences variables as seen in Table 4 and 5. There is no significant difference among the means of each group, by sex, for the six compatibility factors. The analysis of variance used to test the
### Table 4

**Analysis of Variance for Groups I, II, and III for Males for the Four Bipolar Personality Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group I n=30</th>
<th>Group II n=30</th>
<th>Group III n=30</th>
<th>F-Value df=89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert-Introvert</td>
<td>M = 102.067</td>
<td>M. = 103.800</td>
<td>M = 97.467</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 23.964</td>
<td>Sd = 19.935</td>
<td>Sd = 23.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Intuition</td>
<td>M = 96.600</td>
<td>M = 97.200</td>
<td>M = 104.600</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 28.899</td>
<td>Sd = 27.515</td>
<td>Sd = 24.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking-Feeling</td>
<td>M = 105.933</td>
<td>M = 98.867</td>
<td>M = 99.800</td>
<td>1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 17.700</td>
<td>Sd = 19.475</td>
<td>Sd = 17.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment-Perception</td>
<td>M = 95.667</td>
<td>M = 90.800</td>
<td>M = 101.067</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 31.392</td>
<td>Sd = 25.191</td>
<td>Sd = 24.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

**Analysis of Variance for Groups I, II, and III for Females for the Four Bipolar Personality Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Group I n=30</th>
<th>Group II n=30</th>
<th>Group III n=30</th>
<th>F-Value df=89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert-Introvert</td>
<td>M = 100.267</td>
<td>M = 99.000</td>
<td>M = 100.933</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 20.141</td>
<td>Sd = 22.852</td>
<td>Sd = 22.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Intuition</td>
<td>M = 91.067</td>
<td>M = 100.933</td>
<td>M = 99.267</td>
<td>1.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 28.326</td>
<td>Sd = 24.140</td>
<td>Sd = 23.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking-Feeling</td>
<td>M = 111.200</td>
<td>M = 107.533</td>
<td>M = 103.33</td>
<td>1.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 19.794</td>
<td>Sd = 16.128</td>
<td>Sd = 17.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment-Perception</td>
<td>M = 95.400</td>
<td>M = 101.400</td>
<td>M = 99.267</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd = 26.010</td>
<td>Sd = 25.818</td>
<td>Sd = 22.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data revealed (Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A) that there is no significant difference among Groups I, II, and III variance using the mean standard error F-test as a measure on all six compatibility factor variables.

To assess group compatibility vs. noncompatibility on the six compatibility factors, a difference variable (DF) was created across the six compatibility factors for males and no significant differences were found (see Appendix A, Table 1). The difference variable (DF) was created by subtracting each factor by sex, i.e., DF = MFl - FFl, for each couple in each group. Next, a one-way analysis of variance was performed across the three groups were DF1 . . . DF6 = MFl . . . MF6 - FFl . . . FF6. The differences among the means for the six difference variables (DF) across the three groups and Bartlett's probability t and F-ratio values show there are no significant differences among the means of the difference variable (DF) on each of the three groups.

Using the four bipolar personality preferences, i.e., DVMI = male extroverts vs. male introverts, as the breakdown variable or group determiner and the six compatibility factors, MFl . . . MF6, as the variables of analysis, 48 t-tests were performed. There are no significant differences among the means of the six compatibility factors on the four bipolar personality preferences, when broken down, and using the designator of sex. Table 6 shows that between Male Extroverts-Introverts, the variable means on Sociability (p < .005) and Dominance (p < .025) were significantly different.
as were the means between the female breakdown variable, the means on Emotional Stability and Dominance ($p< .005$) and Drive Level ($p< .025$). Although there were no compatibility categories which showed mean significant differences, Female Introverts were shown to be more social ($p< .025$), more emotionally stable ($p< .005$) to be higher in Dominance ($p< .005$), show a greater Heterosexual Need Level ($p< .025$), and a higher Drive Level ($p< .025$).

Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations and $t$-Ratios for the Six Compatibility Factors by Sex on the Bipolar Personality Preference: Extrovert-Introvert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Males (n=90)</th>
<th>Females (n=90)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extro-vert</td>
<td>Intro-vert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M =2.707</td>
<td>M =3.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.346</td>
<td>Sd=1.362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>M =3.024</td>
<td>M =3.178</td>
<td>3.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.508</td>
<td>Sd=1.320</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M =2.463</td>
<td>M =1.933</td>
<td>2.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.206</td>
<td>Sd=1.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M =2.366</td>
<td>M =2.556</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.888</td>
<td>Sd=0.738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Need Level</td>
<td>M =2.317</td>
<td>M =3.333</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.234</td>
<td>Sd=1.225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M =2.683</td>
<td>M =2.311</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.934</td>
<td>Sd=1.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .025$  **$p< .005$
Table 7 reveals that there were no compatibility categories which showed mean significant difference between Male Sensation-Intuitive Types. However, the Female Intuitive Types were found to be significantly higher in sociability ($p < .05$) and the Sensation Types significantly higher in the area of Educational Level ($p < .025$).

**Table 7**

Means, Standard Deviations and t-Ratios for the Six Compatibility Factors by Sex on the Bipolar Personality Preference: Sensation-Intuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>n=42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M=3.143</td>
<td>M=3.396</td>
<td>1.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M=2.810</td>
<td>M=2.646</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M=2.476</td>
<td>M=2.354</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Need Level</td>
<td>M=2.476</td>
<td>M=2.417</td>
<td>1.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M=2.714</td>
<td>M=2.646</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$p < .05$ **$p < .025$

The breakdown variable, Thinking-Feeling, shown in Table 8 revealed a significant difference on means between the Males and Females.
Females on Intellectual Level ($p < .005$) and Drive Level ($p < .05$). Between the Female and Male Thinking-Feeling types there were significant differences between the Sociability means ($p < .05$) and the Thinking Male Drive Level ($p < .05$).

**Table 8**
Means, Standard Deviations and t-Ratios for the Six Compatibility Factors by Sex on the Bipolar Personality Preference: Thinking-Feeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male (n=40)</th>
<th>Female (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Feel-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=3.550</td>
<td>M=3.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>Sd=1.484</td>
<td>Sd=1.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=2.700</td>
<td>M=3.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Sd=1.454</td>
<td>Sd=1.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=2.800</td>
<td>M=2.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Sd=1.244</td>
<td>Sd=1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M=2.150</td>
<td>M=2.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.864</td>
<td>Sd=0.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Need Level</td>
<td>M=2.425</td>
<td>M=2.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.174</td>
<td>Sd=1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M=2.500</td>
<td>M=2.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.934</td>
<td>Sd=0.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$p < .05$  **$p < .005$**

Table 9 shows a significant difference between the means of males Judgment-Perception types on the compatibility factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment-</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Judgment-</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>n=40</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>n=45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M =3.080</td>
<td>M =3.525</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>M =3.578</td>
<td>M =4.044</td>
<td>2.067**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.455</td>
<td>Sd=1.414</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.076</td>
<td>Sd=1.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.356</td>
<td>Sd=1.414</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.439</td>
<td>Sd=1.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M =2.560</td>
<td>M =2.925</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>M =2.400</td>
<td>M =2.489</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.146</td>
<td>Sd=1.118</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.136</td>
<td>Sd=1.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M =2.280</td>
<td>M =2.575</td>
<td>1.746*</td>
<td>M =2.644</td>
<td>M =2.533</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.784</td>
<td>Sd=0.813</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.802</td>
<td>Sd=0.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Need</td>
<td>M =2.540</td>
<td>M =2.325</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>M =3.667</td>
<td>M =3.467</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Sd=1.297</td>
<td>Sd=1.228</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.108</td>
<td>Sd=1.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>M =2.680</td>
<td>M =2.675</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>M =2.800</td>
<td>M =2.311</td>
<td>2.258**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.891</td>
<td>Sd=0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.991</td>
<td>Sd=1.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .025

Sociability, Emotional Stability, Dominance and Intellectual Level (p< .05). The male personality type preference of The Perception Function is significantly more emotionally stable (p< .05) and less intellectually inclined than their opposite preference, Judgment (p< .05). The female personality type of the Perception Function was more social (p< .025) but stated less drive level (p< .025).
There were no other significant differences among the means on the bipolar personality types and compatibility factors other than those shown here.

Lastly, the 90 couples were divided into two groups and rank ordered by the total score between couples from the most compatible to least compatible on all six compatibility factors and compared on the four bipolar personality types. The most compatible (30 couples) formed Group A and the least compatible (30 couples) formed Group B. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was performed to assess the relationship of the six compatibility factors and the four bipolar types. No significant correlations were found (see Appendix A, Table 4).
The results of the studies reported here suggest that the relationship between particular personality types and specific compatibility factors have little or no relationship to one another, at least as designed, tested and computed in the present study. Therefore, there is "no effect on" compatibility, non-compatibility by personality types. However, when the bipolar personality traits are broken down into eight specific personality "traits," i.e., extrovert versus introvert, sensing versus intuition, there are some differences in the compatibility factors and they will be discussed.

This section, then, will be divided into three areas: The first area will discuss each null hypothesis and its outcome; secondly, the topic of statistical methodology will be presented as it applies to this study; lastly, several theoretical issues raised by the study of personality will be discussed. It was decided at the beginning of the study to test the data against chance expectation using null-hypothesis form in order to provide a statistical basis for the study.

The five null hypotheses, then, are stated:

1. There are no significant differences among the four bipolar personality types as measured by the Myer-Briggs Type Indicator
across the groups of married, dating, or separated/divorced couples.

2. There are no significant differences among the six marriage compatibility factors as measured by the Whipple-Whittle Marriage Compatibility Inventory across the groups of married, dating or separated/divorced couples.

3. There are no significant differences among the difference variables, i.e., \( DVI = MFI - FFI \), where \( DVI \) is the expression used for male compatibility factor minus the female compatibility factor, for each of the compatibility factors, one through six, across the groups of married, dating or separated/divorced couples.

4. There are no significant differences among the six compatibility factors and the eight specific personality types as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Whipple-Whittle Marriage Compatibility Inventory.

5. There is no significant relationship between couple compatibility and the four bipolar personality types.

Several questions were generated by the first two hypotheses: It is assumed that Group II will be the most compatible due to length of relationship and an intact marriage, that Group I will be the next most compatible due to the expectation of marriage and the development of a long-lasting relationship and, finally, that Group III will be the least compatible, scoring significantly "different" from either Group I or II. \( t \)-tests were performed between each
group, i.e., one vs two, one vs three, two vs three, in which no significant differences are noted. Overall differences between the means of all males (n = 90) and females (n = 90) on the four bipolar personality preferences are shown on Table 5. Here again, no significant differences are noted.

The second null hypothesis failed to be rejected, i.e., there were no significant differences among the means of the six compatibility factors on the three groups. Across all three groups on the MBTI and the MCI, the couples appear to have no significant differences as to personality preferences and compatibility factors.

Next, when a differing variable was created (DF = difference variable) by subtracting the male compatibility factor (1...5) from the female compatibility factor (1...5) and the means compared across the three groups using both F-ration and Bartlett's personality t-test comparison between each two groups in a row, there were no significant difference among the means of the DF variables. The assumption indicated in the third null hypothesis is that Groups I and II were more compatible or more "alike" in compatibility than Group III, the divorced group. An examination of the means of the six difference variables for the three groups indicates that there were no differences among the means.

The fourth null hypothesis could not be rejected. When the continuous bipolar personality preference scores are separated into eight traits, e.g., Extrovert and Introvert, and compared with the means of the compatibility factors, several results are
found. The results appear contrary to Jung's (1921) notion "that the emotional life of the introverted man is oriented by subjective data" and he "relies principally on what the sense impression constellates in the subject" (p. 374). The data, shown on Table 6, indicates that introverted men in the study are more social. Again, according to Jungian typology, extroverts are oriented to people and things and the introvert "oriented by the factor in the perception and cognition which responds to the sense stimulus in accordance with the individual's subjective disposition" (Jung, 1921, p. 374). Likewise, though, not totally contrary to Jungian typology, introverts in the study are seen as Feeling Type personality preferences. Two of the male compatibility factor means were significant, i.e., male feeling types were higher in intellectual level and drive level. On the female side, the thinking type was higher on the Sociability Factor. This was consistent with the data collected by Myers (1962).

Again, contrary to the prediction in the fourth null hypothesis there were two male and two female compatibility factor means which showed significant differences between the judgment and perception type personality preferences. Perception type showed higher means on Emotional Stability and Intellectual Level. The Female Perception Type preference was higher in Sociability and the Female Judgment Type preference was higher in Drive Level.

The fifth null hypothesis was tested by rank ordering all 90 couples from the most compatible to the least compatible. The
top one-third and bottom one-third of the couples were placed into two groups. When the two groups were compared, no relationship resulted in any significance among the 10 variables compared, i.e., among the four bipolar personality types and the six compatibility factors.

The analysis of variance and the approximate t-tests for the first, second, and third null hypotheses showed no differences between the variances. The fourth null hypothesis showed 14 out of 48 possible differences between the compatibility means on the eight personality trait preferences. While there are some differences, 29% is not sufficient to reject the fourth null hypothesis. Lastly, the fifth null hypothesis found no significant relationship between couple compatibility and the four bipolar personality types.

What seems relevant here is the word "trait." Jackson (1973) and Allport (1931, 1966) point out that personality "type" is difficult to deal with due to the necessity of establishing discreet nonoverlapping categories. The construction of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was developed "to identify the Jungian types" (Myers, 1962). This involves the problem of the division-point between one type and another. The personality dichotomies are based on an "inner disposition" (Myers, 1962), each bipolar personality "type" preference is, in itself, two specific personality "traits," i.e., extrovert, introvert, judgment, thinking,
and so on. Inherent in Jungian theory is the notion of opposites, to be exact, dichotomous opposites which need as precise a cutting point as possible. Myers (1962) used a statistical technique called regression of a dependent variable separately upon two halves of an index. Myers (1962) further states:

The crucial question is whether the observed disparities in level and/or slopes between the two halves of the line are consistent with the usual assumption of a continuous regression or are better explained by the hypothesis of two difference populations (p. 61).

Another problem peculiar to an inventory with a continuous score with breaking points is that there is no test of significance to help draw inferences from the shape of a regression. Myers (1962) points this out and handles it by using independent raters to rate particular personality types, i.e., extroverts are "gregarious," introverts are "less gregarious." The pitfall here is that in order to compare and establish correlations, the bipolar types score had to be broken down into traits, i.e., introvert, extrovert, and the like. When Myers (1962) did break the bipolar types down from continuous scores to static scores, the types become traits, easy to manage, and statistically pliable with $t$- and $F$-values at $p < .001$. This, apparently, may be a statistical reason why the first three null hypotheses in this study failed to be rejected. This is not to
say that continuous score bipolar personality type preferences do not offer an explanatory hypothesis, but rather like any definition, a word has parameters which include a "breaking point," like where does "hot" begin and "cold" end. In the design of this study it was assumed that personality "types" and compatibility "traits" could be compared but not until the types were transformed to specific traits did any statistical significance reveal itself.

Jungian concepts, in general, are difficult to verify by clinical observations or experiments that might lend themselves to experimental control. Jung (1921) actually asserted that the facts about personality and the unconscious are difficult to ascertain; they cannot be stated in such a manner to satisfy the demands or laws of logic. His metaphysics often appear theological and his propositions are, at times, an ambiguous set of ontological propositions. It would seem an impossible and complex task to set forth these propositions of "personality type" into a self reporting instrument. Jung (1921) felt that it took many years of clinical and analytical skill to assess personality types.

As explained in the first section of this study, the Marriage Compatibility Inventory was recently developed, and, with what appears to be appropriate reliability and validity testing. The MCI suffers from not having constructed internal validity scales, i.e., L, F, K, scales on the MMPI. The authors (Whipple & Whittle, 1976) did several correlations with self-raters, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale
and the MMPI. However, for Drive Level and Heterosexual Need there are no correlates and this weakens the whole inventory. The normative sample of 145 and a later test-retest with a population of 290 subjects is too small, at this point, to indicate the power of the instrument (Kerlinger, 1973).

The idea of a measure of compatibility somehow also implies the "strength" of the relationship, i.e., the degree of compatibility will say something about the nearness or fitting togetherness of a couple. To simply say to a couple that "if you have more than two areas with a raw score difference of three or more you are in some king of trouble" (Whipple & Whittle, 1976) appears, first, to be a poor coefficient of "strength" and arbitrary in the prediction of "trouble." Over all, the MCI did not answer the question raised by this study: Is there a difference between the three groups in terms of compatibility? This is due, in large part, to the small raw score (1 through 5) and the difficulty in establishing mean differences, although they were reflected in the fourth null hypothesis.

It is evident that this study has failed to reject all five hypotheses. It can be concluded with some certainty, then, on the face of this research design, that there is no relationship between these personality types and marital compatibility as measured by the MBTI and the MCI. Those persons seeking to predict success in a relationship can neither confirm or negate their probability for success based on the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator or the Marriage Compatibility Inventory. What is left, then, is to suggest that specific personality traits do appear to
have some marginal relationship with a number of the compatibility factors and that the inventories may have usefulness as a general guide for professionals in counseling situations.
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### APPENDIX A

**Table 1**

Analysis of Variance for Groups I, II, and III, for Males on the Six Marriage Compatibility Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M =3.367</td>
<td>M =3.467</td>
<td>M =3.00</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.377</td>
<td>Sd=1.479</td>
<td>Sd=1.486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>M =2.767</td>
<td>M =3.033</td>
<td>M =3.100</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.382</td>
<td>Sd=1.299</td>
<td>Sd=1.539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M =2.633</td>
<td>M =2.633</td>
<td>M =2.900</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.999</td>
<td>Sd=1.217</td>
<td>Sd=1.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M =2.367</td>
<td>M =2.467</td>
<td>M =2.400</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.718</td>
<td>Sd=0.681</td>
<td>Sd=1.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Level</td>
<td>M =2.500</td>
<td>M =2.467</td>
<td>M =2.367</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.333</td>
<td>Sd=1.306</td>
<td>Sd=1.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M =2.733</td>
<td>M =2.633</td>
<td>M =2.667</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.828</td>
<td>Sd=1.033</td>
<td>Sd=0.758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2

Analysis of Variance for Groups I, II, and III, for Females on the Six Marriage Compatibility Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M =3.733</td>
<td>M =3.867</td>
<td>M =3.833</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.143</td>
<td>Sd=1.137</td>
<td>Sd=1.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>M =3.667</td>
<td>M =3.333</td>
<td>M =4.067</td>
<td>2.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.322</td>
<td>Sd=1.470</td>
<td>Sd=1.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M =2.500</td>
<td>M =2.300</td>
<td>M =2.533</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.075</td>
<td>Sd=1.179</td>
<td>Sd=1.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M =2.567</td>
<td>M =2.600</td>
<td>M =2.600</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.626</td>
<td>Sd=0.814</td>
<td>Sd=0.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Need</td>
<td>M =3.500</td>
<td>M =3.667</td>
<td>M =3.533</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.137</td>
<td>Sd=1.241</td>
<td>Sd=1.196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M =2.533</td>
<td>M =2.567</td>
<td>M =2.567</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.008</td>
<td>Sd=1.165</td>
<td>Sd=1.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Groups I, II, and III on the Difference Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group I (n=30)</th>
<th>Group II (n=30)</th>
<th>Group III (n=30)</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M =0.367</td>
<td>M =0.400</td>
<td>M =0.833</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.790</td>
<td>Sd=1.694</td>
<td>Sd=1.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>M =0.900</td>
<td>M =0.300</td>
<td>M =0.967</td>
<td>1.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.539</td>
<td>Sd=1.822</td>
<td>Sd=1.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M =0.133</td>
<td>M =0.333</td>
<td>M =0.367</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.383</td>
<td>Sd=1.749</td>
<td>Sd=1.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Level</td>
<td>M =0.200</td>
<td>M =0.133</td>
<td>M =0.200</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=0.805</td>
<td>Sd=1.074</td>
<td>Sd=1.375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Level</td>
<td>M =1.000</td>
<td>M =1.200</td>
<td>M =1.167</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.174</td>
<td>Sd=1.789</td>
<td>Sd=1.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Level</td>
<td>M =0.200</td>
<td>M =0.067</td>
<td>M =0.100</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sd=1.215</td>
<td>Sd=1.437</td>
<td>Sd=1.242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Between the Means of the Difference Score on the Most Compatible and Least Compatible Groups on the Four Bipolar Personality Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert-Introvert</td>
<td>-.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing-Intuitive</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking-Feeling</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment-Perception</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each group equaled thirty couples
APPENDIX B

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator
Form F
by Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers

DIRECTIONS

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to these questions. Your answers will help show how you like to look at things and how you like to go about deciding things. Knowing your own preferences and learning about other people's can help you understand where your special strengths are, what kinds of work you might enjoy and be successful doing, and how people with difference preferences can relate to each other and be valuable to society.

Read each question carefully and mark your answer on the separate answer sheet. Make no marks on the question booklet. Do not think too long about any questions. If you cannot decide on a question, skip it but be careful that the next space you mark on the answer sheet has the same number as the question you are then answering.

Read the directions on your answer sheet, fill in your name and any other facts asked for, and work through until you have answered all the questions.

Which question comes closest to telling how you usually feel or act?
1. Does following a schedule (A) appeal to you, or (B) cramp you?

2. Do you usually get along better with (A) imaginative people, or (B) realistic people?

3. If strangers are staring at you in a crowd, do you (A) often become aware of it, or (B) seldom notice it?

4. Are you more careful about (A) people's feelings, or (B) their rights?

5. Are you (A) inclined to enjoy deciding things, or (B) just as glad to have circumstances decide a matter for you?

6. When you are with a group of people, would you usually rather (A) join in the talk of the group, or (B) talk individually with people you know well?

7. When you have more knowledge or skill in something than the people around you, is it more satisfying (A) to guard your superior knowledge, or (B) to share it with those who want to learn?

8. When you have done all you can to remedy a troublesome situation, are you (A) able to stop worrying about it, or (B) still more or less haunted by it?

9. If you were asked on a Saturday morning what you were going to do that day, would you (A) be able to tell pretty well, (B) list twice too many things, or (C) have to wait and see?

10. Do you think on the whole that (A) children have the best of it, or (B) life is more interesting for grown-ups?

11. In doing something that many other people do, does it appeal to you more to (A) do it in the accepted way, or (B) invent
20. Is it harder for you to adapt to (A) routine, or (B) constant change?

21. Would you be more willing to take on a heavy load of extra work for the sake of (A) extra comforts and luxuries, or (B) a chance to achieve something important?

22. Are the things you plan or undertake (A) almost always things you can finish, or (B) often things that prove too difficult to carry through?

23. Are you more attracted to (A) a person with a quick and brilliant mind, or (B) a practical person with a lot of common sense?

24. Do you find people in general (A) slow to appreciate and accept ideas not their own, or (B) reasonably openminded?

25. When you have to meet strangers, do you find it (A) pleasant, or at least easy, or (B) something that takes a good deal of effort?

26. Are you inclined to (A) value sentiment more than logic, or (B) value logic more than sentiment?

27. Do you prefer to (A) arrange dates, parties, etc., well in advance, or (B) be free to do whatever looks like fun when the time comes?

28. In making plans which concern other people, do you prefer to (A) take them into your confidence, or (B) keep them in the dark until the last possible moment?

29. Is it a higher compliment to be called (A) a person of real feeling, or (B) a consistently reasonable person?
30. When you have a decision to make, do you usually make it right away, or (B) wait as long as you reasonably can before deciding?

31. When you run into an unexpected difficulty in something you are doing, do you feel it to be (A) a piece of bad luck, or (B) a nuisance, or (C) all in the day's work?

32. Do you almost always (A) enjoy the present moment and make the most of it, or (B) feel that something just ahead is more important?

33. Are you (A) easy to get to know, or (B) hard to get to know?

34. With most of the people you know, do you (A) feel that they mean what they say, or (B) feel you must watch for a hidden meaning?

35. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you, (A) take time to list the separate things to be done and the order of doing them, or (B) plunge in?

36. In solving a personal problem, do you (A) feel more confident about it if you have asked other people's advice, or (B) feel that nobody else is in as good a position to judge as you are?

37. Do you admire more the people who are (A) conventional enough never to make themselves conspicuous, or (B) too original and individual to care whether they are conspicuous or not?

38. Which mistake would be more natural for you: (A) to drift from one thing to another all your life, or (B) to stay in
a rut that didn't suit you?

39. When you run across people who are mistaken in their beliefs, do you feel that (A) it is your duty to set them right, or (B) it is their privilege to be wrong?

40. When an attractive chance for leadership comes to you, do you (A) accept it if it is something you can really swing, or (B) sometimes let it slip because you are too modest about your own abilities, (C) or doesn't leadership ever attract you?

41. Among your friends, are you (A) one of the last to hear what is going on, or (B) full of news about everybody?

42. Are you at your best (A) when dealing with the unexpected, or (B) when following a carefully worked out plan?

43. Does the importance of doing well on a test make it generally (A) easier for you to concentrate and do your best, or (B) harder for you to concentrate and do yourself justice?

44. In your free hours, do you (A) very much enjoy stopping somewhere for refreshments, or (B) usually want to use the time and money another way?

45. At the time in your life when things piled up on you the worst, did you feel (A) that you had gotten into an impossible situation, or (B) that by doing only the necessary things you could work your way out?

46. Do most of the people you know (A) take their fair share of praise and blame, or (B) grab all the credit they can but shift any blame on to someone else?
47. When you are in an embarrassing spot, do you usually (A) change the subject, or (B) turn it into a joke, or (C) days later, think of what you should have said?

48. Are such emotional "ups and downs" as you may feel (A) very marked, or (B) rather moderate?

49. Do you think that having a daily routine is (A) a comfortable way to get things done, or (B) painful even when necessary?

50. Are you usually (A) a "good mixer," or (B) rather quiet and reserved?

51. In your early childhood (at six or eight), did you (A) feel your parents were very wise people who should be obeyed, or (B) find their authority irksome and escape it when possible?

52. When you have a suggestion that ought to be made at a meeting, do you (A) stand up and make it as a matter of course, or (B) hesitate to do so?

53. Do you get more annoyed at (A) fancy theories, or (B) people who don't like theories?

54. When you are helping in a group undertaking, are you more often struck by (A) the cooperation, or (B) the inefficiency, or (C) don't you get involved in group undertakings?

55. When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather (A) plan what you will do and when, or (B) just go?

56. Are the things you worry about (A) often really not worth it, or (B) always more or less serious?

57. In deciding something important, do you (A) find you can trust your feeling about what is best to do, or (B) think you
should do the logical thing, no matter how you feel about it?

58. Do you tend to have (A) deep friendships with a very few people, or (B) broad friendships with many different people?

59. Do you think your friends (A) feel you are open to suggestions, or (B) know better than to try to talk you out of anything you've decided to do?

60. Does the idea of making a list of what you should get done over a week-end (A) appeal to you, or (B) leave you cold, or (C) positively depress you?

61. In traveling, would you rather go (A) with a companion who had made the trip before and "knew the ropes," or (B) alone or with someone greener at it than yourself?

62. Would you rather have (A) an opportunity that may lead to bigger things, or (B) an experience that you are sure to enjoy?

63. Among your personal beliefs, are there (A) some things that cannot be proved, or (B) only things that can be proved?

64. Would you rather (A) support the established methods of doing good, or (B) analyze what is still wrong and attack unsolved problems?

65. Has it been your experience that you (A) often fall in love with a notion or project that turns out to be a disappointment so that you "go up like a rocket and come down like a stick," or do you (B) use enough judgment on your enthusiasm so that they do not let you down?

66. Do you think that you get (A) more enthusiastic about things than the average person, or (B) less enthusiastic about
things than the average person?

67. If you divided all the people you know into those you like, those you dislike, and those towards whom you feel indifferent, would there be more of (A) those you like, or (B) those you dislike?

68. In your daily work, do you (A) rather enjoy an emergency that makes you work against time, or (B) hate to work under pressure, or (C) usually plan your work so that you won't need to work under pressure?

69. Are you more likely to speak up in (A) praise, or (B) blame?

70. Is it higher praise to say someone has (A) vision, or (B) common sense?

71. When playing cards, do you enjoy most (A) the sodiability, (B) the excitement of winning, (C) the problem of getting most out of each hand, (D) the risk of playing for stakes, (E) or don't you enjoy playing cards?

Which word in each pair appeals to you more?

72. (A) firm-minded    warm-hearted (B)
73. (A) imaginative    matter-of-fact (B)
74. (A) systematic     spontaneous (B)
75. (A) congenial      effective (B)
76. (A) theory         certainty (B)
77. (A) party          theatre (B)
78. (A) build          invent (B)
79. (A) analyze        sympathize (B)
80. (A) popular   intimate (B)
81. (A) benefits  blessings (B)
82. (A) casual    correct (B)
83. (A) active    intellectual (B)
84. (A) uncritical critical (B)
85. (A) scheduled  unplanned (B)
86. (A) convincing touching (B)
87. (A) reserved  talkative (B)
88. (A) statement  concept (B)
89. (A) soft      hard (B)
90. (A) production design (B)
91. (A) forgive   tolerate (B)
92. (A) hearty    quiet (B)
93. (A) who       what (B)
94. (A) impulse   decision (B)
95. (A) speak     write (B)
96. (A) affection  tenderness (B)
97. (A) punctual  leisurely (B)
98. (A) sensible  fascinating (B)
99. (A) changing  permanent (B)
100. (A) determined devoted (B)
101. (A) system   zest (B)
102. (A) facts    ideas (B)
103. (A) compassion foresight (B)
104. (A) concrete  abstract (B)
105. (A) justice  mercy (B)
106. (A) calm  
107. (A) make  
108. (A) wary  
109. (A) orderly  
110. (A) approve  
111. (A) gentle  
112. (A) foundation  
113. (A) quick  
114. (A) thinking  
115. (A) theory  
116. (A) sociable  
117. (A) sign  
118. (A) systematic  
119. (A) literal  
120. (A) peacemaker  
121. (A) accept  
122. (A) agree  
123. (A) executive  

lively (B)  
create (B)  
create (B)  
easy-going (B)  
question (B)  
firm (B)  
spire (B)  
careful (B)  
feeling (B)  
experience (B)  
detached (B)  
symbol (B)  
casual (B)  
figurative (B)  
judge (B)  
change (B)  
discuss (B)  
scholar (B)  

Which answer comes closest to telling how you usually feel or act?

124. Do you find the more routine parts of your day (A) restful, or (B) boring?

125. If you think you are not getting a square deal in a club or team to which you belong, is it better to (A) shut up and take it, or (B) use the threat of resigning if necessary to get your rights?
126. Can you (A) talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to, or (B) find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions?

127. When strangers notice you, does it (A) make you uncomfortable, or (B) not bother you at all?

128. If you were a teacher, would you rather teach (A) fact courses, or (B) courses involving theory?

129. When something starts to be the fashion, are you usually (A) one of the first to try it, or (B) not much interested?

130. In solving a difficult personal problem, do you (A) tend to do more worrying than is useful in reaching a decision, or (B) feel no more anxiety than the situation requires?

131. If people seem to slight you, do you (A) tell yourself they didn't mean anything by it, or (B) distrust their good will and stay on guard with them thereafter?

132. When you have a special job to do, do you like to (A) organize it carefully before you start, or (B) find out what is necessary as you go along?

133. Do you feel it is a worse fault (A) to show too much warmth, or (B) not to have warmth enough?

134. When you are at a party, do you like to (A) help get things going, or (B) let the others have fun in their own way?

135. When a new opportunity comes up, do you (A) decide about it fairly quickly, or (B) sometimes miss out through taking too long to make up your mind?
136. In managing your life, do you tend to (A) undertake too much and get into a tight spot, or (B) hold yourself down to what you can comfortably handle?

137. When you find yourself definitely in the wrong, would you rather (A) admit you are wrong, or (B) not admit it, though everyone knows it, (C) or don't you ever find yourself in the wrong?

138. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in (A) right away, or (B) only after they really get to know you?

139. In your home life, when you come to the end of some undertaking, are you (A) clear as to what comes next and ready to tackle it, or (B) glad to relax until the next inspiration hits you?

140. Do you think it more important to (A) be able to see the possibilities in a situation, or (B) be able to adjust to the facts as they are?

141. Do you feel that the people whom you know personally owe their successes more to (A) ability and hard work, or (B) luck, or (C) bluff, pull and shoving themselves ahead of others?

142. In getting a job done, do you depend upon (A) starting early, so as to finish with time to spare, or (B) the extra speed you develop at the last minute?

143. After associating with superstitious people, have you (A) found yourself slightly affected by their superstitions, or (B) remained entirely unaffected?

144. When you don't agree with what has just been said, do you usually (A) let it go, or (B) put up an argument?
145. Would you rather be considered (A) a practical person, or (B) an ingenious person?

147. Would you rather work under someone who is (A) always kind, or (B) always fair?

148. In a large group, do you more often (A) introduce others, or (B) get introduced?

149. Would you rather have as a friend someone who (A) is always coming up with new ideas, or (B) has both feet on the ground?

150. When you have to do business with strangers, do you feel (A) confident and at ease, or (B) a little fussed or afraid that they won't want to bother with you?

151. When it is settled well in advance that you will do a certain thing at a certain time, do you find it (A) nice to be able to plan accordingly, or (B) a little unpleasant to be tied down?

152. Do you feel that sarcasm (A) should never be used where it can hurt people's feelings, or (B) is too effective a form of speech to be discarded for such reasons?

153. When you think of some little thing you should do or buy, do you (A) often forget it till much later, or (B) usually get it down on paper to remind yourself, or (C) always carry through on it without reminders?

154. In listening to a new idea, are you more anxious to (A) find out all about it, or (B) judge whether it is right or wrong?

155. Do you more often let (A) your heart rule your head, or (B) your head rule your heart?
156. Are you oppressed by (A) many different worries, or (B) comparatively few?

157. When you don't approve of the way a friend is acting, do you (A) wait and see what happens, or (B) do or say something about it?

158. Do you feel it is a worse fault to be (A) unsympathetic, or (B) unreasonable?

159. When a new situation comes up which conflicts with your plans, do you try first to (A) change your plans to fit the situation, or (B) change the situation to fit your plans?

160. Do you think the people close to you know how you feel (A) about most things, or (B) only when you have had some special reason to tell them?

161. When you have a serious choice to make, do you (A) almost always come to a clear-cut decision, or (B) sometimes find it so hard to decide that you do not wholeheartedly follow up either choice?

162. On most matters, do you (A) have a pretty definite opinion, or (B) like to keep an open mind?

163. As you get to know people better, do you more often find that they (A) let you down or disappoint you in some way, or (B) improve upon acquaintance?

164. When the truth would not be polite, are you more likely to tell (A) a polite lie, or (B) the impolite truth?

165. In your way of living, do you prefer to be (A) original, or (B) conventional?
166. Would you have liked to argue the meaning of (A) a lot of these questions, or (B) only a few?
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### Male Code Conversion Chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:</th>
<th>B:</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>D:</th>
<th>E:</th>
<th>F:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 38 or more</td>
<td>34 or more</td>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>25 or more</td>
<td>27 or more</td>
<td>26 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 34 - 37</td>
<td>30 - 33</td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>21 - 24</td>
<td>33 - 36</td>
<td>22 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 30 - 33</td>
<td>26 - 29</td>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>14 - 20</td>
<td>28 - 32</td>
<td>16 - 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 26 - 29</td>
<td>22 - 25</td>
<td>12 - 16</td>
<td>11 - 13</td>
<td>24 - 27</td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 25 or less</td>
<td>21 or less</td>
<td>11 or less</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>23 or less</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Female Code Conversion Chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:</th>
<th>B:</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>D:</th>
<th>E:</th>
<th>F:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 40 or more</td>
<td>27 or more</td>
<td>24 or more</td>
<td>25 or more</td>
<td>43 or more</td>
<td>25 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 37 - 39</td>
<td>33 - 36</td>
<td>19 - 23</td>
<td>21 - 24</td>
<td>38 - 42</td>
<td>21 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 32 - 36</td>
<td>28 - 32</td>
<td>14 - 18</td>
<td>14 - 20</td>
<td>33 - 37</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 28 - 31</td>
<td>24 - 27</td>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td>13 - 11</td>
<td>28 - 32</td>
<td>14 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 27 or less</td>
<td>23 or less</td>
<td>9 or less</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>27 or less</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When continuous scores are wanted for statistical purposes, they should, to avoid confusion, be uniformly obtained. 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. While the arithmetic involved is of the simplest, it may frequently be found convenient for clerical help to use Table 2 to speed conversion.

For 20 years all research by the authors has followed this convention as to the positive poles of the indices, and it is suggested that the same system be adopted by other users. Adherence to a uniform method will insure that the signs of correlations, factor loadings, etc., in different studies will correspond. In making interpretations of reported findings, one should determine the type of scoring used in order to avoid errors in interpretation.

When regressions of dependent variables are plotted on the indices, these continuous scores, increasing normally from left to right, will put E scores at the left and I scores at the right, S scores at the left and N scores at the right, etc., and thus correspond to the designation of the index, which should always read from left to right along the horizontal axis for such regressions.

Table 2. Transformation of Preference Scores into Continuous Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference Score</th>
<th>Continous Score</th>
<th>Preference Score</th>
<th>Continous Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>01 = 101</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>01 = 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 = 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>03 = 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 = 105</td>
<td></td>
<td>05 = 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07 = 107</td>
<td></td>
<td>07 = 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>09 = 109</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>09 = 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 = 111</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 = 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 = 113</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 = 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 = 115</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 = 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>17 = 117</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>17 = 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 = 119</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 = 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>23 = 123</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>21 = 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 = 125</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 = 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 = 127</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 = 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 = 129</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 = 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 = 131</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 = 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>33 = 133</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>33 = 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 = 135</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 = 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37 = 137</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 = 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 = 139</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 = 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>41 = 141</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>41 = 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 = 143</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 = 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 = 145</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 = 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 = 147</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 = 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>49 = 149</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>49 = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 = 151</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 = 153</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 = 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 = 155</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 = 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, N, F, P</td>
<td>57 = 157</td>
<td>E, S, T, J</td>
<td>57 = 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 = 159</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 = 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 = 161</td>
<td></td>
<td>61 = 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 = 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 = 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67 = 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Myers, 1962, pp. 9-10)
APPENDIX E

HUMAN SUBJECTS

The investigator, after careful analysis, can see no psychological, physical, or sociological risks detrimental to the subjects intended for use in this study. The subjects will be (1) all volunteers, (2) informed as to the nature and design of the study, and (3) asked to sign an informed consent statement, that they acknowledge the above and have been fully informed about their participation in the research. Subjects will be given the opportunity to receive feedback about the research itself. The benefits to the participants will be in the form of increased self-awareness and, hopefully, a better understanding of the marital relationship. Members of the first two (2) groups may use the information in an active, prognostic manner, being able to view what their relative strengths and weaknesses are; the third group, the divorced or separated couples, will have the opportunity, under supervision, to attempt to understand the difficulties and reasons for the breakdown of the marital relationship. No person will be given test results about another participant without a release of information consent form signed or that person being present in consultation.

The benefits for society are in the form of a better understanding of the nature and, possibly, the first study of the
relationship between personality and marital compatibility. In the hands of professional psychologists or marriage counselors, the results of this study may provide a useful tool for assisting persons contemplating a commitment to a relationship, to better understand the dynamics, processes, and variables of personality traits and compatibility factors within the parameters of the marital relationship.

Each subject will be (1) given a copy of the instructions at the beginning of the testing on both protocols and have them read aloud so as to insure complete understanding of the task, (2) told the design of the research in detail, (3) given the opportunity, once having heard the design of the program, not to participate in the testing with no loss of face or embarrassment, (4) volunteers only, (5) and asked to sign an informed consent form to indicate all the above has been told to them. At the time of testing, all subjects will be advised that following completion of the data analyses specific dates will be made available for a feedback session, detailing the results of their test scores, if they so desire. At this time, an explanation of both inventories and their rational will be discussed, along with another look at the design and, lastly, how the results appear. A series of evening group meetings will be scheduled to insure that those who are interested in the results will have the opportunity to attend. Those persons not able to attend or wish to consult in private will be offered one (1) hour of consultation with no fee charged. If either a couple or a single participant wishes further consultation, several
alternatives will be explained to them, including seeing another professional, possible referral to an agency, or continuing with the investigator in consultation. It is clear, however, that the purpose of this study is not to generate clients but to complete the project.

All of the test protocol will be coded, both for the computer and raw data, with one master list of names kept by the investigator to contact subjects for feedback sessions. This list will be held in strict confidence and will be destroyed ninety (90) days following the Western Michigan University Graduate College's acceptance of this dissertation.
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

YOU HAVE VOLUNTEERED TO PARTICIPATE IN A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY TYPES AND MARITAL COMPATIBILITY FACTORS BEING CONDUCTED BY PETER GRAHAM-MIST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND PERSONNEL AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY. THIS FORM IS BEING USED TO ADVISE YOU THAT:

(1) YOU ARE A VOLUNTEER AND MAY WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY AT ANY TIME WITH NO PENALTIES OR EMBARRASSMENT.

(2) YOU WILL BE INFORMED AS TO THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY;

(3) ALL INFORMATION GATHERED IN THIS STUDY WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE. ALL OF THE TEST MATERIAL AND THE RESULTS WILL BE CODED FOR THE COMPUTER WITH ONE (1) MASTER LIST OF NAMES KEPT BY THE INVESTIGATOR FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONTACTING THE PARTICIPANTS FOR FEEDBACK NINETY (90) DAYS AFTER THE GRADUATE COLLEGE OF WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY ACCEPTS THE DISSERTATION;

(4) THAT UPON COMPLETION OF THE ANALYSIS OF DATA, GROUP SESSIONS WILL BE PROVIDED FOR THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHO WISH TO VIEW THE RESULTS. IF EITHER A COUPLE OR A SINGLE PARTICIPANT WISHES FURTHER CONSULTATION, ONE HOUR OF PRIVATE CONSULTATION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE WITH NO FEE.

(5) IT IS NOT THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY TO GENERATE NEW CLIENTS BUT TO COMPLETE THE INDICATED RESEARCH; IF FURTHER
CONSULTATION IS NEEDED BEYOND THE ABOVE MENTIONED, SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE PARTICIPANTS.

(6) NO INDIVIDUAL RESULTS FROM THE TEST INVENTORIES WILL BE AVAILABLE TO ANYONE WITHOUT EITHER THAT PERSON PRESENT AT THE TIME OF PRESENTATION OR A RELEASE OF INFORMATION FORM SIGNED AND IN THE POSSESSION OF THE INVESTIGATOR AND THEN, IN THAT CASE, THE INFORMATION WILL BE GIVEN ONLY BY THE INVESTIGATOR.

BY SIGNING THIS FORM YOU ARE NOT AGREEING TO ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION AND UNDERSTAND ITS CONTENTS.

DATE_________________________________ SIGNATURE_________________________________
COMPATIBILITY TEST INTERPRETATION - MALE

FACTOR A - SOCIABILITY

A-1 You like people - crowds - and don't want to be by yourself, be sure to pick a mate who is a goer and not a stay-at-home. While dating you should watch to see if she likes to go places where there are other people and she should not let herself be tied down to responsibilities when you want to go (a goer can get ready on a moment's notice).

A-2 You need people around you a good deal of the time. You will do best with a mate who is sociable and a good mixer. She should like to be with people most of the time but not all the time. Give her a call thirty minutes before a party or a trip and the goer will be ready.

A-3 You like about an even mixture of quietude and parties. Contact with others stimulates you but can get on your nerves if it becomes constant. Unless you vocation gives you enough "socializing" do not tie yourself to one who likes to sit at home most of the time.

A-4 Avoid women who want to be on the go all the time and never want to spend an evening alone. You want the quietness and solitude of time away from the mob. Find a mate who can enjoy simple pleasures.

A-5 You are a quiet person who dislikes mobs, heavy traffic and crowds. Find a mate who is the same way. Such a woman can be happy working and playing alone or with only one companion.

FACTOR B - EMOTIONAL STABILITY

B-1 You are a stable, secure, well-adjusted individual who will need a mate just like yourself. Look for symptoms of instability during the time you are dating.

B-2 You are emotionally more stable than the average man although you still exhibit some weaknesses and, at times, are a little uncertain about your masculinity. Do not choose a neurotic mate. Determining how a woman thinks
her family feels toward her will be a cue as to how she will feel toward you.

B-3 You occasionally have trouble in feeling secure and self-confident. Find a mate who can support you emotionally when you need it and who needs your support in areas in which she feels insecure. Find a woman who not only loves you but admires you.

B-4&5 You badly need warmth and affection around you (you never seem to have had it). It seems that no matter how hard you try, you do not or have not gotten the needed love from your family, friends or mate. Other people like you much better than you like yourself. You are unhappy and no person can, by themselves, make you happy. You can make a better adjustment with a woman who compensates for your weaknesses but she must always be able to benefit from your strengths.

FACTOR C - DOMINANCE

C-1 Your extremely strong personality makes you a dominant male. You tend to overpower others with your personality. This is an excellent trait in many vocations which require leadership, supervision and some types of selling. There is a danger in marriage of you becoming too dominating, possessive and inconsiderate of your wife's feelings. Study the principles of democratic leadership.

C-2 You are stronger in personality than the average man and can be "bull-headed," but most of the time you are willing to listen to and consider another person's point of view. Most people tend to let you lead. You have an ability to compromise which will allow you to make better adjustments to family and work.

C-3 You are an easy going individual who can both give and take orders. Beware of a dominating woman--your ideal marriage partner will be just that--a partner. Decision making should be a joint enterprise which will keep arguments to a minimum.

C-4 You don't like to argue and prefer to do what the other person wants to avoid a hassle. Do not select a dominating or bossy mate or you will grow to resent such disregard for your thoughts and feelings. You can let her implement the minor points of your home life without fear of her domination.
You are inclined to push off too many decisions onto your mate. You should learn more about decision making and train yourself to be more assertive of your rights or she will become very bossy and take over, making all of your decisions.

**FACTOR D - INTELLECTUAL AND EDUCATIONAL**

**D-1** You have more intelligence than most people in this country. You will want a mate who will appreciate your talents, urge you to use them and inspire you to take advantage of these capacities to their fullest. You will want a girl who will be able to talk on your level, think as fast as you, or at least follow you, and of whom you can be proud.

**D-2** You are more intelligent than the average man and will be required to get more training and education than the average man. Choose a mate who can help you exploit your talents and achieve your goals. She should be smart and able to think.

**D-3** You are above average in intelligence and have the responsibility of recognizing and using his mentality. If you do not train and educate this intelligence, or get into a vocation which demands its use, you will be an unhappy man. Shy away from the brainy woman who tries to mentally dominate her man.

**D-4** You should be smarter and more educated than your mate, therefore pass up the so-called brainy woman in favor of the more realistic, down-to-earth type. You will not be happy with a woman who prides herself on her intellectual achievements.

**D-5** You and the men like you perform most of the world's work possess most of the skills. You want a mate who is very practical, has realistic notions of life and does not expect a man to give her fur coats and the moon. You need emotional satisfaction and not intellectual prodding and nagging.

**FACTOR E -- HETEROSEXUAL NEED**

**E-1** You are a man who is not likely to be satisfied with the average woman. Only about 10% of them will have the warmth
and affection you require. Women are drawn to you and you may be attracted to female "sexpots." You will live intensely and can either be very happy or very miserable.

E-2 It is important that you find a mate who will be equal to you in warmth and affection. There are more women who will be mismatches for you than will be compatible.

E-3 You measure in an area where most of the women are found. You will experience unhappiness by choosing either a woman who is cold and calculating or one who is overly sensual and passionate. Pick qualities in a woman that will last through the years.

E-4 Your emotional adjustments are such that most women are compatible with you. You will not want a mate who wishes to spend most of her life in bed. Therefore shy away from those who are filled with romantic dreams, are mushy in their affection and have a compulsion to get married right away.

E-5 Select a mate who is more interested in doing things other than petting and mumbling sweet nothings. You need someone who expresses love through actions rather than just words; one who can help you to accomplish your goals and build a life on the more important aspects of companionship instead of just love. Reject the idea of men that man only expresses his manhood and virility through sexual exploits. There are many things you want and desire more than sexual love—and this is right and good.

FACTOR F - DRIVE LEVEL

F-1 You want to always be on the go, doing things, having excitement, muscular activity and you even talk and think fast. Control all of this energy and keep it headed in one direction or you will become a job jumper and irresponsible. Choose a mate who can keep up with you, one that has as much energy and drive as you.

F-2 You have an inner push and ambition. It's hard for you to sit down and talk—much harder to read a book. Whether you climb in the business world or not will depend on your ability to curb your tendency to always be looking for greener pastures. You should choose a mate with as much energy as you, do not choose a stay-at-home girl who tires easily or you will tire of her.
F-3 You have more energy than the average man—this is a push. It can make you either a job jumper or a man who gets ahead in life. Planning and setting long range objectives and short range goals are helpful. Choose a mate who is as energetic as you.

F-4 You are realistic and life comes to you a day at a time. You know that there are so many things you want and that there are some of them you can't get, so why fret. Find a mate who is not a "social climber" or who wants the whole world. Get a woman who has the same ideas as you.

F-5 You want to enjoy life. You don't want to be pushed or nagged by anyone. Beware of the overly ambitious woman who is always wanting something. You are more concerned with living each day as it comes along. You need a mate who takes things easy and sees the beauty of life a day at a time too.

COMPATIBILITY TEST INTERPRETATION - FEMALE

FACTOR A - SOCIABILITY

A-1 You like people. You nearly always want to be in a crowd, excitement, activity, laughter, loud noise; these things are your life. It brings happiness to you and will continue to do so if you marry a man who also likes these things. You should be on a job where you are constantly with others—in the theater, sports, politics, sales, teaching, and such occupations.

A-2 You like people and want to share your joys and sorrows with them and have them do the same with you. Since you get so much pleasure from people, marry a man who is like yourself.

A-3 You like people more than the average woman. You will be more contented if you pick a man who is as gregarious as you. Go where groups gather and associate with sociable people when looking for a compatible mate.

A-4 You really don't like people around you all of the time. You need some time to yourself. You will fit into a job where your contact with others is limited. Be sure your mate is a man who can enjoy staying at home without being bored, and be sure YOU find it interesting being alone with him.
A-5 Choose an occupation that will not put you in direct contact with people: accountant, bookkeeper, researcher, chemist, engraver, underwriter, programmer, copywriter, artist, and any other isolated type of job. You should select a mate who likes to be alone or only with you, most of the time. Do not make the mistake of thinking opposites attract in this area.

FACTOR B -- EMOTIONAL STABILITY

B-1 You are very stable and should avoid a man who is always getting his feelings hurt and venting emotional wrath and temper tantrums. Find a mate who is as emotionally stable as you are.

B-2 You have been concerned because some of your friends and acquaintances are so unpredictable and you never know what to expect from them. This is because they are not as emotionally secure as you. Do not marry a man of this type.

B-3 You have difficulty sometimes because of insecurity and not being sure of yourself. At such times you need a strong man to lean upon, but positively not a neurotic one.

B-4 Do not select a sadistic man. You punish yourself enough without having a man who enjoys hurting you. You are a much finer person than you give yourself credit for being and can be liked and loved, if you will only allow it.

B-5 Everyone about you likes you better than you like yourself. Your attitude of self-depreciation creates guilt feelings. Find a mate who is stronger and more secure than you—-one you can trust, love, depend and lean on.

FACTOR C--DOMINANCE

C-1 You have an extremely strong personality (too strong for most men). It will require a very strong, masterful man to hold your respect and love. You do face something of conflict within yourself; when you are with a man you tend to dominate him. If you can, you will soon lose respect for him and be unhappy. Do not marry a mousey individual hoping to make him more aggressive.
C-2  You recognize that some men are weak and other strong. If you marry a weak man, it will distress both of you. Men who say "anything you want to do" are not being nice, probably just too weak to decide—be suspicious.

C-3  You do not want to get into a marriage situation where you will have to make all of the decisions. You want a man who can make decisions and knows where he is going in life. A weak man cannot be leaned upon so look closely when choosing a mate.

C-4  You want a man to make decisions and assume all the responsibilities (a highly dominating male). Don't go to extremes however. You will do best in a partnership situation when your desires are brought out and discussed as well as his.

C-5  If you continue to push off decisions to the men, do not be surprised if you become one's servant. It is best if your man is strong enough for you to look up to and be proud of and yet who is kind and considerate and shows respect for you.

FACTOR D - INTELLECTUAL AND EDUCATIONAL

D-1  You are highly intelligent and must do two things to be happy: (1) you must do some kind of work which will give you a mental challenge and (2) you must get a mate you can respect—marry a brainy one. Marriage will probably not end your work career.

D-2  Being a smart girl you should aspire to a higher intellectual type of man. Select your man from among the professional and businessmen who think. Get one who will be proud of your mind then keep up with him during day or evening school. Mental activity and learning can bring you satisfaction.

D-3  You are not particularly interested in purely mental things—you are more realistic and practical. You will like the things that most people do, and you can learn to do them well. This will give you satisfaction and a feeling of importance and achievement. Select a mate like yourself.

D-4  You are not too brilliant so that you make men uncomfortable and not too dumb to excite their interest. You like men upon whose shoulders the work and accomplishments rest.
and really do not care enough for intellectual things to embarrass men with a show of superior knowledge. Give a man the love and understanding which only you can give.

D-5

A woman's intuition will tell you to be curious, the type who wants to know everything about her man. It will not become you to make a show of your knowledge and wisdom. You will be happiest with a mate who can match you on the Compatibility Test.

FACTOR E - HETEROSEXUAL NEED

E-1

You are a woman with extremely high emotional drives and needs. You will find that the most important thing in your life is companionship and the need for physical and emotional love. You should marry a man who is very warm and loving, if you are to be happy.

E-2

Within yourself you are broadminded and strongly attracted to men. Your strong need for affection and love can cause you to make a mistake in choosing a mate. Look for a mate who is especially tender, thoughtful, and thinks more of your happiness than his own.

E-3

You should not choose a man who is cold, calculating and business-like, nor ones who are passionate and overpowering. You will be happier with an inbetween man who has regard for your feelings.

E-4

You are more idealistic and more interested in other things which are more important to you than running after a man and sex. You must find a man who wants to be with a woman who is personally interesting, has something more than a body and is a good companion. You will want a man who has the same interests as yours.

E-5

Shy away from men with roaming hands, mushy words, those trying to get you to prove you're alive. The right man will respect you and love not only your body but also your mind and heart. Because of your unique make-up, not just any man will do.

FACTOR F - DRIVE LEVEL

F-1

You have an excess of energy. This makes you want and even more feel a compulsion toward constant activity. You
will need to find a mate who is constantly on the go and
doing things. Beware of the man who tires easily, wants
to sit a lot and who lies to stay home or you will become
bored. Find one who can offer you excitement and variety.

F-2 You have a desire to always be doing something, going
somewhere, activity, excitement, always moving, never
tiring—find a man who has this same push to avoid
melancholy boredom.

F-3 You will never be able to carry out all your plans, do all
the things you want to do, see all the sights, go to all
the places—how wonderful if you did not have to waste time
sleeping and doing the humdrum things of life. This is
symptomatic of your need for change and variety in life.
You must find a man who is the same way if you want to have
a happy marriage.

F-4 Find a mate who enjoys a more leisurely pace; has time
to live and love. Find a man who likes to read, watch TV
or the movies, fishing, good conversation, in short, one
who wants to savor each moment of life and not just rush
through it.

F-5 Look for a mate who enjoys the luxury of complete relaxation
and lazing around. Even emotions and love can't build up
if you are always hurrying. You know that deep waters run
slowly and you should find a man who feels the same way.
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