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The relationship between personality type as measured by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and marital satisfaction as measured by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI) was examined in this research.

Subjects were 100 volunteer couples from a southwestern urban area who were given the MBTI and the MSI. These couples were divided into three groups: 40 were in marital therapy; 30 had satisfactory marriages and had been married seven years or less; 30 also had satisfactory marriages, but had been married more than seven years.

The therapy group and the satisfactorily married groups were compared as to the number of MBTI preferences held in common, the strength of these preferences and the length of time married. The extraversion-introversion (E-I) scale and the sensing-judging (S-J) temperament of the MBTI were examined by comparing the spousal combinations in each of the groups. Chi square analysis and a Pearson correlation were used. A one-way analysis of variance was run between six of the scales of the MSI and each of the four MBTI
dimensions. A MANOVA was attempted on the relationship between the spousal MBTI combinations and the six MSI scales, but the population was too small for this analysis to be conclusive.

There were no significant differences between the groups as far as number of preferences held in common, length of time married, and the sensing-judging temperament. There were significantly more couples in the therapy group who had differences of 40 or more points on the four MBTI scales. The extent of the difference on the sensing-intuitive (S-N) scale was found to discriminate between satisfactory and unsatisfactory marriages. Differences on the E-I scale were found to effect couples' satisfaction in the MSI scales of Time Together and Affective Communication with the combination of introvert with introvert having the most difficulty in these areas.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

What is it that determines the choice of marital partners? When this question is asked, nine out of ten people would reply, without hesitating, that Americans marry for love (Murstein, 1973). And when asked what distinguishes marriages that fail from those that are successful, the answer might well be love again. Social scientists, however, have probed more deeply into these two questions of marital choice and marital success. For the past sixty years, beginning with the two pioneering studies of Terman (1938) and Burgess and Cottrell (1939), and continuing to the present, researchers have asked whether marriages are more successful when the partners' personality traits are similar or complementary (Kohn, 1987). Researchers have tried throughout the years to determine whether this success is more evident when like marries like (similarity/homogamy) or whether opposites attract (complementarity/heterogamy). Tharp (1963) stated that "the organizing issue in all mating research has remained the same... the degree of similarity between husbands and wives" (p. 97).

The second most important variable for researchers on the subject of marriage to examine has been that of marital
success . . . what are the personality factors that contribute to a successful marriage? (Tharp, 1963).

One instrument that has now become the most widely used measurement of personality, as well as a counseling tool, for "normal" populations is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which was developed by Isabel Briggs Myers in 1958 (Fredman & Sherman, 1987). More than a million people fill out the questionnaire yearly (Ost, 1987). Counselors, ministers, social workers, and psychologists administer the MBTI for both pre-marital and marital counseling (Sherman, 1981; Merner & Carskadon, 1983; Luecke, 1989).

The MBTI is based on C. G. Jung's (1921) theories about judgment and perception and the ways in which these attitudes are used by different people. The purpose of the MBTI is to make Jung's theory of psychological types understandable and useful for people today (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). In light of the present increased interest in Jungian thought (Friedrich, 1987), and Jung's tendency to lack lucidity in his thinking (Jones, 1955), an understanding of Jung's thought is important. The MBTI measures a person's personality type in terms of the opposite concepts of extraversion (E) - introversion (I), sensation (S) - intuition (N), and thinking (T) - feeling (F). To Jung's basic types, Myers (1962) added the dimensions of perceiving (P) - judging (J). The use of the MBTI is appropriate and timely for examining the
relationship between marital satisfaction and similar or dissimilar personality types.

There has been little research which has examined the relationships between psychological type as measured by the MBTI and marital happiness. Sherman (1981) found that the question of similar or dissimilar types being attracted to each other had no simple explanation. Carskadon (1984) stated that most people choose a mate who is similar on two or three preferences and that the MBTI can be used to predict what kinds of problems might arise in a marriage. Jung (1953) indicated that it was on the E-I dimension that opposites are more likely to attract, but that as couples live together, the very thing that attracted them to each other in the beginning is the thing that leads to conflict. Myers & Myers (1980) found that in a study of 375 couples there were significantly more couples with like preferences than with differences. These authors postulated that the difference between their findings and Jung's could be attributed to the fact that Jung was referring to couples who were in therapy as opposed to couples who reported no marital difficulty.

Significance of the Study

During the same period of time that researchers were examining the issue of similarity and complementarity and marital success, social scientists also called attention to the increasing divorce rate. Pittman (1987) noted that
"marriages fail about as often as they succeed" (p. 49) with the partners blaming the failure on a variety of reasons, including falling out of love or the nature of the specific partner. Burgess (1939) wrote that the rate of increases in divorce called public attention to the problem of adjustment in marriage. He considered the divorce rate to be increasing geometrically. Ellis (1953) stated that the divorce rate was alarmingly high and that the development of techniques that could weed out doomed marriages before they took place would be welcome. There were 28 divorces per 100,000 marriages in 1870 and 193 divorces per 100,000 marriages in 1937. In 1985, there were 1,190,000 divorces and 2,413,000 marriages. The rise in the number of divorces does not necessarily mean that marriages were any more unsatisfactory or maladjusted than they had been in the past. The growing rate could actually mean a decrease in marital discord since unhappy unions were being ended rather than continued (Burgess, 1939). After continued steady increases throughout the 1960s and the 1970s, the number of divorces, as well as the number of marriages has begun to decline, although only slightly. The divorce rate reached a peak of 5.3% per 1,000 population in 1979 and 1981; held steady at 4.8% in 1986 and 1987, and dropped to 4.7% per 1,000 by June 1988. The number of divorces estimated at that date was 1,157,000, while the number of marriages estimated in June 1988 was
2,446,000 with a rate of 9.7 marriages per 1,000 population that was the lowest since 1977 (Monthly Vital Statistics, 1988; Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1989). However, the search for techniques that could weed out doomed marriages that Ellis (1953) called for seems to be less than successful. Divorce is still an accepted cure for ailing marriages although marriage continues to be popular (Fowers & Olson, 1986). Murstein and Glaudin (1966) and Murstein (1980) called attention to the failure of research work to identify the factors involved in satisfactory marriages.

One phenomenon that has grown out of the increase in divorce is the rise of computer matchmaking services. Tubbs (1988) has developed a questionnaire that attempts to match couples on the similarities in their personality traits and life styles. At the same time, current marital therapists (Beck, 1988; Campbell, 1984; Hendrix, 1988) stated that they have found in their practices that opposites do tend to attract. Moreover, Beck (1988) wrote that as couples continue to live together they become more alike. The issue of homogamy versus heterogamy in marriages seems to continue unabated to this day in both scholarly (Mathes & Moore, 1984; Lazarus, 1985; Rosenberger & Strube, 1986) and popular (Buffington, 1988; Hunt, 1988) literature. Kelly and Conley (1987) found a predictive relationship between personality traits and marital compatibility and stated
that personality traits were the strongest predictors of compatibility. These researchers recommended a return to the study of the effects of personality on marital outcome.

In light of the continued confusion on whether like attracts like or whether opposites attract, the rising use of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator for both marital and pre-marital therapy, the continuing high divorce rate, and the recommendation that there be renewed research on ways that personality traits do affect marital success, it is believed that this study can contribute significantly to knowledge of the relationship between personality and marital satisfaction. While it is impossible in our society to control who is attracted to whom and who marries whom, the continued high failure in marital relationships necessitates continued research to help both the couples who experience difficulties and the counselors who work with them.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to examine ways in which the MBTI can be a useful instrument in looking at the relationship between a couple’s similarities and differences and their marital satisfaction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to ascertain whether couples in marriages that are unsatisfactory enough to have brought them to therapy are different in personality
compatibility from couples who have satisfactory marriages. This study was undertaken by examining the differences and similarities in the couples' personality types as described by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). If personality does effect marital satisfaction and these effects should be further explored (Kelly and Conley, 1987), the instrument that is currently experiencing the most usage in determining personality - the MBTI- (Fredman and Sherman, 1987) would be expected to reveal information that is helpful to counselors working with couples. At present information coming from the research on the MBTI and marital satisfaction is not conclusive (Sherman, 1981; Carskadon, 1984). Further purposes of the study were to examine ways in which the location of the differences and the extent of those differences effect couples' perception of marital satisfaction. Myers and McCaulley (1985) indicated that counseling issues for a couple vary with the location of differences.

Hypotheses

1. Couples who are in therapy will have fewer preferences in common, as measured by the MBTI, than will those couples with satisfactory marriages, as determined by the MSI.

2. Couples who have a difference of 40 or more points on any one preference of the MBTI will report more problems
than couples who have satisfactory marriages, as determined by the MSI.

3. For all groups studied, as the difference between a couple's scores on each of the 4 pairs of opposites of the MBTI increases, overall marital satisfaction, as determined by the MSI, will decrease.

4. Couples who have been married 7 years or less (The average length of a marriage is 6 to 7 years according to Glick, 1984.) will have fewer preferences, as measured by the MBTI, in common than will those couples who have been married more than 7 years.

5. There will be significantly more couples who have sensing-judging personality types in therapy than in a population of satisfied married couples, as determined by their score on the MSI.

6. There will be significantly more introverted wives, as measured by the MBTI, in a population of satisfied married couples, as determined by their score on the MSI, than in a therapy population.

7. There will be significantly more couples composed of an extraverted wife and an introverted husband, as measured by the MBTI, in a therapy population than in a population of satisfied married couples, as determined by their score on the MSI.
Research Question

This study also examined the relationship between type differences on each dimension of the MBTI and the nature of marital difficulties as identified by the MSI. Are there certain type combinations that experience specific problem areas on the MSI?

Definition of Terms

The definitions of the following terms are in accordance with their usage in the present study:

1. Conventionalization (CNV): the tendency of people to distort their appraisals of their marriages in the direction of social desirability. This is one of the 11 scales on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI) which was used in this study. The operational definition of conventionalization is the score obtained on the CNV scale of the MSI.

2. Extraversion: a person's preference for focusing on the world of people and things rather than on the inner world of ideas. Extraversion is the opposite of introversion on the MBTI. The operational definition of extraversion is the score obtained on the extraversion scale of the MBTI.

3. Introversion: a person's preference for focusing on the inner world of ideas rather than on the outer world of people and things. Introversion is the opposite of
extraversion on the MBTI. The operational definition of introversion is the score obtained on the introversion scale of the MBTI.

4. **Feeling**: a person's preference for basing his or her judgments more on personal values than on impersonal logic. This is one of four basic functions measured by the MBTI and is seen as being an opposite of thinking. The operational definition of feeling is the score obtained on the feeling scale of the MBTI.

5. **Thinking**: a person's preference for linking ideas together by using logical methods. The person who prefers thinking relies on principles of cause and effect and has a tendency to be impersonal. Thinking is believed to be the opposite function of feeling as measured on the MBTI. The operational definition of thinking is the score received on the feeling scale of the MBTI.

6. **Intuition**: a person's preference for looking for possibilities and relationships and for using more abstract, as opposed to concrete, methods for processing information. This is one of four basic mental functions or processes measured by the MBTI, and is seen as an opposite of sensing. The operational definition of intuition is the score obtained on the intuition scale of the MBTI.

7. **Sensing**: a person's preference for the way in which he or she perceives. The sensing individual prefers to rely on observable data and tends to focus on immediate
experience. Sensing is believed to be the opposite function of intuition as measured on the MBTI. The operational definition of sensing is the score received on the sensing scale of the MBTI.

8. **Judgment**: one of two preferences added to Jung's (1971, 1921) work by Myers (1962) which includes the process of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived. In the attitude of judgment, "a person is concerned with making decisions, seeking closure, planning operations, or organizing activities" (Myers & McCaulley, 1985, p. 14). Judgment is believed to be the opposite of perception. The operational definition of judgment is the score received on the judging scale of the MBTI.

9. **Perception**: one of two preferences added to Jung's (1971, 1921) work by Myers (1962) which includes the processes of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, and ideas. When using perception, a person is focused on incoming information (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The operational definition of perception is the score received on the perceiving scale of the MBTI.

10. **Marital Satisfaction**: an attitude of greater or lesser favorability toward the individual's marital relationship (Roach, Frazier, & Bowden, 1981). In this research, the measure of a person's marital satisfaction will be determined by scores on the 11 components of the
MSI. The operational definition of marital satisfaction is the score received on the global distress scale of the MSI.

11. **Marital Quality**: the subjective evaluation of a married couple's relationship in terms of their adjustment to each other, communication, personal and marital happiness, and satisfaction. It suggests a continuum rather than a fixed state (Lewis & Spanier, 1980).

12. **Psychological Type**: the theory developed by Jung (1923) that stated that what seems to be random differences in people is "due to basic differences in the way individuals prefer to use their perception and judgment" (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

13. **Temperament**: the characteristic or habitual inclination of a person to choose one attitude or one function rather than another as their customary behavior (Michael & Norrissey, 1984).

**Review of the Literature**

This review will cover four areas: research on marital quality and satisfaction, research on homogamy versus heterogamy, a review of Jungian personality types, and research on personality type and marital quality and satisfaction.

**Marital Quality and Satisfaction.**

Lewis and Spanier (1980) stated that the quality of marital relationships is still the most widely studied area in the field of marital research. During the 1970s,
approximately 150 articles on the quality of marriage were published in professional journals, and 182 American doctoral dissertations included the concept of marital quality in the dissertation title.

Bowman (1970) stated that it is only recently that interpersonal adjustment has been considered necessary for a marriage to be successful. "So long as children were born to continue the family line and the couple were forced by social pressure to stay together, the purpose of marriage was considered to have been achieved" (p. v). In fact, a close personal relationship between husband and wife was discouraged so that conflict between the two might be avoided (Bowman, 1970). In 1924, research in the area of interpersonal adjustment in marriage began with studies by Hamilton and Davis which were not published until 1929 (Terman, 1938).

Terman (1938) and Burgess and Cottrell (1939) contributed two major pioneering studies in attempts to determine what makes some marriages succeed while others fail. Terman (1938) identified factors correlated with marital adjustment or happiness to be non-neurotic personalities, similar cultural backgrounds, conservatism, good relationships between each spouse and his or her parents, and the marital happiness of the spouses' parents. Burgess and Cottrell (1939) found that outstanding factors in marital adjustment seemed to be tempermental
compatibility, affection, and social adaptability, with the
dependence of the wife's adaptability being more important than the
husband's. These studies led to the development of many
global measures of marital quality. By 1975, 813 marriage
and family instruments had been published. Most of these
instruments were no doubt developed for specific research
projects and then abandoned (Fredman & Sherman (1987).
Roach et al. (1981) believed that in spite of the number of
instruments available with which to measure marital
satisfaction, most were not adequate. In a review of 319
family-related instruments by Strauss (1969), only four
instruments related to marriage satisfaction had established
reliability and validity. These four dealt with marital
success (Bernard, 1933), marital adjustment (Bowerman, 1957;
Locke and Wallace, 1959), and marital happiness (Terman,
1938). Cromwell et al. (1976) failed to list any other
measures dealing with marital satisfaction that had
acceptable reliability and validity, and indicated that most
measurement tools had been borrowed from areas other than
marital or family therapy. As a result, instruments were
being used as diagnostic tools for purposes other than those
for which they had been designed.

The earlier scales that were developed in the field of
marital adjustment were primarily self-reporting, pencil and
paper instruments and have had little reporting of validity
and reliability (Spanier, 1976; Hicks & Platt, 1970; Roach,
Frazier & Bowden, 1981). Lively (1969) questioned the continued use of the concept of marital happiness, success, or adjustment and stated that "the dangers of semantic distortion resulting from such terms . . . may be sufficient to justify their elimination from the literature" (p. 108). Spanier and Cole (1976) found 12 different definitions of marital adjustment and noted that many studies did not even attempt to define the term.

Hicks and Platt (1970) noted that a recurrent criticism of research on marital quality was that a measurement was taken at only one point in time which ignored the changing nature of the marriage relationship. Their review of the literature to 1970 suggested that there are significant differences in satisfaction at various times within the marriage and also that the husband's and wife's satisfaction does not necessarily co-vary. Spanier and Lewis (1980) in another review of the literature found that research since 1970 had not employed longitudinal studies and that much of the research on marital quality over the family developmental life cycle was flawed.

The most widely used inventory that attempts to measure marital adjustment is the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Inventory (LWMAS) (Roach, Frazier & Bowden, 1981; Snyder, 1979; Spanier & Cole, 1976). Locke and Wallace (1959) defined marital adjustment as accommodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time and used three main
dimensions of marital adjustment to design their scale. These dimensions were conflict resolution and management, marital satisfaction and happiness, and companionship and consensus. The LWMAS has been criticized for a variety of reasons (Hawkins, 1966; Edmonds, 1967; Edmonds, Withers, & Dibastia, 1972; Spanier, 1972, 1973; Spanier & Cole, 1976; Snyder, 1979; Roach, Frazier & Bowden, 1981). The focus of this criticism has been on the issue of conventionalization or social desirability in which the respondents tend to report their marriages as being happier than they actually are. Murstein and Beck (1972), however, did not find that conventionalization was a major contaminating factor in assessing marital adjustment.

Another scale which has been widely used in marital assessment research is the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) developed by Spanier (1976). Spanier and Thompson (1982) indicated that more than 300 researchers planned to use the DAS. Norton (1983) stated that the DAS is becoming increasingly popular. Spanier and Cole (1976) defined marital adjustment as a process in which the outcome of which is determined by

1) troublesome marital differences;
2) interspousal tensions and personal anxiety;
3) marital satisfaction;
4) dyadic cohesion; and
5) consensus on matters of importance to marital functioning (p. 127-128).
Roach, Frazier, & Bowden, (1981) considered the DAS to be well-done but essentially a revision, even though an improved version, of the Locke-Wallace scale. Fredman and Sherman (1987) found that the phenomenally high correlation of the DAS with the Locke-Wallace indicated that the DAS is essentially an alternate form of that classic test. Neary (1984) in a study which sought to determine whether elements needed for marital satisfaction had undergone any significant change since Terman's 1938 study, found that there were high correlations between the marital satisfaction instruments used by Terman (1938), Locke (1951), and Roach, Frazier & Bowden (1981). The DAS is well-known and has connections to past instruments, but it is not considered to be strong in diagnosing what specific aspects of the relationship are causing difficulties, nor does it have norms for distressed couples, specific age groups, and length of marriages. Spanier and Filsinger (1983) recommended that it be used in conjunction with other instruments to overcome these deficiencies.

An instrument that takes into account the problem of conventionalization, that discriminates between clinical and non-clinical couples, and does diagnose areas that are causing difficulties in marriages was developed by Snyder (1979) and is entitled the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI). The MSI is a multidimensional, self-report instrument that identifies for each spouse the type and
extent of distress in the marriage. There are 11 scales in the MSI which measure conventionalization, global distress, affective communication, problem-solving communication, time together, disagreement about finances, sexual dissatisfaction, role orientation, family history of distress, dissatisfaction with children, and conflict over childrearing (Snyder, 1985). The MSI was chosen for this study because of its approach to the difficult task of measuring marital quality and satisfaction. The MSI will be reviewed later in this paper.

**Homogamy versus Heterogamy**

Marriage and family counselors are confronted daily with troubled couples who often seem to be having difficulties in living with a spouse who is different in some way from his or her mate. Frequently, the presenting problem to the counselor is "If only he/she would change . . ." These couples seem to bear out the well-known cliche that opposites attract. However, this cliche is balanced by an equally well-known sentiment that like is attracted to like (Kiersey & Bates, 1978). Corsini (1956) stated that possibly the oldest theory of marital happiness was that of homogamy, or like married to like. Hollingshead (1953) stated that in looking at the question of who marries whom and whether like attracts like or whether opposites attract, there have been essentially two approaches. Psychologists have focused on physical and psychological characteristics
in their research, while sociologists have looked at factors that are external to the individual. In the latter research, data seems clear that in terms of the external factors of race, age, religion, ethnic origin, social and economic class, and residential location homogamy is supported (Eshleman, 1988; Hollingshead, 1953; Ktsanes & Ktsanes, 1953; Burgess & Wallin, 1944).

Murstein (1976) looked at early theories of homogamy versus heterogamy and found Hegel to be one of the earliest proponents of a theory of the attraction of opposites when he proposed that two opposing forces interact to form a new, more viable entity. Fowler in 1859 wrote about the necessity of like marrying like when he questioned whether lions lie down with sheep or wolves with fowls. However, Fowler did manage to combine homogamy with heterogamy when he stated

Wherein, and as far as you are what you ought, marry one like yourself; but wherein and as far as you have any marked excesses or defects, marry those unlike yourself in these objectionable particulars.

(Murstein, 1976, p.292)

The early classic investigators (Terman, 1938; Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Locke, 1951; Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Corsini, 1953) concluded that homogamy in personality traits did lead to more successful marriages, although relationships were of a lower order among psychological
variables than were cultural and social characteristics (Tharp, 1963). Tharp (1963) did caution that most of the traits investigated to that time had been neurotic in character and that the effects of the degree of homogamy or heterogamy had not been studied.

Gray and Wheelwright (1944), two Jungian analysts, were among the first to advance a theory of complementary mating or heterogamy, and developed the Gray-Wheelwright Questionnaire which also measures a person's personality type in Jungian terms. Winch (1958) became a vigorous dissident of homogamy (Tharp, 1963). Winch (1958) held that there was homogamy of social characteristics, but that within a homogamous field, mate selection took place based on complementary needs. Complementarity of needs was divided into two kinds: 1) difference in degree of the same need and 2) difference in the kind of need. Murstein (1980), however, found that "the only support for Winch's theory was the work of Winch (1958) himself" (p. 782). Tharp (1963) reviewed the work of Winch and that of other researchers who had attempted to verify the theory of complementarity and found that all evidence was for homogamy, not for complementarity. Barry (1970) also concluded in a review of research, that homogamy had a clear hold in theories of mate selection. Mathes and Moore (1984) listed 21 studies which had been unable to find empirical support for a theory of complementarity while finding a
large number of studies which confirmed that individuals fall in love with similar others. These authors found that individuals with high esteem were more likely to be attracted to romantic partners on the basis of similarity than were individuals with low self-esteem. Mathes and Moore concluded that both complementarity and similarity are used in mate selection but they are used differentially by high or low self-esteem individuals.

Another area of research, that being done on attitude similarity (Byrne, 1971), also confirms that homogamy, not heterogamy, prevails in interpersonal attraction (Sachs, 1975; Touhey, 1975). Touhey (1975) suggested that the perception of similarity of attitudes was an important component of attraction. This conclusion seems to support earlier research by Preston et al. (1952) and Dymond (1954). Dymond (1954), using 55 items from the MMPI in her research on understanding and marital satisfaction, concluded that "...the better each partner understands the other's perceptions of himself and his world, the more satisfactory the relationship" (p. 171). Newmark, Woody, and Ziff (1977) also used the MMPI and found significantly more similarity in satisfactorily married couples than in unsatisfactorily married. Regts (1985) used the MMPI and the MSI and found a correlation between personality traits and marital satisfaction. Additional research using Holland's (1978) theory of personality type and marital
satisfaction has found similarity and intermediate similarity to be associated with relationship satisfaction (Wiggins, Moody, & Lederer, 1983; Gennette, 1984). Type A and Type B personality types and marital satisfaction have been investigated (Rosenberger & Strube, 1986) with results that indicated that over time a mixed A-B couple had fewer confrontations and less conflict.

Jungian Personality Types

Jung first introduced his theory of psychological types in 1921, but was sensitive to the problems involved in typing people and undertook the task reluctantly (Rychlak, 1981). In beginning his typology, Jung (1921) looked first at history and found a common dimension of opposition which he classified as introversion versus extraversion. The introvert's interest is directed predominantly inward. A situation is not objectively considered but the dominant factor in any situation is the way in which the introvert reacts to it. The introvert is never completely at home in the outer world of people and things, but is completely at ease in his or her own inner world. In contrast, the extravert's interest lies in the external world. People, things and events are endlessly interesting, and the extravert adapts himself or herself easily to the environment (Maduro & Wheelwright, 1983).
In the Jungian theory of types, there are two modes of perception - sensation and intuition. Sensation refers to sense perception through the five senses. Sensation can be thought of as conscious perception, i.e. being directly aware of objective reality as seen, heard, or touched. Again, in contrast, intuition is unconscious perception. Intuitive people are immediately aware of a whole configuration but not of the details. The intuitive person perceives the inherent possibilities in a situation, things as they may be, while the sensation type is interested in things as they are (Rychlak, 1981; Maduro & Wheelwright, 1983).

There are also two opposite functions used for assessing or judging that are termed thinking and feeling. The thinking individual is concerned with content and proceeds from intellectually considered motives. The thinker is impersonal; he or she classifies, clarifies and names. The feeler, in contrast, represents an individual's acceptance or rejection of something based on internal values. The feeling person judges by evaluating the event, person, or place. The thinker evaluates and reasons in order to reach a decision. The feeling type person somehow "knows" whether something is suitable without deliberation (Rychlak, 1981; Maduro & Wheelwright, 1983).

Everyone has both extraversion and introversion, sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling, but certain ways
will predominate and be more characteristic of a person's approach to life than will others. We develop what works best for us although Jung indicated that there was an underlying physiological tempo which might determine introversion or extraversion. Jung did consider the most serious problem confronting humanity to be its onesidedness and that the extent of disturbance people will experience depends on the number of incompatible opposites generated (Rychlak, 1981; Maduro & Wheelwright, 1983).

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator and Marital Quality

The manual for use with the MBTI indicated that people marry persons similar on two or three preferences rather than their own or opposite type (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). From data reported in Myers and Myers(1980) and from the Center for Applications of Psychological Type (CAPT) the following table was developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Like Preferences</th>
<th>Myers Sample (375 Samples)</th>
<th>CAPT Data (571 Couples)</th>
<th>Random Assortment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All four</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
Myers and McCaulley (1985) noted that based on these figures, people are a little more likely to marry a similar type than an opposite type. Myers and Myers (1980) found that the most frequent similarity was on the SN dimension. Sherman (1981) found a significant tendency towards homogamous pairings for sensing types and Beers (1986) found that the SN dimension was most highly correlated with marital satisfaction.

Merner and Carskadon (1983) stated that although the MBTI is used widely in both marital and pre-marital counseling, little research has been done investigating relationships between personality type as determined by the MBTI and marital happiness. They hypothesized that marital partners who have different type preferences will have more points of natural disagreements than will partners who are similar in type. Merner and Carskadon (1983) found no significant differences between two groups of functional versus dysfunctional couples. However, all couples were drawn from a population which was in counseling. Merner, Miller and Carskadon (1984) in re-analyzing the results from the 1983 study using the Yeakley method (described below) indicated that the small sample size of only 20 couples in each group could have contributed to the lack of significant findings. There was a small tendency for a greater similarity in type to be associated with greater marital happiness but the results did not reach significance.
Merner et al. (1984) stated that "the question of the effects of partner similarity on marital functioning and happiness is one of the most . . . important in the area of psychological type" (p. 40). Another possible reason for lack of significant results could possibly be found in the population used. Sager, Gundlach, Kremer, Leng, and Royce (1968) reported that 50% of patients who seek psychotherapy are doing so for marital difficulties, while an additional 25% have marriage-related problems. Waring (1984) indicated that more people sought therapy for intimacy difficulties than for any other problem area.

Yeakley (1982, 1983) found that significant relationships between marital happiness and type similarity are more likely to be found when the individual's psychological type is also measured by the communication adjustment rank score method than by the MBTI alone. However, Yeakley (1985) cautioned against pursuing research with his communication style similarity scales since there had been several unsuccessful attempts at replication. A study by Carey et al. (1985) had been the only study to date that had shown that similar dyads would show greater relationship satisfaction than would dissimilar dyads.

Sherman (1981) assessed the nature and extent of problems in dyadic relationships by looking at 167 couples who were either married or had lived together for at least two years. Approximately one-fourth of Sherman's sample was
made up of couples who had requested counseling, and some couples in the study were not married. She developed her own inventory to look at 12 specific problem areas such as communication, finance, sex, values, interests, decision making. This inventory had not been standardized on any population nor had predictive validity been examined. Sherman concluded that the question of homogamy versus heterogamy had no simple answer, but did find that individuals similar on all four scales of the MBTI did report fewer problems than other combinations. Next to being totally similar, however, couples who were exact opposites reported the second lowest level of problems. Sherman did question whether the particular combinations of an ESFJ male and an INFP female that appeared in her sample of complete opposites really fit into the category of having good marriages. One further significant finding of this study was that all men, whether extraverted or introverted, reported fewer problems when their relationship was with an introverted woman.

Lindner (1972) found a small but significant tendency for intermediate similarity of personality types to be associated with greatest marital happiness than either extreme similarity or dissimilarity. There was a small but significant tendency for personality similarity between mates to be positively associated with length of marriage. There was a significant tendency for reported feelings of
being understood to be positively associated with marital happiness. Extraverts were found to be better at predicting their mates' descriptions of them, while introverts were better at predicting their mates' self descriptions.

Gosse (1979) examined the relationship between Jungian psychological types and marital adjustment and found no support for Myers and Myers (1980) belief that people of similar type would have a more harmonious marriage, nor for Jung's (1971) contention that opposite types often had marriages of conflict. In a clinical interview with the couples in his sample, Gosse did find that the styles and stresses in the marriages and the couples' methods of coping with these did seem to be type-related.

Kiersey and Bates (1978) wrote extensively about which of the 16 basic personality types are attracted to and marry each other; however, these authors cite no research on which their conclusions are based. They stated "cautiously . . . that people are attracted to and marry their opposites with high frequency" (p. 67), basing this conclusion on their two decades of type watching.

Wentworth (1981) studied marital adjustment and the degree of similarity in psychological type. Wentworth found a tendency for people to select mates who are neither totally alike or unlike themselves as far as psychological type is concerned. She discovered some evidence that those
couples who are similar on the judging-perceiving dimension tend to experience more difficulties.

Lacey (1984) identified ways in which couples with divergent personality types were able to achieve high levels of marital happiness and concluded that these couples were able to adapt to personality differences as well as viewing these differences as positive and reinforcing to the marriage.

Germann (1988) found no relationship between temperament, type, and mate selection or between temperament and marital adjustment in an examination of 179 subjects. He did find a significant relationship between husbands' self-concept and marital adjustment. Williams (1977) studied the relationship between mate selection, type, marital adjustment and length of marriage and found no significant relationship between number of shared preferences and adjustment.

Limitations and Assumptions

An assumption of the study was that all of the couples who were in therapy would experience a higher rate of global distress than the couples in the satisfactorily married groups. This held true for all but 6 of the couples. These 6 had entered therapy to work on only one specific issue.

The study did not attempt to differentiate between couples who had been previously married and those in first time marriages. The study included couples who had children
as well as those who did not have any children. All couples in the study were volunteers, and as such there was perhaps a higher representation of Sensing-Judging temperaments than would be found in a normal population.

Slightly over 90% of the population was caucasian; therefore, caution must be taken in making generalizations to other populations.
 CHAPTER II

Procedures and Collection of Data

Population

Subjects were selected from couples who requested counseling for marital difficulties and from volunteers in a southwestern metropolitan area. The volunteer population was obtained by mailing a letter of appeal to ministers of local churches and to heads of local civic organizations.

Two groups of maritally satisfied couples were selected from the volunteers on the basis of their scores on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI). One of these groups was made up of couples married 7 years or under; the other group consisted of couples married over 7 years. Criteria for inclusion in these groups were scores of 50 or below for both husband and wife on the Global Distress Scale (GDS) of the MSI. Scores on the Affective Communication (AFC), Problem-Solving Communication (PSC), Time Together (TTO), Disagreement about Finances (FIN), Sexual Dissatisfaction (SEX), and Conflict over Childrearing (CCR) scales of the MSI were also 50 or below with the exception that one of any of these scales was allowed to reach a mid-range of 58. A third group of couples was drawn
from counselees and was obtained by approaching area counselors and counseling centers. Counselors all held current licenses as either licensed professional counselors, licensed psychologists, or were certified as clinical members of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy. The therapy group consisted of 40 couples who had had no more than three counseling sessions.

Subjects ranged in age from 24 to 73. There were 91% caucasian males and 92% caucasian females. The range of education was from a low of two years for one man and nine years for one woman to a high of 23 years for one of the women and 28 years for one of the men. Twenty-seven per cent of the women had 16 years of education; 28% of the men had attended school for 16 years. For 67 of the women, it was a first marriage; 68 of the men had no prior marriage. It was the second marriage for 22 of the women and for 28 of the men. Eleven of the women had two prior marriages. Sixty-four of the women worked outside the home; 25% worked 40 hours a week. Employment was considered on the executive level for 14 of the women; 26 were lower professional; 9 were administrative; 13 were clerical, sales or technical; and 2 were unskilled. Eighty-eight of the men were employed. Employment was considered to be executive for 37; 27 were lower professional; 11 were clerical, sales or technical; 8 were skilled manual; and 2 were semi-skilled. Fifty-nine of the couples had children.
Instrumentation

All three groups were given the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI) and the Myers-Briggs TypeIndicator (MBTI), either by the researcher or the couples' counselor in a controlled setting. Couples were instructed not to discuss the tests with their spouse while they were taking them.

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) attempts the formidable task of measuring Jung's personality types (described in a previous section) in a psychometric instrument (Coan, 1979). The MBTI is not an attempt to measure people but to sort them into the groups in which they belong by nature of their existing preferences. To accomplish this task, three assumptions were made:

1) that true preferences actually exist and can be identified, 2) people are able to give an accurate picture of these preferences on a self-report inventory, and 3) the preferences are dichotomous and equally valuable (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

As noted, the MBTI is built upon the assumption in Jungian theory that the two components in each of the three pairs of introversion-extroversion, thinking-feeling, and sensing-intuition are incompatible. One function then becomes used consciously and developed while the other function becomes inferior through disuse. This is a major theoretical assumption that is not easily testable or
verifiable. The MBTI, of necessity, focuses on behavioral correlates which are only fair indicators of the construct which is being measured (Coan, 1979). For instance, Jung (1921) considered the difference between introversion and extraversion to be the person's direction toward the inner world of subjective experience or ideas (introversion) versus the outer world of people and things (extraversion). The items on the MBTI which attempt to measure this construct focus on the dimension of withdrawal or shyness as opposed to gregariousness (Lake et al, 1973). Moore and Carskadon (1984) raised the possibility that the EI scale does not measure what it has been assumed to measure and theorized that this scale may be better at measuring the popular notion of introversion.

The original items in the MBTI were first administered between 1942 to 1944 to 20 friends and relatives of Myers who considered the type preferences of this group to be clear to her (Lake, Miles & Earle, 1973). Items that survived the initial validation were published as Form A, with a rearrangement of these same items becoming Form B. In 1947, Form C incorporated item weighting which differentiated more clearly around the zero score. With the decision of the Educational Testing Service to publish the MBTI, another period of development took place between 1956 to 1958. Previous to this period, all items had been normed on adults; now, in an attempt to better differentiate type,
a younger age sample was used. The test has been re-evaluated and refined until Forms F (1962) and G (1977) are the current forms in use. These forms are considered to be essentially interchangeable although Form G has dropped 40 items while adding only one item. Form G was used for this study because of the shorter time required for participants to complete the inventory (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Concurrent validity for the MBTI was established by comparisons of this indicator with similar scales, the most relevant of which is the Gray-Wheelwright inventory which is also based on Jungian type theory. The product moment correlations for the continuous scores were .79 for EI, .58 for SN, .60 for TF and .41 for JP. All of these correlations are significant at the .01 level (Lake et al., 1973).

Stricker and Ross (1962) examined construct validity and questioned six aspects of the MBTI's relationship to Jungian theory:

1) the assumption of scale bipolarity;
2) the assumption of the comparability of the alternatives' scale position (i.e. is choice "A" as much thinking as choice "B" is feeling?);
3) the assumption that social desirability response sets improve measurement;
4) the setting of the zero points;
5) the original type classifications made by the authors in 1942-44 (would they not have to have been competent Jungian analysts?); and
6) the absence of item analyses relating current internal consistency with the original empirical type classifications (which were based on an accidental sample of 20 and a low criterion of predictability - 60%).

(Lake et al, 1973, p. 47)

Loomis (1982) examined the validity of the MBTI and the Gray-Wheelwright and suggested that these indicators "may be taking too atomistic a view of Jung's theory" (p. 61). Loomis believed that Jung did not intend for extraversion and introversion to be considered separately from the four functions of sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling, and that the forced choices used in the MBTI could lead to distorted results.

Bradway (1964) asked 28 Jungian analysts to classify themselves and to take the MBTI and the Gray-Wheelwright. Both tests showed an almost perfect agreement with the analysts' self-typing in the introvert-extravert dimension, and a greater than chance agreement in the sensation-intuition dimension. Only the Gray-Wheelwright showed greater than chance agreement in the thinking-feeling dimension.
Myers and McCaulley (1985) in their extensive manual for use with the MBTI have presented answers to the problem of forced choice questions and to the sometimes reported lower reliability in the T-F dimension. Forced choice questions are used, according to these authors because both poles of a preference are valuable and if each choice was presented separately, both poles could be chosen leaving an uncertain preference. Forced choice questions are also believed by Myers and McCaulley to avoid socially desirable response sets. The thinking-feeling index is expected to be especially vulnerable to deficiencies in type development because good judgment (which is measured by the TF dimension) is assumed to be the most difficult to develop.

The estimates of internal consistency reliabilities for the continuous scores of the MBTI scales are considered acceptable for most adult samples. Reliabilities are adequate, although lower, for younger age samples (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Lake et al. (1973) cite reliabilities ranging from .42 to .60 for EI and from .42 to .59 for JP. Internal consistency reliability of the continuous scores was estimated by Cronbach's alpha-coefficient with results of .76 to .83 for EI; .74 to .80 for SN; .64 to .74 for TF and .78 to .84 for JP. Myers (1962) using tetrachoric rs and the Spearman-Brown formula obtained median correlations of .83.
In summary, although the work done on validity and reliability of the MBTI is somewhat contradictory, the MBTI does reveal much information about personality types. Research has shown the instrument to be useful for many applications. The MBTI is self-administering and easy to score (Lake et al., 1973; Coan, 1979). Because of its wide popularity (Fredman & Sherman, 1987; Ost, 1987) and its ability to provide insight in a positive light about the ways in which significant people in our lives differ (Kiersey & Bates, 1984), the MBTI was considered to be an appropriate instrument for use in the present research.

**Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI)**

The Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI) was developed, in part, because of Snyder's (1979) belief that most marital assessment instruments have serious deficiencies and suffer from the lack of a comprehensive multidimensional measure with well-constructed norms that permit the simultaneous assessment of a broad range of dimensions in marriage as these relate to global marital satisfaction (p. 813).

The beginning construction of the MSI took place with a pilot investigation of 55 couples, 13 of whom were in therapy. Snyder collected 440 true-false items which were divided into 11 non-overlapping scales. The majority of the test items were original. A second study revised the MSI and used 111 couples randomly selected from the general
population and 30 couples in therapy. The revision resulted in the selection of 280 items that had test-retest reliability, internal consistency, and discriminant validity established for each of the MSI scales (Snyder, 1979, 1981).

The 11 scales and the number of items in each scale are as follows:

1) Conventionalization (CVN): the tendency to exaggerate the success of the marriage (21);
2) Global Distress (GDS): the overall dissatisfaction with the marriage (43);
3) Affective Communication (AFC): complaints about lack of affection, understanding and self-disclosure (26);
4) Problem Solving Communication (PCS): tendency for problems to become major and unresolved (38);
5) Time Together (TTO): lack of time together and common interests (20);
6) Disagreement about Finances (FIN) (22);
7) Sexual Dissatisfaction (SEX) (25);
8) Role Orientation (ROR): rejection of women's homemaker role (25);
9) Family History of Distress (FAM): unhappy parental marriage, unhappy childhood, and unhappy relationships (15);
10) Dissatisfaction with Children (DSC) (22); and
11) Conflict over Childrearing (CCR) (19)


The last 41 items, which have to do with children, are to be taken only by those couples who have children.

The MSI is available in booklet form from Western Psychological Services and consists of a 280 item, true-false, self-report instrument. It is intended for use with couples who have either been married or living together for at least six months. However, it can be used for pre-marital counseling. Responses are made on an answer sheet which is scored by hand, using answer keys. The questions can be answered in 30 minutes and hand scored in five minutes. Raw scores are converted into separate T-scores for wives and husbands (Fredman & Sherman, 1987; Snyder, 1981, 1983).

Test-retest reliability on the scales was established upon the responses of 37 couples, selected from the general population, who took the MSI twice within an average span of six weeks. Reliability coefficients ranged between a high of .94 for FAM to a low of .84 for AFC. Internal consistency ratings were derived from the responses of 650 individuals in the general population and 100 persons who were in marital therapy. The coefficients reported were a low of .80 for DSC to a high of .97 for GDS with a mean coefficient of .88 (Snyder, 1981).
Although there has been only a limited amount of research completed on the MSI at this point in time, the instrument has been labeled as valid and as possibly the best global assessment of marital satisfaction available by means of self-report (Dixon, 1985). The MSI does avoid one of the major difficulties of prior marital satisfaction instruments by measuring social desirability directly in the Conventionalization scale. Although the MSI is a comparatively lengthy scale, Snyder's instrument is reported as promising and as being based on careful research (Roach et al, 1981).

The MSI was chosen for this study because of its ability to pinpoint specific areas of marital difficulty, its empirical base, its control for the effect of social desirability, its relative atheoretical constructs (Filsinger, 1983), and its ability to distinguish between couples in therapy from those in the general population.
CHAPTER III

Analysis of Data

Hypotheses one, two, four, five, six, and seven were tested using chi-square analysis. Hypothesis three was tested with the Pearson product-moment correlation. Differences were considered significant at the .05 level or better. The research question was tested using one-way analysis of variance.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that couples who are in therapy will have fewer preferences in common, as measured by the Myers Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI), than will those couples with satisfactory marriages, as determined by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI). Table 1 shows the level of significance to be greater than .05; therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 1

The Number of Preferences in Common for Couples with Satisfactory Marriages and Couples in Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferences in Common</th>
<th>Satisfactory Marriages</th>
<th>Therapy Group</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: 0.2119
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Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 states that couples who have a difference of 40 or more points on any one preference of the MBTI will report more problems than couples who have satisfactory marriages, as determined by the MSI. Table 2 shows the level of significance to be less than .05; therefore, the hypothesis is supported.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marriages</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: 0.0412

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that for all groups studied, as the differences between a couple's scores on each of the four pairs of opposites of the MBTI increases, overall marital satisfaction, as determined by the MSI, will decrease. Table 3 shows that the level of significance on the Extraversion-Introversion, Thinking-Feeling,
Judging-Perceiving dimensions is above .05; therefore the hypothesis is rejected for these three dimensions. The level of significance for the Sensing-Intuitive dimension is below .05; therefore, the hypothesis is supported on this one dimension of the MBTI.

Table 3

Correlations of Each of the 4 Scales of the MBTI with Marital Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I-E</th>
<th>S-N</th>
<th>T-F</th>
<th>J-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.0083</td>
<td>.2096</td>
<td>.0508</td>
<td>.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 states that couples who have been married seven years or less will have fewer preferences, as measured by the MBTI, in common than will those couples who have been married more than seven years. Table 4a shows the findings for all couples in the study; Table 4b shows the findings for all couples who have satisfactory marriages; Table 4c shows only the couples in therapy. The level of significance in all tables is above .05; therefore the hypothesis is rejected.
Table 4a
Comparison of Preferences in Common for Couples Married 7 Years or Less and 7 Years or More (All Couples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferences in Common</th>
<th>7 Years or Less</th>
<th>More Than 7 Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .3828

Table 4b
Comparison of Preferences in Common for Couples Married 7 Years or Less and Couples Married More than 7 Years (Maritally Satisfied Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferences in Common</th>
<th>7 Years or Less</th>
<th>More Than 7 Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .7225
Table 4c
Comparison of Preferences in Common for Couples Married 7 Years or Less and Couples Married More than 7 Years
(Therapy Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferences in Common</th>
<th>7 Years or Less</th>
<th>More Than 7 Years</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .1820

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 states that there will be significantly more couples who have sensing-judging (S-J) personality types in therapy than in a population of satisfied married couples, as determined by their score on the MSI. Table 5A shows couples when only one of the pair is of the S-J type; Table 5B shows couples where both are of the S-J types. The level of significance in both tables is above .05; therefore the hypothesis is rejected.
### Table 5a

The Effect of Differences on the Sensing-Judging Scale (S-J) for the Satisfactorily Married Group Compared to the Therapy Group (1 S-J in Couple)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory Marriage</th>
<th>Therapy Group</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No S-J in Couple</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 S-J in Couple</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .1814

### Table 5b

The Effect of Differences on the Sensing-Judging Scale (S-J) for the Satisfactorily Married Group Compared to the Therapy Group (Both of Couple S-J)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory Marriage</th>
<th>Therapy Group</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Combinations</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both S-J</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .6980
Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 states that there will be significantly more introverted wives, as measured by the MBTI, in a population of satisfied married couples, as determined by their score on the MSI, than in a therapy population. Table 6 shows that there are significantly more extraverted wives in the satisfactorily married group than in the therapy group with a level of significance less than .05. The difference is away from the hypothesis; therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6
A Comparison of Introverted and Extraverted Wives in the Satisfactorily Married Group and the Therapy Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory Marriage</th>
<th>Therapy Group</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .0372

Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 states that there will be significantly more couples composed of an extraverted wife and an introverted husband, as measured by the MBTI, in a therapy population than in a population of satisfied married couples, as determined by their scores.
on the MSI. Table 7 shows the level of significance to be greater than .05; therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 7
A Comparison of Couples Composed of Extraverted Wives and Introverted Husbands in the Satisfactorily Married Group and the Therapy Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory Marriage</th>
<th>Therapy Group</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extravert Wife/Introvert Hus.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Significance: .7872

Research Question

The research question examined the relationship between marital difficulties as determined by the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI) and each of the four dimensions of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). A multiple analysis of variance was done comparing Extraversion-Introversion (E-I), Sensing-Intuition (S-N), Thinking-Feeling (T-F), and Judging-Perceiving (J-P) with 6 areas of dissatisfaction measured by the MSI.
Table 8 shows the relationship between Extraversion-Introversion (E-I), Sensing-Intuition (S-N), Thinking-Feeling (T-F), and Judging-Perceptive (J-P) with the MSI scale of Affective Communication (AFC). A significant relationship between E-I and AFC was found to exist.

Table 8
The Relationship Between E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P and AFC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3240.13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>399.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3479.44</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>160.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3500.66</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>139.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>3509.49</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>130.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 ranks the different spousal combinations of extraverts and introverts as they relate to difficulties with Affective Communication (AFC). A trend is shown for introversion in any of the spouses to contribute to problems in the area of AFC. The most problematic combination seems to be that of introvert wife and introvert husband.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>11.091</td>
<td>6.929</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>9.176</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>7.690</td>
<td>5.947</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>5.828</td>
<td>4.780</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>3.606</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the relationship between E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P with the MSI scale of Problem Solving Communication (PSC). No significant relationships were found for any of the four dimensions of the MBTI and PSC.
Table 10

The Relationship Between E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P and PSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>9735.11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>691.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>172.78</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>9712.19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>714.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178.51</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>9972.52</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>453.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113.43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>9922.54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>503.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125.92</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the relationship between E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P with the MSI scale of Time Together (TTO). A significant relationship between E-I and TTO was found.
Table 11
The Relationship Between E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P and TTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>2187.27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>280.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>2450.31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>2435.85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>2389.24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>78.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 ranks the different spousal combinations of extraverts and introverts as they relate to the MSI scale of Time Together (TTO). A trend for introversion in either of the spouses to contribute to problems in the area of TTO is shown, with the combination of introvert and introvert being the most problematic.
Table 12

The Spousal Combinations of Extraverts and Introverts as They Relate to Problems with TTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>8.568</td>
<td>5.213</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>5.624</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>6.724</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>3.927</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the relationship between E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P with the MSI scale of Finances (FIN). No significant relationships were found for any of the four dimensions of the MBTI and FIN.

Table 13

The Relationship Between E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P and FIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1422.68</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>108.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1494.49</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1439.12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>92.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.06</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1498.54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 shows the relationship between E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P with the MSI scale of Sexual Satisfaction (SEX). No significant relationships were found for any of the four dimensions of the MBTI and SEX.

Table 14

The Relationship Between E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P and SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3212.58</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>161.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3266.37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>107.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3254.32</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>119.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>3255.26</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>118.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows the relationship between E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P with the MSI scale of Conflict over Child Rearing.
(CCR). No significant relationship between E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P with CCR was found.

Table 15
The Relationship Between E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P and CCR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>597.95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>570.50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-N</td>
<td>61.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>601.35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>557.01</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-P</td>
<td>75.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of the Results
This study has attempted to clarify the ways in which the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) can be useful in both pre-marital and marital counseling. Research on this instrument and marital satisfaction is considered important due to the popularity and increasing usage of the MBTI.
While previous studies have not been completely conclusive in determining whether similar types or dissimilar types have more satisfactory marriages, an understanding of the ways in which differences and similarities effect marital satisfaction is important in light of the high divorce rate in the United States.

Hypothesis 1 examined whether couples in therapy would have fewer preferences in common than couples who had satisfactory marriages. As previously stated, an assumption of this study was that couples who came to therapy would all have a high degree of global dissatisfaction (GDS) with the marriage. Six of the couples in the therapy group did not have high GDS, but seemed to have entered therapy to work on one specific issue. Eleven of the couples had only one spouse who expressed high GDS. The study also attempted to control for the effects of therapy by limiting the therapy group to couples who had participated in no more than three therapy sessions; the majority of couples in the therapy group did, in fact, take the MBTI and MSI during their intake into therapy.

The number of preferences in common for both the therapy group and satisfactorily married group did not differ significantly. The findings of this study agreed with the statistics from the Center for Applications of psychological Type (Myers and McCaulley, 1985) differed slightly from the findings of Myers and Myers (1980)
(See Figure 1). For both groups, the highest number of preferences in common was two. There was a ratio of 7:1 in four preferences in common with the satisfactorily married group being higher.

Although this study doubled the number of couples in the therapy group from that of a similar study (Merner and Carskadon, 1983), the sample size particularly for the therapy group could have been larger. There were no INTPs or ESFPs in the therapy group and no ENTP and ENTJ wives or ENFP husbands in the maritally satisfied group.

Hypothesis 2 looked at the degree of difference in preferences between problematic couples and satisfactorily married couples. It is possible when looking at differences in type preference to have two people who hold opposite type designations but who are quite close to the dividing line that determines which of a pair of opposites they might be. In reality, it is possible that these two people are not very different although they are typed differently. It is also possible that two people can have the same type designation but one could have a weak preference and the other quite a strong preference. Therefore, hypothesis 2 measured an absolute difference between couples rather than a perceived difference and found a significant difference (.04) in marital satisfaction when the degree of difference was 40 or more points. This seems to agree with Lindner's (1972) findings that there is a significant tendency
for intermediate similarity to be associated with the greatest marital happiness than either extreme similarity or dissimilarity. The findings of this study do not agree with those of Merner and Carskadon (1983) who found no difference when looking at the number of points by which the couples differed.

Hypothesis 3 further examined the degree of a couple's differences on each of the four dimensions of the MBTI and found a significant difference (.018) on the sensing-intuitive (S-N) dimension. This finding seems to support earlier research (Myers & Myers, 1980; Sherman, 1981; Beers, 1986) which found the S-N dimension an important indicator of marital adjustment. Myers and Myers found that the most frequent similarity for happily married couples was on the S-N dimension; Beers found this dimension to be highly correlated with marital satisfaction; and Sherman found a significant tendency toward homogamous pairings for sensing types and that the S-N dimension was more useful in discriminating between happy or unhappy wives than between happy and unhappy husbands.

The current study found a fairly even distribution of types married to each other on the S-N dimension for the maritally satisfied groups. The number of sensors married to sensors was somewhat higher but is possibly a reflection of the higher number of sensors found in this volunteer group. The therapy group in contrast contained more than
twice as many sensing wives as it did intuitive types (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Maritally Satisfied</th>
<th>Therapy Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

This data does not support the finding by Sherman (1981) which indicated that both male and female, sensing or intuitive, are likely to be happier married to a sensor. The maritally satisfied group in this study is almost equally divided between sensors and intuitives while the therapy group contains more than twice as many sensors as intuitives.

It is possible that the significance found on the degree of difference on the S-N dimension is reflective of the different ways in which the sensor and intuitive perceive the world and that a large degree of difference in perception leads to the power struggle that Campbell (1984) describes as an either-or way of thinking where if my way is valid then yours must be wrong.

Hypothesis 4 stated that couples married seven years or less would have fewer MBTI preferences in common than would couples married more than seven years. Glick (1984) found
that the average length of a marriage is six to seven years. It is also believed that couples tend to become more alike as they live together longer (Beck, 1988). It was thought possible that during the first seven critical years of a marriage, the differences in personality could be a factor leading to marital dissatisfaction and possible eventual divorce. The data were examined three ways:

1. by comparing all 100 couples in the study;
2. by comparing only those in the population of maritally satisfied; and
3. by comparing those in the therapy group

For all three comparisons, no significant difference was found. When all 100 couples were compared the level of significance found was .3828. For the maritally satisfied couples, the level of significance was .7225. For the couples in the therapy group, however, the level of significance was .1820. The differences found for each of the three questions is so extreme that further study which focuses specifically on length of time married for couples in therapy or with dissatisfactory marriages might be beneficial. The chance breakdown of the therapy group for the length of time married was N=15 for those married seven years or less and N=25 for those married more than seven years. This is not considered an adequate sample from which to draw conclusions for the MBTI. It does point out a deficiency in the research design which could be corrected
for by including an equal number of couples in therapy for each of the two groups.

Hypothesis 5 looked at whether there were more couples who were of sensing-judging (S-J) temperament in the maritally satisfied group than in the therapy group. Clinical experience of several church connected counseling centers indicated a tendency for more couples who were of the S-J temperament to request counseling than did couples who were of any other temperament. The data were analyzed two ways:

1. only one of the couple was of S-J temperament,
2. both of the pair were S-Js.

Neither analysis reached significance. When one spouse has an S-J temperament, the level of significance is .1814. These findings support the findings of Germann (1988) that relationship adjustment is not dependent on temperament. When both are S-Js, the level of significance is .6980. There does seem to be a tendency, however, for more S-Js to be found in a therapy group. In this sample, approximately 75% of the therapy group couples had one partner who was of the S-J temperament. Keirsey and Bates (1984) indicated that roughly 38% of the population was made up of S-Js. It is possible that the higher percentage of S-Js who request counseling in church counseling centers is reflective of the tendency for more people of these temperaments to be found in church settings (Keirsey & Bates, 1984: Michael &
Norrissey, 1984; Oswald & Kroeger, 1988), rather than the higher numbers indicating that S-Js have more dissatisfying marriages. It is also possible that the pessimistic nature of an S-J (Keirsey & Bates, 1984; Michael & Norrissey, 1984) could lead a couple to therapy. If one holds a pessimistic attitude in general, it is possible that marital problems could seem more serious than they would to others who possess different temperaments.

Hypothesis 6 compared the wives in the satisfactory married group and the therapy group on the dimension of extraversion - introversion (E-I). Sherman (1981) found that both extraverted and introverted males were more satisfied when married to introverted females than to extraverted females. In this study, opposite findings seem to be true. There are significantly more extraverted women in the satisfactorily married group than there are in the therapy group (level of significance .0372). While hypothesis 6 looked only at the wives in the groups, the criteria for selection into the maritally satisfied group was that both husband and wife have a low global distress score on the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI), as well as low to medium problem areas. The number of introverted wives in the therapy group was higher than the number of extraverted wives in the same group, while the number of extraverted wives was approximately twice as large as the
number of introverted wives in the maritally satisfied group.

Hypothesis 7 further examined the dimension of extraversion and introversion by comparing the number of extraverted wives married to introverted husbands in the therapy group and the satisfactorily married group. This hypothesis was also formulated to replicate Sherman's (1981) study but with the substitution of using a well-validated instrument, the Marital Satisfaction Inventory. Sherman found that the "most perilous combination seems to be an introverted male living with an extraverted female" (p. 115). Myers and McCaulley (1985), in the manual for use with the MBTI also reported the combination of extraverted wives and introverted husbands to be problematic. Again, the data from this study do not confirm either the Sherman (1981) or Myers and McCaulley (1985) findings.

Examination of additional data obtained from 35 couples who did not meet the criteria for marital satisfaction but who had agreed to participate in this study is shown in Figure 3. This additional data indicates no difference between extraverted wives married to introverted husbands and extraverted wives married to extraverted husbands, but does show almost twice as many extraverted wives as introverted wives in this additional group of dissatisfied marriages.
Further examination of the effects of difference and similarity on the extraversion-introversion dimension might well be considered, especially in light of Jung's (1971) belief that it was on the extravert-introvert dimension that opposites are more likely to attract and ultimately enter into bitter conflict. It would also seem that additional examination of the extent of the absolute differences would be beneficial, especially considering the results of hypothesis 2 of this study.

When the research question was analyzed, significant differences were found on the extraversion-introversion (E-I) dimension. The first of these findings was between E-I and the Affective Communication Scale (AFC) of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI). (See Table 8.) Table 9 indicates that the combination of introvert with introvert is most problematic as far as AFC is concerned. The next most problematic combination is that of an introvert wife
with an extravert husband, followed by an extravert wife with an introvert husband. The combination that has the least difficulty with affective communication is that of an extravert married to an extravert. AFC measures complaints about lack of affection, understanding, and self-disclosure. Difficulty in this particular area seems a reasonable expectation given the introvert's tendency to process information inwardly and the extravert's preference for processing by talking (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Luecke (1989) stated that introverts often wait to express themselves until the opportunity to talk is past. In the area of emotional support, which would be applicable to AFC, the introvert tends to be brief, is careful about offering help, and attempts to avoid being irrelevant or intrusive. The findings concerning the relationship of E-I with AFC seem to lend support to the results of hypotheses 6 and 7 and do not support the findings of Sherman (1981) and Myers and McCaulley (1985). It is possible that while the areas covered by AFC are problematic, they do not necessarily aversively effect the overall marital satisfaction but are compensated for by other qualities in the marriage.

The only other significant finding in examining the research question also involved the E-I scale. A significant relationship (level of significance .021) was found between E-I and the Time Together Scale (TTO). The rankings of spousal combinations shown in Table 12 indicate
again that the combination of introvert with introvert, followed by an introvert wife married to an extravert husband, and an extravert wife married to an introvert husband are the more troublesome. The extravert-extravert combination seems to experience the least amount of difficulty with the amount of time spent together. TTO consists of 20 items that reflect the couple's feelings about the quality and quantity of leisure time spent together. This scale, with the AFC scale and the Problem Solving Communication (PSC) are the strongest predictors of marital satisfaction (Hilkey, 1986; Snyder, 1981). The findings of a relationship between the E-I dimension and TTO also seem to be reflective of the introvert's interest in the inner world of ideas and his or her tendency to be drained by association with people and the extravert's opposite preference for interest in the outer world of people and things and the tendency to be energized by people.

While there were only two areas where a significant relationship was found in comparing the scales of the MSI with the four dimensions of the MBTI, there are several areas where a tendency toward significance can be found. In Table 10, the relationship between the MBTI and the Problem Solving Communication scale (PSC) is examined. Again, the E-I dimension is involved, as is the Sensing Intuitive (S-N) dimension. In Table 13, there is a tendency toward
significance for E-I and the financial problem scale (FIN). Table 15 shows the relationship between the MBTI dimensions and conflict over childrearing (CCR). In this table, the only MBTI dimension that approaches significance (.138) is the judging-perceiving (J-P) dimension. The J personality is quite structured and decisive in his or her approach to life while the P is usually more flexible and open-ended as well as being slower at arriving at a decision than a J is. The P is less structured and time-conscious than the J (Michael & Norrisey, 1984). These differences in ways of approaching life are ones that would make it difficult for a couple to avoid conflict over childrearing.

A multiple analysis of variance of the relationship between each of the spousal type combinations and the scales of the MSI was attempted. The numbers of each combination were so small that the analysis did not yield measurable results.

Conclusions

The number of Myers Briggs Type Indicator preferences a couple holds in common is no different even when a clear distinction is made between couples who have satisfactory marriages and those couples who are in therapy and who have a high overall degree of dissatisfaction with the marriage. It appears, however, that the extent of the difference between the preferences does have an effect on the amount
of satisfaction a couple will experience. The amount of difference on the sensing-intuitive dimension of the MBTI is most likely to be a factor that causes more global dissatisfaction for couples. Type similarity seems to have little relationship with the length of time a couple is married. However, there is a possibility that those couples who enter therapy in their first seven years of marriage will have fewer preferences in common than those who enter therapy at a later time in the marriage.

Couples who both have sensing-judging (S-J) temperaments in common are no more likely to experience marital dissatisfaction than will couples of other temperament combinations. However, the presence of the S-J temperament in one partner could lead to more marital dissatisfaction.

The extroversion-introversion (E-I) scale of the MBTI is one which is more often related to specific problem areas that affect marital satisfaction. There is a tendency for the combination of an introverted husband and wife to experience more dissatisfaction and problems on the MSI, while the combination of two extraverts seems to experience the least difficulty. In this study, there were significantly more introverted wives in the therapy group than there were in the maritally satisfied group. An additional group of couples who had unsatisfactory marriages had a higher number of extraverted wives.
Recommendations

In researching the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, it is apparent that as an instrument for measuring personality traits, it has a wide, popular appeal. Its usefulness in helping to determine the long asked question of whether opposites attract or whether birds of a feather flock together, and which pair has a more satisfactory marriage, is not as readily apparent. Bader and Pearson (1988), in writing about the stages of couples' relationships, considered the first stages of couplehood as being a time when similarities are magnified and differences are overlooked in order for the couple to bond and merge. In later stages, as differentiation takes place, the inevitable conflict arises as differences emerge. In light of this fact, perhaps the most useful role for the MBTI in the hands of a counselor is simply to help couples understand and accept the differences between them without judgment that those differences are right or wrong.

In this study, as in other MBTI research (Merner, Miller and Carskadon, 1984), it was found that a larger sample size would have been beneficial. Further examination of the relationship between individual type combinations and the separate scales of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory could yield important information about the types of problems certain combinations could expect to encounter. A larger
sample size than 100 couples is necessary for this kind of analysis to be productive.

It is recommended that another source of volunteers be explored in order to have a wider pool of type combinations available to analyze. A large number of volunteers seem to be of the SJ temperament. This temperament seems to be the backbone of church and civic organizations (Keirsey & Bates, 1984) from which most of the population of this study was obtained.

Further exploration of the absolute difference between a couple's scores is recommended. A difference of 40 points was arbitrarily assigned for this study. A study which looked at different point separation could yield more exact information as to when the degree of difference becomes an issue.

Additional investigation of the combinations of extraverted-introverted and sensing-intuitive types to further clarify which combinations encounter more dissatisfaction is an important area to undertake. An examination of these combinations, taking into consideration the degree of difference, might yield more significant results.
APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO ORGANIZATIONS
Dear Organization President/Pastor:

I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education Department at North Texas State University. To complete the requirements for my degree, I am conducting a study on the relationship between certain personality traits and marital satisfaction. I believe that the knowledge gained from this study will benefit married couples as well as those who do marital and pre-marital counseling. A study of this nature is of prime importance in an era of increased divorce rates.

I would appreciate being allowed to address your organization/congregation at your earliest convenience to seek volunteers for this study. I would require no more than fifteen minutes of time to present the purposes and mechanics of the study.

Participants will be asked to volunteer approximately one and a half hours of their time to take the two inventories used in this research. One inventory will measure marital satisfaction and the other, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, will identify personality traits. Participants will be assured of their anonymity in the study. If they desire the results of the research, this information will be mailed to them at the conclusion of the study.
I will contact you by phone within the next two weeks to answer any further questions you might have about this study.

Mary Hicks
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO COUNSELORS
Dear Counselor:

I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education Department at North Texas State University. To complete the requirements for my degree, I am conducting a study on the relationship between certain personality traits and marital satisfaction. I believe that the knowledge gained from this study will benefit married couples as well as those who do marital and pre-marital counseling. A study of this nature is of prime importance in an era of increased divorce rates.

You can help me with this important research by asking couples who are in the first three sessions of marital therapy with you to participate in this study by volunteering one and a half hours of their time to take two inventories. One inventory is the Marital Satisfaction Inventory developed by Snyder and the other is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This researcher will administer the instruments at a time and place convenient to you and the volunteers. They will be assured of their anonymity in the study, but if they desire feedback on the results, this will be provided to them confidentially. Taking these two inventories can be beneficial both to you and your clients by providing added information about the individual and the marriage.
I will contact you by phone within the next two weeks to answer any further questions you might have about this study.

Mary Hicks

Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR GENERAL VOLUNTEERS
I hereby give consent to Mary E. Hicks to administer the following research instruments to me:

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and

The Marital Satisfaction Inventory by Snyder.

I have heard a clear explanation of and understand the nature and procedure of the research. I have heard a clear explanation of the way in which this research can be beneficial and of the minor risk that is involved. I understand that I may withdraw my consent to participate at any time, and that my anonymity will be preserved if I so desire. I understand that all information will be coded to assure confidentiality, but that information on the results of the research can be given to me following completion of the dissertation.

SIGNED:__________________    DATE:__________________

I would/would not like to receive the results of the research.
APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM FOR COUPLES IN THERAPY
I hereby give consent to Mary E. Hicks/my counselor to administer the following research instruments to me:

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and
The Marital Satisfaction Inventory by Snyder (MSI)

I have heard a clear explanation of and understand the nature and procedure of the research. I have heard a clear explanation of the way in which this research can be beneficial and of the minor risk that is involved. I understand that I may withdraw my consent to participate at any time, and that my anonymity will be preserved. I give permission to my counselor, however, to see the results of the MBTI and the MSI; and to decide whether my knowledge of these results will be beneficial to my counseling.

SIGNED: ___________________________ DATE: _______________

I would/would not like to receive the results of the research.
APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR VOLUNTEERS
Your packet contains two copies of administration booklets for the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, the Marital Satisfaction Inventory, and computer bubble sheets on which you are to record your answers to the questions in the booklets. Both of the answer sheets have been pre-coded with H (husband) or W (wife), plus a number. This code is to insure your anonymity and that the answer sheets for couples remain together. Do not put your name in the space provided on the Myers-Briggs answer sheet and please do not mark in the booklets.

Each booklet has instructions that will help you answer the questions. Please read the instructions thoroughly. If there are any questions that you still have after reading the booklet instructions, the supervisor will be happy to answer them, but please do not consult with your spouse on any question. The purpose of the MBTI is to determine YOUR personality type and the MSI gives YOUR evaluation of the marriage, so it is important for the outcome of this research that answers be your answers only.

Thank you for volunteering your time to assist in this research.
APPENDIX F

OUTLINE FOR PRESENTATION TO GROUPS
I. Purpose of research:

A. To examine the relationship between personality type as measured by the MBTI and marital satisfaction as measured by the MSI.

B. Need for knowledge of contributors to satisfactory marriages.

C. Like versus unlike attraction question.

D. Will certain personality types be more prone to specific types of marital problems.

II. Explanation of instruments

A. MBTI

1. Background
   a. Jung
   b. Isabel Briggs Myers

2. What it measures
   a. Extraversion versus introversion
   b. Sensing versus intuition
   c. Thinking versus feeling
   d. Judging versus perception

B. MSI

1. Areas it measures
   a. Conventionalization
   b. Global distress
   c. Affective communication
d. Problem solving communication

e. Time together

f. Disagreement about finances

g. Sexual dissatisfaction

h. Role orientation

i. Family history of distress

j. Dissatisfaction with children

k. Conflict over childrearing

III. Requirements for participants

A. Time requirements

B. Assurance of confidentiality

C. Results of research.
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