SIMILAR OR RELATED PERSONALITY TRAITS
AS A FACTOR IN MARITAL HAPPINESS

by

JOHN HENRY PICKFORD

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Philosophy and Psychology

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
standard required from candidates for the
degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

Members of the Department of
Philosophy and Psychology.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1957

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to test experimentally the relation of homogamy in personality to marital adjustment. It was hypothesized that similar or related personality traits in husband and wife are significantly related to marital happiness, and that dissimilar or unrelated personality traits in husband and wife are significantly related to unhappiness.

To test the hypothesis, three groups designated as Happily-married, Having-trouble, and On-the-verge-of-separation, each containing thirty five married couples, were compared in terms of the ten personality variables found in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

Six of the ten personality traits showed statistically significant correlations. Four traits G, R, F and P were positively correlated with marital happiness. Trait E had negatively significant correlations for both the Having-trouble, and the On-the-verge-of-separation groups; trait O gave a negatively significant correlation for the Having-trouble group. These two traits were negatively correlated with unhappiness. Correlations for traits A and S approximated the standard of significance used, and the change from the positive correlations for the Happily-married to the negative correlations for the two other married groups, showed a distinct tendency to favour similarity in person-

ality traits as a factor in marital happiness. The trend in the low coefficients for traits T and M for husband-wife similarity relating to happiness, and the trend in the negative low coefficients for traits R, A, S, F, T and P for husband-wife dissimilarity relating to unhappiness, are compatible with the major conclusions of this study.

The hypothesis that similar or related personality traits are significantly related to marital happiness, and that dissimilar or unrelated personality traits are significantly related to marital unhappiness, was confirmed in this study in a number of the ten personality traits measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representative. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Philosophy and Psychology

The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date April 1957

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. E. I. Signori, who supervised this research, and who proffered many helpful criticisms.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	ABSTRACT	iii
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
	A. Studies in Homogamy	3
	B. Personality and Homogamy	4
III	EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE	8
	A. Introduction	8
	B. Selection of the Criteria	8
	C. Nature of the Sample	9
	D. Test Materials	11
	E. Gathering the Data	14
	F. Statistical Procedure	17
IV	RESULTS	19
	A. Statement of Results	19
	B. Interpretation of Results	20
V	DISCUSSION	25
VI	CONCLUSION	29
VII	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH STUDIES	30
VIII	SUMMARY	32
	REFERENCES	34
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
	APPENDICES	40

TABLES

Table		Page
I	Correlations of Scores on Traits from Three Marital Groups on Guilford- Zimmerman Temperament Survey	18

APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
I Controlled Characteristics found Related to Marital Happiness	40
II Territory from which the Sample was Secured	41
III Means, Range and Standard Deviations of Control Characteristics for the Three Marital Groups	42
IV Background Form	43
V The General Satisfaction of Self and Conceptions of Mate's General Satisfaction	44
VI Scores from the Happily-Married Group on Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	46
VII Scores from the Having-Trouble Group on Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	48
VIII Scores from the On-the-Verge-of-Separation Group on Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	50
IX Comparison of Page of Scores from Three Marital Groups of Thirty Five Couples on Guilford-Zimmerman Survey for Traits G, R and A.	52
X Comparison of Page of Scores from Three Marital Groups of Thirty Five Couples on Guilford-Zimmerman Survey for Traits S, E and O.	53
XI Comparison of Page of Scores from Three Marital Groups of Thirty Five Couples on Guilford-Zimmerman Survey for Traits F, P and T	54
XII Comparison of Page of Scores from Three Marital Groups of Thirty Five Couples on Guilford-Zimmerman Survey for Trait M	55

SIMILAR OR RELATED PERSONALITY TRAITS
AS A FACTOR IN MARITAL HAPPINESS

by

JOHN HENRY PICKFORD

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

IN THE DEPARTMENT

of

PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine the relation of similar or dissimilar personality traits in husband and wife to marital happiness. With the family under such stress, with the marriage institution cracking at the seams, with divorce statistics piling up impressive and shuddering records, the social scientist is driven to understand more adequately the characteristics of marital adjustment.

Research work on marital relations has accumulated an imposing collection of data. Focus has been turned upon the physical, the social, the cultural and the economic aspects of marriage, and some fairly well defined principles of marital adjustment have been advanced. However, the psychological aspects of marriage have not received the attention they deserve.

It can hardly be questioned that the personal equation of marriage relations is vitally important. Two personalities are not only interacting with the social, the cultural and the economic environments, but they are interacting with each other. Adjustment in marriage is the product of such personal interaction. It would seem essential, then, to know the combinations of personality traits that interact favourably or unfavourably in marital adjustment. The

questions as to what similar or related personality traits in husband and wife contribute to marital happiness, and what influence dissimilarity of personality traits might have upon marital adjustment, need to be answered.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Studies in homogamy

Three main theories of mating are advanced: homogamy, that like attracts like; heterogamy, that opposites attract each other; complementary, that each individual person seeks the person who gives the greatest opportunity of providing him with maximum need gratification.

Research indicates that no one of these theories fully explains mate selection. McKain and Anderson, (27) in their research on associative mating, found positive correlation for homogamy in many characteristics; Winch (36, 37) saw evidence that the individual person searches for the complement of himself; Benson, (4,5) finding little support for the theory of common interests, concluded that the type of personality was more important than the number of common interests. It is noted, however, that a review of the literature of over one hundred studies (3) on associative mating indicates almost unanimity in finding homogamy as a factor in mate selection.

Studies have shown that men and women tend to select their mates on the basis of general resemblance in such traits as age, (24) physical characteristics, (15) mental abilities, (18, 29, 31) socio-economic background, (2) residential propinquity, (1,13) and personality traits

(17,20,30). Correlations of assortative mating for I Q and educational level (28,35) are fairly high (.60 to .70); correlations for social characteristics (10) are a little lower (.30 to .40); correlations for personality traits (9) are definitely low (.15 to .27). Such low correlations for homogamy in personality traits have led some to conclude that findings on homogamy in personality characteristics are inconclusive, or that cultural likeness is more important than temperamental or personality similarity in marital selection. It is more likely that further research is needed in this field; also more refined measures to test personality remain to be devised.

Burgess-Wallin, (8) using 1000 engaged couples as subjects, administered an abbreviated version of Thurstone Neurotic Inventory along with a form of 23 selected personality traits. They found that on the Thurstone Neurotic Inventory 14 items were statistically significant. The distribution of all but one of 42 items studied was in the direction of homogamy. On the self-ratings of 23 selected personality traits, 9 were statistically significant, and the distribution of the rest, in all but two, was in the direction of homogamy.

B. Personality and homogamy

Early investigators of marital happiness viewed the problem from a medical orientation, stressing physical and sexual factors; then sociologists such as Bernard (6,7) and

the Mowrers (25,26) corrected this emphasis by turning attention to broad social factors. It remained for Terman, however, to make a strictly psychological approach, and to bring sharply into focus, personality as a factor in marital happiness.

In 1935 he and his associates (32) compared the personality characteristics of 345 married and 166 divorced couples taken from the state of California. He sought to determine the relationship between marital happiness, and the scores obtained on 12 personality traits and 7 types of interest constellations. He used as a measure of marital happiness, questions largely adapted from a previous study by Burgess and Cottrell (11). The Bernreuter Personality Inventory and Strong Vocational Interest Blank were administered to the subjects, and the results showed low or negligible correlations with marital happiness. It was observed, however, that the statistical treatment of results indicated that more than a quarter of the items, when taken singly, appeared to have appreciable validity as indicators of marital happiness.

Following up this study, Terman (33) in 1938 investigated 792 couples taken from the middle and upper middle class of the state of California. He tested them on a wide variety of factors, including 233 personality items. He found that 140 items of his personality list showed an appreciable degree of correlation with the happiness score.

He computed a personality index score of the subject's temperamental disposition to determine happiness in marital relationship. This correlated with the marital score .46.

Terman's work seemed to initiate a number of studies in the relation of personality to marital happiness. In 1937, Clifford Kirkpatrick, (21,22) seeking to determine factors in marital adjustment, found personality a significant variable. Robert F. Winch (36,37) studied the relationship between neurotic tendency and adjustment in engagement, and found certain combinations favourable, and others unfavourable to marital happiness. In his research work of seeking to determine the cause of the high divorce rate in the United States, Norman E. Himes, (16) concluded that personality is the chief determiner of successful and happy marriage.

E. Lowell Kelly, (19) studied marital compatibility as related to personality traits of husbands and wives. Seventy-six couples (married from 1 to 45 years) were used as subjects. Husband and wife filled out independently graphic personality rating scales covering 36 personality traits. The subject was required to rate himself and his marriage partner. The results showed that in both husband and wife, the partner rated himself lower than his partner rated him.

Such major studies in marital adjustment as Ernest W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, (8) seeking to predict marital

happiness from adjustment in engagement, and Harvey J. Locke, (23) predicting adjustment in marriage from a comparison of a divorced and happily married group, have fairly well defined the personality characteristics that make for marital happiness.

In the comparison of a divorced and a happily married group, Locke showed a degree of agreement between husband and wife on such personality traits as readiness to assume responsibility, ability to make decisions readily, adaptability, etc. This confirmed the findings of Terman and Burgess-Wallin that there is an association of general personality traits to marital adjustment. As Raymond B. Cattell (2) has concluded: research has given us "an excellent collection of data and generalization about the personalities of marriage partners in relation to marital success."

Since homogamy in personality in marital selection has been fairly well established, and personality characteristics have been found definitely related to marital happiness, it is surprising that little has been done to explore directly the possibility that similar or related personality traits are significantly related to marital happiness. This study is designed to test such an hypothesis: that similar or related personality traits as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperamental Survey are significantly related to marital happiness, and that dissimilar or unrelated personality traits are significantly related to marital unhappiness.

Chapter III

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

A. Introduction

In this study a comparison is made of three groups, each containing 35 married couples to whom is administered the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperamental Survey: Group A, the Happily-married group; Group B, the Having-trouble group; Group C, the On-the-verge-of-separation group.

An attempt is made to control such factors in homogamy that have been shown to be significantly related to marital adjustment. These factors were age, children in family, education, religion, church attendance, socio-economic status and cultural background. By controlling these factors, what differences showed up in the tests may be attributed to personality traits. (See Appendix I for summary of some of the research findings on these factors).

B. Selection of the criteria

It is assumed that marital happiness varies along a continuum with happiness at one extreme, and separation or divorce at the other. However, due to the difficulty of obtaining a divorced sample, it was necessary to regard those seriously contemplating separation as this other extreme. It was also assumed that those Having-trouble, but

who were determined to work out an adjustment, would fall in between the two extremes, tending toward the On-the-verge-of-separation group.

Happiness was measured by the subjective judgment of close relatives or friends in agreement with the self-ratings of the married couples on the Burgess-Wallin General Classification Marital Happiness Schedule. This procedure of combining the two usual criteria of measuring marital happiness is a distinct feature of this present study, and thus may be regarded as a reasonable criterion of marital adjustment.

The Having-trouble group was defined by the couple having sought the aid of a marriage counsellor, minister, lawyer or social worker to resolve their marital problems. The couples in this group expressed no intention to separate. They seemed determined to find some satisfactory adjustment.

The On-the-verge-of-separation group was defined by the couple having approached a marriage counsellor, minister, lawyer, or social worker, and voiced their intention to separate, and were taking steps accordingly.

C. Nature of the sample

Many investigations on human behaviour are made on University or College students who volunteer as subjects for the experiment. It is often assumed such information is applicable to the general population. However, some studies

(14,34) point to a personality difference between volunteers and non-volunteers of a qualitative and quantitative nature. Any such personality difference in the sample would be damaging to research on personality traits relating to marital adjustment. To avoid any selective personality traits as well as to hold constant certain factors believed significant in marital happiness, certain controls governed the selection of the sample.

The sample consisted of the first available 105 married couples from the Lower Mainland of the Province of British Columbia, who met the established criteria for inclusion in the study. The territory from which the sample was secured is shown in Appendix II. The sample was accumulated over the period of sixteen months, November 1955 to March 1957, and was divided into three groups, viz., 35 Happily-married; 35 Having-trouble; 35 On-the-verge-of-separation.

The couples were between the ages of 23 and 30 years; married from 3 to 7 years; having at least one child in the family; and coming from the same educational, cultural and socio-economic groups. They were Canadian born, of British parentage, Protestant in faith, and they attended church at least once a month.

The sample was taken from three economic levels; 9 in each group earning over \$4,500; 18 in each group earning between \$2,500 and \$4,500; 8 in each group earning \$2,500

or under. The sampling sources did not permit extending the range of the socio-economic groups beyond that described.

No information was secured about family background or the marital happiness of parents, due to the difficulty of obtaining such information on all cases, and of establishing its validity whenever it were available.

It will be seen from Appendix III that the means and the standard deviations of age, length of marriage, years of schooling, and number of children in the family are reasonably uniform for each group. The deviations are so narrow that each group can be regarded as similar in these characteristics.

D. Test Materials

Three tests were administered to the Happily-married group: the Background Form, the Burgess-Wallin General Satisfactions Schedule, and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Only two tests were given to the Having-trouble and the On-the-verge-of-separation groups: the Background Form and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The Burgess-Wallin was given to the Happily-married group in order to help select and confirm the happiness level of this group. It was not considered essential to administer the Schedule to the other groups since the other criteria actually used on these groups, assume great-

er significance in establishing the fact of unhappiness.

The Background Form contains 12 questions dealing with age, place of birth, length of marriage, number of children, and educational, religious, racial and socio-economic status. (See Appendix IV).

The General Satisfaction of Self and Conception of Mate's General Satisfaction is Schedule 3 of Burgess-Wallin Multiple Criteria of Marital Success. It is but a self-rating of the marriage; it seeks to get at an over-all feeling of contentment with the marriage and with one's mate. A scoring key for the Schedule is provided by Burgess-Wallin with the highest possible score of 44. Anyone scoring less than 36 on the General Satisfaction Form was discarded as a subject for the Happily-married group. A score of 36 on this form is considered high according to the standards of happiness set by Burgess-Wallin. An agreement between self-rating and outside-rating was necessary, then, before the subjects were accepted as Happily-married, as expressed by friends or close relatives. (See Appendix V for General Satisfaction Schedule).

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was used as a measurement of personality. It was chosen in that it was designed to measure traits of normal personality rather than maladjustment, and its traits were identified by factor analysis procedures, thus affording a clearer definition of what is being measured. Instead of putting

the items in question form, they occur in the form of a statement, expressed affirmatively in the second person. This feature seems to add to its objectivity. The reliabilities of the Guilford-Zimmerman Test range from .75 to .87 on odd-even and first-half and second-half. Kuder-Richardson formulas were used, and all such indices of reliability are considered under-estimates.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey contains 300 items; 30 under each of 10 traits. These traits are given letter symbols: G, R, A, S, E, O, F, T, P and M, and are described herewith.

G -- General Activity: indicative of drive, energy and activity as against slowness, inefficiency and fatiguability.

R -- Restraint: indicative of serious-mindedness, self-control and deliberateness as against impulsiveness, carefreeness and excitement-loving.

A -- Ascendance: indicative of leadership habits, self-defence and outspokenness as against following, submissiveness and hesitation to speak.

S -- Sociability: indicative of having many friends, liking and seeking social activities as against shyness and avoiding social contacts.

E -- Emotional Stability: indicative of evenness of moods, composure and optimism as against fluctuation of moods and depressive tendencies.

O -- Objectivity: indicative of "thickskinnedness" as against egoism and hypersensitiveness.

F -- Friendliness: indicative of toleration of hostile action, acceptance of domination and respect for others as against belligerence, hostility, resistance to domination and contempt for others.

T -- Thoughtfulness: indicative of reflectiveness, philosophical inclinations and mental poise as against over-activity and mental disconcertedness.

P -- Personal Relations: indicative of toleration of others and faith in social institutions as against hypercriticalness and suspicions.

M -- Masculinity: indicative of interest in masculine activities and inhibitions of emotional feelings as against interest in feminine activities and emotional expressions.

E. Gathering the data

Because volunteers were not being used as subjects, it was necessary to develop techniques to gain the confidence

and co-operation of the subjects.

To secure the Happily-married group, church-going young married couples who lived in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia were asked to give the names and addresses of the most happily married couples that they knew between the ages of 23 and 30, who met the desired controls. They were assured that the couples would not know who supplied their names and addresses.

Visits were made to these homes to secure their co-operation in this research project. The prospects were approached as follows:

I am from the University. I should like to get your co-operation in a research project on marital relationships which may prove helpful to young people in the selecting of a life-partner. I should like both husband and wife to fill in a Survey which will take about an hour of your time. I will come at a time most convenient to you. I assure you that your answers to the Survey will not be divulged to anyone.

Appointments were made, and at the stated hour, three forms were given to the couple to be completed without any collusion between husband and wife. Steps were taken to assure honest and accurate answers; the forms and answer sheets were unsigned, and the subjects were given assurance that the information would be kept anonymous. A letter and number indicating group and subject were already on the forms. The Background Form was filled in first, then Burgess-Wallin General Satisfaction of Self and

Conception of Mate's Satisfaction Schedule, and, finally, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was administered according to standard instructions.

For subjects in both the Having-trouble and On-the-verge-of-separation groups, marriage counsellors, ministers, lawyers and social workers were canvassed for names and addresses of available subjects that fitted the categories and the controls. The nature and purpose of the experiment were explained to them, and assurance was given not to violate their confidences by telling anyone that the counsellors had supplied their names and addresses.

The same approach was made to these prospects as in the cases of the Happily-married group. When tested, subjects in these two groups were administered only the Background Form, and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

In some instances, the counsellors preferred to contact the subjects themselves, and secure their co-operation in taking the Survey. The necessary forms with stamped addressed envelopes to the University of British Columbia were given to the Counsellors along with explicit instructions concerning the administration of the tests.

One hundred and fifty-three forms were used. Some subjects in the Having-trouble and On-the-verge-of-separation groups failed to mail back their Survey Booklet and Answer Sheet; some in the Happily-married group had to be discarded for lack of agreement between the subjective

judgment of friends and their own rating; others in each group were set aside for disparity in age, cultural or educational factors. Some made appointments to have the Survey administered, and then the prospective subjects changed their minds. On the other hand, many have requested the results of the tests, and desired information and help. At no time were any of the subjects informed about the real nature of the research, or of the categories into which the subjects were classified.

F. Statistical procedure

The answer sheets of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were all scored, using the hand scoring key. Scores were obtained on all the personality trait factors for the husbands and wives in each of the three groups. (See Appendices VI, VII and VIII).

Product-moment correlations were computed for husband-wife on each of the ten traits for the Happily-married, Having-trouble, and On-the-verge-of-separation groups.

The obtained correlations were examined for significance at the .05 level of significance. A tabular representation of the correlation coefficients is given in Table I.

The range of scores for husband and wife in each category on all ten traits was obtained. Since these results are not vital to the main hypothesis, they have been placed in Appendices IX, X, XI and XII.

TABLE I

CORRELATIONS OF SCORES ON TRAITS FROM THREE MARITAL GROUPS ON GUILFORD-
ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

GROUP	TRAITS									
	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
GROUP A										
Happily-Married n=35	.45*	.35*	.19	.28	.24	.07	.41*	.18	.50*	.18
GROUP B										
Having-Trouble n=35	.06	-.07	-.26	-.06	-.33*	-.43*	-.13	.04	-.13	.05
GROUP C										
On-the-Verge-of- Separation n=35	.01	-.14	-.18	-.26	-.41*	-.01	-.06	-.09	-.13	.02

* Significant at 5% level

Chapter IV

RESULTS

A. Statement of results

From Table I it is observed that of the ten traits of the Guilford-Zimmerman Survey, six are statistically significant. In the case of four traits, viz., G, R, F and P, similarity between husband and wife appears to be positively related to marital happiness. Whereas in the case of two traits, viz., O and E, dissimilarity between husband and wife seems to be related to marital unhappiness. In the case of two other traits, viz., A and S, although statistical significance was not achieved, the results in both happiness and unhappiness extremes are in the expected direction. In the case of the remaining two variables, viz., T and M, the correlations are low, yet the trend is in the expected direction.

Low negative correlations were obtained for both the Having-trouble and On-the-verge-of-separation groups on traits: R, A, S, F, T and P -- with the exception of a positive correlation on trait T for the Having-trouble group. Such correlations indicate trends in support of dissimilarity in personality traits being related to marital unhappiness.

B. Interpretation of results

Significance on the G trait points to the association of similar general activity in husband and wife being related to marital happiness. Happily-married couples tend to be alike in drive, energy, productivity, and enthusiasm. On the other hand, the two other groups show a very slight or non-existent husband-wife similarity on this trait.

It is not to be construed that the lack of similarity on G trait makes for marital unhappiness, for the results obtained do not point to that fact; rather it is the presence of such similarity that favours happiness. In other words, this result is significant for what contributes to understanding marital happiness, but has no significance for understanding marital unhappiness.

Similarity on the R trait for the Happily-married couples is indicated by a statistically significant correlation of .34. Thus, marital happiness seems to be related to husband-wife similarity on this restraint factor. Happily-married couples are more alike in such characteristics as self-control, serious-mindedness, deliberateness, and persistency of effort than are the unhappily married groups. The latter show a slight trend in dissimilarity as reflected in the low, but not statistically significant negative correlation. Although the absence of agreement in the R trait does not mean marital unhappiness, similarity in this trait as in the G trait favours marital happiness.

The statistically significant correlation of .41 on the F trait for the Happily-married group indicates that similarity in friendliness or agreeableness is correlated with marital happiness. Happily-married couples are alike in the extent that they are able to handle frustrations, in freedom from hostility, in the desire to please, and to be liked by others.

A movement in the direction of dissimilarity is seen in the negative correlations obtained on the F trait by both the Having-trouble and the On-the-verge-of-separation groups. Although these correlations are not statistically significant, they emphasize the degree of similarity on this trait in husband-wife of the Happily-married group. The low negative correlations of the two unhappily married groups add nothing to our understanding of marital unhappiness. It is pointed out-- as in trait R-- that husband-wife dissimilarity on this trait is not to be interpreted as marital unhappiness; it is similarity therein that contributes to marital happiness.

Happily-married couples showed similarity on trait P. The highest correlation was obtained in this factor, .50, and it appears to be an important trait in marital happiness. Similarity in personal relations is positively related to marital happiness. This links marital happiness with the degree of husband-wife likeness in their attitude toward social institutions, tolerance of people, and the measure

of their co-operativeness.

The low negative correlations obtained by the two other groups on trait P show that the unhappily married groups lean toward husband-wife dissimilarity in personal relations. However, correlations of these two groups being statistically insignificant, contribute little understanding as to marital unhappiness. It is similarity on the P trait that favours marital happiness.

The significant negative correlations obtained on the E trait for both the Having-trouble and the On-the-verge-of-separation groups ($-.35$ and $-.41$) associate dissimilarity in this trait with marital unhappiness. This does not imply that similarity in this E trait necessarily means marital happiness, although the correlation for the Happily-married group is positive in the expected direction, and approximated the standard of significance.

Unlikeness in emotional stability tends to marital unhappiness. This suggests that contrasting moods such as depressive tendencies in one mate, and evenness of moods in the other favours marital maladjustment.

A significant difference occurred between the Happily-married, and the Having-trouble groups on trait O. The Happily-married secured a positive correlation not significantly different from zero ($.07$); the Having-trouble obtained the negatively significant correlation of $-.43$; the On-the-verge-of-separation had a negative correlation of

zero order.

It is seen, thus, that dissimilarity on trait O is associated with marital unhappiness. The hypersensitive, egotistic, and suspicious, mated with the "thickskinned" seems to presage trouble in marital relations, although not of such a nature that leads to contemplate separation. The fact that On-the-verge-of-separation yields a low correlation of $-.10$ on this variable is difficult to reconcile with the significant results obtained for the Having-trouble group. It might be that the statistically significant negative correlation on trait O for the Having-trouble group suggests that husband-wife dissimilarity indicates the presence of a fairly objective partner who moves to resolve the marital problems before the critical point of separation is reached. The existence of such an objective partner is not assured in the correlation of this trait for the On-the-verge-of-separation group.

None of the correlations for trait S are significant. A definite trend is indicated in the changing from the positive correlation of $.28$ (which approximates the standard of significance) for the Happily-married to the negative correlation of $-.26$ for the On-the-verge-of-separation group. This trend points to husband-wife agreement in the number of friends, in participating in social activities and in seeking social contacts, as being conducive to marital happiness. In the case of trait A where the correlations change from

positive to negative indicating a movement from similar to dissimilar characteristics in these groups, the trend is also in the desired direction.

Traits T and M show little relation to marital happiness or unhappiness in respect to a degree of similarity or dissimilarity in the married couples, but move in the right direction to support the hypothesis.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that similar or related personality traits as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is significantly related to marital happiness, and that dissimilar or unrelated personality traits are significantly related to unhappiness, is partly upheld in this study. On most of the ten traits of the personality scale used, the Happily-married couples showed a higher degree of similarity than did either the Having-trouble or On-the-verge-of-separation group; on the other hand two traits showed dissimilarity linked with unhappiness.

Significant differences on six of the ten traits were obtained. Similarity on the traits G, R, F and P seems positively related to marital adjustment. Likeness in such characteristics as general activity, restraint, friendliness and personal relations, favours marital happiness. Dissimilarity on traits E and O tends to be associated with marital unhappiness. This links unlikeness in such characteristics as emotional stability and objectivity with unhappiness.

The change from the positive correlations in the Happily-married group to the negative correlations in the two unhappily married groups on traits A and S, with the

correlations of the Happily-married group approximating the criterion of significance, tend to uphold a degree of similarity in these two traits being associated with marital happiness. Happily-married couples are more alike in the trait of ascendance and sociability than are the unhappily married groups.

The assumption that marital happiness is a continuum with the Happily-married group at one extreme, and the On-the-verge-of-separation group at the other, with the Having-trouble group falling somewhere in between and gravitating toward the unhappy end, is supported by the statistically significant findings and trends in nine of the ten traits: G, R, A, S, E, F, T, P and M (see Table 1). This bears out that the hypothesis is affirmed as anticipated.

In one trait, viz., O, although it is not altogether inconsistent with the hypothesis, nevertheless a significant statistical result was obtained only for the Having-trouble group. The results for the other two groups, while in the expected direction, were not statistically significant.

The findings of this study tend to bear out the more general conclusions of Locke's study (23) on a Happily-married, and a Divorced group in which he found similar personality patterns in happily married husbands and wives. The value of the present study lies in the fact that the

traits in personality that are considered important in marital happiness are more specifically defined.

However, a degree of caution is voiced against assuming that the findings reported in this study can be generalized beyond the universe sampled. The study sample was small and homogeneous; it was taken from a restricted area. However, certain factors known to be associated with marital happiness could not be controlled. It was not practical to equate the subjects in family background, due to difficulties in securing the necessary information. It was not possible to obtain a valid appraisal of the marital happiness of the couples' parents, or to hold constant the length of engagement of marriage. Likewise it was not possible to extend the variable pertaining to socio-economic status beyond that shown because of the scarcity of case material. Any extension of the socio-economic range would have meant not only a prolongation of the study, but also a broadening of the limits set for the other control variables.

In view of these limitations it seems possible that the results obtained might have been more decisive had a more representative sample been available.

The complexity of personality, and the problem of more adequate and refined measurements to test personality, also militate against clear-cut results in such studies. Research work in husband-wife similarity and dissimilarity

in personality traits is further complicated by the fact that intra and inter integration of traits may cancel out the contribution of similarity or dissimilarity in certain traits that may lead to happiness or unhappiness. In the application of personality tests most authors propose that scales be evaluated both separately, and according to the influences that each trait might exert upon each other.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS

1. Within the limitations of the sample, and the methods used in this study, the findings generally support the hypothesis that husband-wife similarity in personality traits is related to marital happiness and that husband-wife dissimilarity in personality traits is related to marital unhappiness.

2. The statistically significant traits in which similarity relates to marital happiness are: G, R, F and P. Trends in similarity favouring marital happiness are found on traits A, S, E, T and M.

3. The statistically significant traits in which dissimilarity relates to marital unhappiness are: E and O. Trends in dissimilarity which favour marital unhappiness are: R, A, S, F, T and P.

4. The continuum depicting different degrees of marital adjustment as assumed in this study seems to have afforded a valid basis for evaluating the significance of compatibility in personality between husband and wife in marriage.

Chapter VII

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH STUDIES

The relation of husband-wife similarity or dissimilarity in personality traits to marital happiness provides an opportunity for further individual and collaborative research work. To confirm or to modify the findings of the present study, a similar sample of subjects with either Catholic or Jewish persuasion might be tested.

Since the analysis of the data in the present study was limited to correlation procedures, it is felt that other information may be extracted out of the present data from analysis guided by other statistical procedures. For example, the various marital groups might differ on the amounts of the various traits represented in each, or there may be differences in the extent to which the traits are found in husbands as compared to wives.

Since divorce is a fairly objective criterion of marital unhappiness, research work might be done on a sample of divorced couples who are happily remarried to determine significant difference of personality traits in the mates in both marriages.

Studies might also be made on the relation of homogamy in personality to marital happiness on a large representative sample of happily married couples to determine how

applicable these findings are to the general population.
So far as is known there are no studies in the literature
dealing directly with these problems.

Chapter VIII

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to test experimentally the relation of homogamy in personality traits to marital adjustment. It was hypothesized that similar and related personality traits in husband and wife were related significantly to marital happiness, and dissimilar or unrelated personality traits are significantly related to unhappiness.

To test the hypothesis, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was administered to 105 selected married couples who were divided into three groups of 35 couples each, viz., those who were Happily-married, those who were Having-trouble but planned to stay together, and those who were On-the-verge-of-separation. Allocations to each group were based on predetermined criteria. Sixteen months were taken to accumulate the sample.

Some characteristics found by other authors to be factors in assortative mating and happiness were controlled: the husbands and wives in each group were similar in cultural background, socio-economic status, age, length of marriage, years of schooling, attendance at church and presence of children in the marriage. All couples lived in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia and were of Protestant religious background.

The personality test results for the 3 groups were compared, using appropriate statistical procedures. Six of the ten personality traits showed statistically significant correlations. Traits G, R, F and P were positive correlations with marital happiness. Traits O and E were negatively significant correlations in the Having-trouble and the On-the-verge-of-separation groups, and trait O showed a negatively significant correlation for the Having-trouble group. This pointed to dissimilarity in these two traits as being related to unhappiness. Correlations for traits A and S approximated the standard of significance, and the change of the correlations from the positive for the Happily-married, to the negative for the two other married groups, showed a distinct trend in favour of similarity.

The hypothesis that similar or related personality traits in husband and wife are significantly related to marital happiness, and dissimilar or unrelated personality traits are related to marital unhappiness, was upheld in a number of the ten traits. Such findings must be interpreted within the limitations set by the sample. The sample was a small homogeneous group from a restricted area.

Similar research is suggested on a Catholic or Jewish sample, on a large representative sample of happily married couples, and on a sample of divorced couples who are happily remarried.

REFERENCES

1. Abrams, R.H. Residential propinquity as a factor in marital selection. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1943, 8, 288-94.
2. Anderson, C.A. The sociological approach to the study of assortative mating. Int. Congress for Studies Regarding Population Problems. 1932, 8, 600-34.
3. Anderson, C.A. Our present knowledge of assortative mating. Rural Sociol. 1938, 3, 251-79.
4. Benson, P. The common interest myth in marriage. Soc. Probl. 1938, 3, 266-308.
5. Benson, P. The interest of happily married couples. Marriage Fam. Living. 1952, 14, 276-80.
6. Bernard, J. The distribution of success in marriage. Amer. J. Sociol. 1933, 39, 78-83.
7. Bernard, J. Factors in distribution of success in marriage. Amer. J. Sociol. 1934, 40, 665-74.
8. Burgess, E.W. and Wallin, P. Engagement and Marriage. Chicago, Lippincott, 1953.
9. Burgess, E.W. and Wallin, P. Homogamy in personality characteristics. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol. 1944, 39, 475-81.
10. Burgess, E.W. and Wallin, P. Homogamy in social characteristics. Amer. J. Sociol. 1943, 49, 109-24.
11. Burgess, E.W. and Cottrell, L.S. Predicting Success and Failure in Marriage. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1939.
12. Cattell, R.B. Personality. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950.
13. Clark, C.C. An examination of the operation of residential propinquity as a factor in mate selection. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1952, 17, 17-21.

14. Edgerton, H.A., Britt, S.H. and Norman, R.D. Objective differences among various types of respondents. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1947, 4, 435-44.
15. Harris, J.H. Assortative mating. Popular Science Monthly. 1912, 80, 476-92.
16. Himes, N.E. Personality as a factor in divorce. Int. J. Sexol. 1949, 2, 217-28.
17. Hoffeditz, E.L. Personality resemblance among married couples. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol. 1934, 5, 214-27.
18. Jones, H.E. Homogamy in intellectual abilities. Amer. J. Sociol. 1929, 35, 369-82.
19. Kelly, E.L. Marital compatibility as related to personality traits. J. Soc. Psychol. 1941, 13, 193-98.
20. Kelly, E.L. Psychological factors in assortative mating. Psychol. Bull. 1940, 37, 473-76.
21. Kirkpatrick, C. Community of interest and the measurement of marital adjustment. The Family. June, 1937, 18, 133-37.
22. Kirkpatrick, C. Factors in marital adjustment. Amer. J. Sociol. September, 1937, 43, 270-83.
23. Locke, H.J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage. New York, H. Holt, 1951.
24. Lutz, F.E. Assortative mating in man. Science. 1905, 22, 249-50.
25. Mowrer, H.R. Personality Adjustments and Domestic Discords. New York, American Book Comp. 1935.
26. Mowrer, R.E. Family Disorganization. Chicago, University Press, 1939.
27. McKain, W.C. Jr. and Anderson, C.A. Assortative mating. Social Soc. Research. 1937, 21(5), 411-418.
28. Popenoe, P. Mate selection. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1937, 2, 735-43.

29. Richardson, H.M. Studies in mental resemblances between husbands and wives and between friends. Psychol. Bull. 1939, 36, 104-20.
30. Schooley, M. Personality resemblance among married couples. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol. 1936, 31, 346-47.
31. Smith, M. Similarities of marriage partners in intelligence. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1941, 6, 699-715.
32. Terman, L.M. and Butterweiser, P. Personality factors in marital incompatibility. J. Soc. Psychol. 1935, 6, 143-171.
33. Terman, L.M. et al. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1938.
34. Wallin, P. Volunteer subjects as a source of sampling bias. Amer. J. Sociol. 1949, 54, 539-544.
35. Willoughby, R.R. Family similarities in mental tests abilities. Genetic Psych. Mon. 1927, 4, 239-277.
36. Winch, R.F. Personality characteristics of engaged couples. Amer. J. Sociol. 1941, 46, 686-697.
37. Winch, R.F. and McGinnes, R. Marriage and the Family. New York, Henry Holt Comp., 1953.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barron, M.L. People Who Intermarry. Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1946.
- Becker, H. and Hill, R. Family, Marriage and Parenthood. Boston, D. Heath, 1948.
- Bowman, H.A. Marriage for Moderns. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1948.
- Christensen, H.T. Marriage Analysis. New York, Ronald Press, 1950.
- Goode, W.J. Economic factors and marital stability. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1951, 16, 802-11.
- Groves, E.R. Marriage. New York, Henry Holt, 1933.
- Hart, H. Happiness in relation to age at marriage. J. of soc. Hyg. 1926, 12, 403-7.
- Hart, H. and Hart, E.B. Personality and the Family. Boston, McHeath Comp., 1941.
- Healy, E.F. Marriage Guidance. Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1948.
- Hill, R. Families under Stress. New York, Harper Bros. 1949.
- Himes, N.E. Your Marriage: A Guide to Happiness. New York, (Rev.Ed.), Rinehart, 1940.
- Hollingshead, A.B. Cultural factors in selection of mates. Amer. Sociol. Rev., 1950, 15, 619-27.
- Kirkpatrick, C. The Family - As a Process and Institution. New York, Ronald Press, 1955.
- Koos, E.L. Marriage. New York, Henry Holt, 1953.
- Koos, E.L. Families in Trouble. New York, Columbia University Press, 1946.

- Landis, J.T. Length of time to achieve adjustment in marriage. Amer. Sociol. Rev. 1946, 11, 666-77.
- Landis, J.T. and Landis, M.G. Readings in Marriage and the Family. New York, Prentice Hall, 1952.
- Macfarlane, J.W. Interpersonal relationships within the family. Marriage Fam. Living. 1941, 3, 30-2.
- Macrory, B.E. and McCormick, T.C., Group values in mate selection in a sample of college girls. Soc. Forces. 1944, 22, 315-21.
- Mowrer, E.R. Disorganization: Personal and Social. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1942.
- Nimkoff, M. and Wood, L. Courtship and personality. Amer. J. Sociol. 1948, 53, 263-69.
- Schnepp, G.S. and Johnson, M.M. Do religious background factors have predictive value? Marriage Fam. Living. 1952, 14, 301-304.
- Skidmore, R.A. and McPhee, W.M. The comparative use of the California test of personality, and the Burgess-Wallin Schedule in predicting marital adjustment. Marriage Fam. Living. 1951, 13, 121-124.
- Strauss, A. Personality needs and marital choice. Soc. Forces. 1947, 25, 332-35.
- Strauss, A. The ideal and the chosen mate. Amer. J. Sociol. 1946, 52, 204-208.
- Terman, L.M. Predicting marital failure from test scores. Marriage Fam. Living. 1950, 12, 52-54.
- Turner, F.B. Common characteristics. Marriage Fam. Living. 1954, 16, 143-146.
- Wieman, R.W. The Family Lives its Religion. New York, Harper Bros. 1941.
- Williamson, R.C. Economic factors in marital adjustment. Marriage Fam. Living. 1952, 14, 298-301.

- Willoughby, R. Neuroticism in marriage. J. Sociol. Psychol. 1936, 7, 19-48.
- Winch, R.F. The study of personality in the family setting. Soc. Forces. March, 1950, 28, 310-316.
- Winch, R.F. The Modern Family.
New York, H. Holt, 1952.
- Winch, R.F. Personality and marital adjustment.
Amer. J. Sociol. 1941, 41, 686-693.
- Zimmerman, C.C. Family and Civilization.
New York, Harper Bros. 1947.

APPENDIX I

CONTROLLED CHARACTERISTICS FOUND RELATED TO
MARITAL HAPPINESS

Item	Studies
AGE	Burgess-Cottrell 526 Individuals
CHILDREN IN FAMILY	Burgess-Cottrell 526 Individuals
RELIGION	Locke 929 Individuals
CHURCH ATTENDANCE	Burgess-Cottrell 526 Individuals
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	Burgess-Cottrell 526 Individuals Locke 929 Individuals
CULTURAL	Burgess-Wallin 1000 Engaged couples
EDUCATION	Kirkpatrick Terman Burgess-Cottrell

APPENDIX II

TERRITORY FROM WHICH THE SAMPLE WAS SECURED

APPENDIX III

MEANS, RANGE AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CONTROL CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE THREE MARITAL GROUPS

GROUP		AGE		YEARS OF SCHOOLING		NO. OF YRS. MARRIED	NUMBER OF CHILDREN
		Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives		
GROUP A							
Happily- Married n=35	Means Range S.D.	25.8 23 to 29 2.01	26.3 23 to 29 1.86	12.4 16 to 9 1.84	11.7 16 to 8 1.74	4.3 3 to 7 1.40	1.7 1 to 3
GROUP B							
Having- Trouble n=35	Means Range S.D.	26 23 to 29 1.99	25.1 23 to 29 1.71	11.8 16 to 8 1.92	11.1 14 to 8 1.83	4.2 3 to 7 1.47	1.9 1 to 4
GROUP C							
On-the- Verge-of Separation n=35	Means Range S.D.	26 23 to 29 2.13	25.8 23 to 29 1.65	12.1 17 to 9 2.15	11.9 16 to 9 1.48	4.7 3 to 7 1.18	1.8 1 to 3

APPENDIX IV

BACKGROUND

CATEGORY _____

1. AGE

22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
2. NUMBER OF YEARS MARRIED

2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---
3. WHERE BORN? Canada _____
Great Britain _____
Elsewhere _____
4. WHERE WERE YOUR PARENTS BORN: Canada _____
Great Britain _____
Elsewhere _____
5. YEARS OF SCHOOLING:

GRADE					HIGH SCHOOL					UNIVERSITY				POST GRADUATE			
	9	10	11	12	13		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	5	
6. SALARY: \$4,500 or above _____
\$2,500 to \$4,500 _____
Up to \$2,500 _____
7. DID HUSBAND OR WIFE LIVE IN SAME COMMUNITY OR CITY BEFORE MARRIAGE: _____ Yes
_____ No
8. NUMBER OF CHILDREN

0	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---
9. DO YOU ATTEND CHURCH:
Regularly: (at least 3 times a month) _____
Fairly Regularly: (over once a month) _____
Infrequently: _____
Not at all: _____
10. RELIGION: Protestant _____ Catholic _____
11. Check what you believe to have been the economic status of your parents during adolescence:
(a) well to do _____ (b) wealthy _____
(c) comfortable _____ (d) meagre _____ (e) poor _____
12. Check what you believe to be the social status of your parents in their community:
(a) One of the leading families _____ (b) Upper class _____
(c) Upper middle class _____ (d) Middle class _____
(e) Lower Middle class _____ (f) Lower class _____

APPENDIX V

THE GENERAL SATISFACTION OF SELF AND CONCEPTIONS
OF MATE'S GENERAL SATISFACTION

SCHEDULE 3

Place a check before any of the following statements which represent your feelings about your marriage or your mate. Check as many or as few as describe your feelings.

- 1) ☐ My marriage is successful but not extraordinarily so.....
- 2) ☐ My mate and I are well mated.....
- 3) ☐ If it weren't for fear of hurting my mate, I would leave him (her).....
- 4) ☐ Frankly, our marriage has not been successful.....
- 5) ☐ My marriage has given me a new enthusiasm for life.
- 6) ☐ Although my marriage has its good points, they are outweighed by its bad ones.....
- 7) ☐ My marriage could be worse and it could be better..
- 8) ☐ On the basis of my marriage at least, I think a person is a fool to marry.....
- 9) ☐ My marriage is less successful than the average....
- 10) ☐ My marriage is perhaps a little less successful than most marriages.....
- 11) ☐ I wouldn't call my marriage a perfect success, but I'm pretty well content with it.....
- 12) ☐ I feel that as time goes on my marriage will mean less and less to me.....
- 13) ☐ Although my marriage has been only moderately successful, its good elements more than compensate for the bad.....
- 14) ☐ My marriage is not a great success but it could be much worse.....
- 15) ☐ My marriage could not be more successful.....
- 16) ☐ My marriage has been a great disappointment to me..
- 17) ☐ I've gotten more out of marriage than I expected...
- 18) ☐ My friends mean more to me than my mate.....
- 19) ☐ Marrying my mate was the biggest mistake I ever made
- 20) ☐ My marriage is as successful as any I know.....

- 21) ___ If you had your life to live over, do you think you would (check):
marry the same person (a) certainly ___;
(b) probably ___; (c) possibly ___; (d) marry a different person ___; (e) not marry at all ___.
- 22) If your mate had life to live over, do you think mate would (check):
marry you (a) certainly ___; (b) probably ___;
(c) possibly ___; (d) marry a different person ___; (e) not marry at all ___.
- 23) How satisfied, on the whole, are you with your marriage? (check):
(l) entirely satisfied ___; (n) very much satisfied ___; (o) satisfied ___; (p) somewhat dissatisfied ___; (s) dissatisfied ___; (t) very much dissatisfied ___; (u) entirely dissatisfied ___.
- 24) How satisfied, on the whole, is your mate with your marriage? (check):
(l) entirely satisfied ___; (n) very much satisfied ___; (o) satisfied ___; (p) somewhat dissatisfied ___; (s) dissatisfied ___; (t) very much dissatisfied ___; (u) entirely dissatisfied ___.
- 25) Do you ever regret your marriage? check:
(u) frequently ___; (v) occasionally ___;
(x) rarely ___; (z) never ___.
- 26) Do you think your mate ever regrets having married you? (check):
(u) frequently ___; (v) occasionally ___;
(x) rarely ___; (z) never ___.

APPENDIX VI

SCORES FROM THE HAPPILY-MARRIED GROUP ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

CASE No.	HUSBANDS										WIVES									
	FACTORS																			
	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
A1	11	19	12	11	26	26	24	22	24	19	17	6	7	20	11	14	23	19	20	7
A2	23	18	13	23	17	19	15	15	20	16	14	20	24	25	9	22	20	22	24	10
A3	9	21	14	20	24	24	14	12	17	24	13	25	16	21	19	21	23	19	18	15
A4	12	19	9	18	19	14	14	24	17	15	17	19	3	10	23	17	19	15	18	14
A5	11	17	26	13	19	14	15	12	21	16	20	11	20	21	27	24	27	9	23	16
A6	19	25	15	17	23	16	17	22	21	19	22	19	9	21	25	22	28	10	25	5
A7	12	20	18	15	15	14	9	12	11	16	7	24	5	20	24	17	15	11	20	6
A8	13	20	8	11	14	14	19	18	21	17	17	26	5	15	14	20	25	20	27	8
A9	14	10	16	17	20	22	19	16	20	18	15	11	8	20	27	24	18	17	19	14
A10	21	22	20	22	18	20	24	17	23	22	24	18	13	13	12	19	25	27	24	10
A11	16	19	9	19	28	23	16	22	21	23	18	17	14	23	21	18	17	23	19	7
A12	12	16	15	23	23	21	24	12	24	17	14	15	10	21	16	19	20	22	9	6
A13	16	28	13	23	10	26	29	22	27	20	12	22	7	22	24	15	24	12	22	11
A14	16	18	24	19	21	17	20	14	21	18	10	14	14	13	12	14	26	21	17	7
A15	13	8	8	14	14	18	17	14	22	21	11	14	12	15	19	11	20	19	28	14

A16	24	12	19	24	23	23	18	18	20	24	18	20	22	26	12	15	19	15	14	9
A17	20	19	16	19	20	21	13	15	23	19	18	20	14	17	23	21	14	14	20	15
A18	24	17	10	19	16	16	14	13	23	21	24	20	21	24	28	19	12	22	17	12
A19	19	26	11	12	11	18	19	24	19	24	23	19	11	18	10	12	21	19	18	15
A20	13	10	23	24	26	23	20	20	25	21	9	7	13	23	22	19	25	20	22	9
A21	19	20	14	23	18	15	16	11	19	19	17	16	8	22	11	14	20	16	12	5
A22	11	19	26	20	17	18	23	12	14	16	16	14	16	24	23	18	22	19	20	13
A23	18	20	11	12	14	10	13	18	13	11	14	14	13	23	12	22	19	12	16	9
A24	8	21	13	21	25	24	15	20	25	20	11	7	5	13	22	20	17	9	27	20
A25	25	15	20	18	19	13	20	19	18	15	22	11	17	22	19	19	20	17	21	13
A26	22	12	19	19	22	20	18	15	16	17	19	15	6	18	14	22	15	8	17	9
A27	10	12	23	21	13	19	24	21	25	16	14	13	9	14	17	26	27	16	23	8
A28	17	19	11	18	20	21	18	16	24	25	15	21	14	9	25	24	19	19	25	15
A29	23	8	17	25	12	20	22	19	23	23	17	13	11	19	20	17	23	16	17	8
A30	15	15	21	18	23	27	17	21	19	18	9	13	5	17	21	12	24	21	16	6
A31	22	19	22	26	8	23	11	15	19	15	19	20	16	25	23	19	13	20	23	10
A32	18	15	25	14	13	14	14	11	21	20	23	15	9	14	17	9	20	22	18	19
A33	20	14	19	19	15	18	11	19	15	19	11	20	16	20	23	23	15	16	11	12
A34	8	18	18	21	11	23	17	19	24	20	15	9	10	20	24	17	19	14	27	15
A35	13	7	16	13	13	13	15	14	19	15	22	15	20	24	7	14	16	9	18	9

APPENDIX VII

SCORES FROM THE HAVING-TROUBLE GROUP ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

CASE No.	HUSBANDS										WIVES									
	FACTORS																			
	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
B1	26	8	19	24	14	18	9	12	11	23	19	15	7	17	5	8	15	18	19	9
B2	9	18	9	13	20	14	12	24	15	23	23	12	10	18	10	12	11	13	19	15
B3	15	21	9	20	22	11	18	21	23	20	27	13	18	23	17	26	14	13	12	20
B4	21	12	26	12	11	9	15	19	12	19	8	19	14	19	14	18	12	20	19	15
B5	18	15	21	20	20	19	20	13	23	23	7	26	9	17	12	15	8	12	14	18
B6	23	8	20	11	13	11	14	12	19	21	24	20	12	24	28	26	13	22	17	12
B7	27	10	16	15	25	22	12	22	11	17	10	19	18	7	20	18	19	9	27	5
B8	8	25	12	18	26	23	10	15	19	18	21	11	23	26	19	10	24	20	15	13
B9	14	12	24	25	21	11	7	16	12	23	22	28	13	18	15	19	18	27	24	10
B10	28	9	23	3	14	9	10	23	15	25	15	10	8	19	21	15	17	11	23	19
B11	17	15	14	21	10	19	13	17	24	20	22	3	14	19	15	11	15	10	17	12
B12	11	22	10	11	21	18	11	21	9	23	19	19	14	18	10	15	14	12	25	14
B13	26	12	21	12	9	15	7	24	9	15	7	14	7	23	21	17	20	19	21	8
B14	24	17	23	20	15	17	7	13	15	23	10	19	5	10	21	11	5	25	13	15
B15	19	21	11	13	11	18	13	22	19	24	9	18	18	25	17	8	18	21	23	11

B16	29	17	27	8	13	8	15	25	9	17	17	7	20	17	19	20	15	14	20	14
B17	12	25	14	24	18	15	12	11	23	14	25	15	17	15	11	9	7	19	10	17
B18	11	16	19	12	14	5	18	20	11	20	20	14	5	21	23	18	19	21	26	10
B19	25	26	20	8	25	11	9	18	11	19	17	10	21	25	15	17	19	24	17	19
B20	17	19	13	7	24	20	19	20	14	14	18	7	20	22	18	11	9	23	5	16
B21	21	11	24	20	7	17	5	10	11	21	8	10	11	18	20	3	16	23	21	9
B22	17	7	12	14	19	21	8	8	20	24	25	13	19	28	9	17	11	19	8	7
B23	25	17	22	19	25	19	13	19	17	13	11	25	6	20	5	7	15	12	24	12
B24	20	5	19	21	8	14	11	9	17	19	18	12	3	13	15	27	18	17	21	11
B25	23	14	28	25	13	10	15	14	13	23	12	21	9	17	6	7	14	25	11	8
B26	9	23	11	15	20	25	9	12	14	20	23	7	20	19	9	14	15	9	20	15
B27	14	14	23	12	12	19	17	11	21	17	19	16	15	11	14	15	9	15	6	13
B28	21	12	24	17	9	26	10	20	17	21	23	7	10	25	14	12	18	27	22	12
B29	25	20	13	7	24	20	19	25	18	14	17	21	20	22	7	8	13	27	20	16
B30	20	19	21	14	7	5	8	19	17	26	7	25	8	19	22	17	15	16	5	14
B31	10	8	23	24	18	13	16	9	9	20	18	19	12	10	9	23	17	13	23	11
B32	25	24	21	9	11	23	4	19	11	19	20	11	19	23	7	11	5	15	9	12
B33	20	10	27	17	19	15	17	15	19	19	9	14	10	9	15	12	12	19	15	8
B34	17	19	19	8	9	14	9	12	21	23	6	17	13	24	24	19	13	17	8	14
B35	25	26	13	7	24	8	11	17	18	14	10	19	3	7	10	18	17	19	21	5

APPENDIX VIII

SCORES FROM THE ON-THE-VERGE-OF-SEPARATION GROUP ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

CASE No.	HUSBANDS										WIVES									
	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
C1	29	6	26	27	22	20	22	19	18	25	25	15	15	20	15	16	12	15	25	9
C2	25	23	19	23	21	22	18	20	25	26	19	24	17	12	12	12	7	22	14	7
C3	19	18	23	11	25	18	8	25	11	19	24	8	8	12	12	17	16	18	20	9
C4	28	11	21	8	7	11	18	11	13	23	17	8	17	25	21	18	17	25	6	16
C5	17	17	22	24	11	19	12	8	8	27	7	24	5	14	23	21	20	21	17	8
C6	16	20	9	28	15	26	17	24	15	20	23	6	20	22	6	18	17	17	9	14
C7	27	14	23	17	9	8	0	25	3	23	16	6	18	23	21	19	22	15	19	11
C8	24	12	25	19	21	14	16	26	12	20	27	20	10	14	14	18	21	18	20	10
C9	26	16	14	23	26	24	12	11	11	16	18	13	4	12	9	19	24	25	22	8
C10	28	8	18	16	29	28	15	13	21	24	21	16	7	18	12	10	17	18	12	11
C11	12	10	20	28	21	15	16	22	14	22	10	17	9	20	8	14	21	9	20	12
C12	14	10	12	25	17	25	22	26	20	21	24	26	22	12	25	11	17	8	11	5
C13	19	17	23	8	12	13	20	9	12	25	23	19	19	25	24	21	12	21	18	14
C14	27	8	10	13	8	8	10	24	19	15	12	21	16	20	19	24	12	9	10	15
C15	16	12	24	12	20	22	17	19	14	22	20	16	22	8	11	12	8	17	9	21

C16	15	18	28	19	13	15	15	12	10	19	14	17	9	24	19	13	21	19	19	17
C17	14	19	12	10	23	17	26	20	24	24	28	11	17	25	9	16	19	13	17	9
C18	24	13	25	23	19	22	13	24	18	25	6	19	8	8	15	15	11	11	12	14
C19	4	17	19	18	26	17	21	24	9	24	9	12	3	13	14	7	18	9	25	16
C20	26	25	21	19	12	24	21	11	17	20	21	15	19	18	6	3	8	26	9	10
C21	15	8	19	23	27	18	9	17	8	17	5	7	15	12	6	12	12	13	19	12
C22	27	16	27	25	24	22	7	10	5	23	19	5	18	19	7	19	21	15	17	9
C23	23	7	14	19	28	14	6	11	15	24	20	9	15	17	8	23	9	19	23	13
C24	13	28	14	12	24	9	14	25	20	14	17	16	19	23	19	15	12	9	12	14
C25	20	23	18	17	9	25	15	15	20	21	16	8	5	14	18	18	19	12	14	16
C26	24	17	24	21	17	14	21	23	7	23	21	25	14	17	12	11	11	17	19	22
C27	28	3	12	17	18	17	10	12	22	26	20	18	10	20	25	20	16	21	9	11
C28	19	23	19	14	26	10	11	15	12	19	15	11	12	24	16	9	22	23	23	5
C29	9	9	24	19	14	21	15	8	8	18	19	12	9	20	21	16	16	19	17	9
C30	26	16	23	13	11	15	10	19	21	20	12	20	11	21	17	14	16	21	12	10
C31	29	15	10	24	24	19	19	21	20	23	21	10	14	13	16	17	24	16	14	16
C32	21	17	25	15	10	14	8	27	11	25	25	9	11	20	21	19	20	24	20	14
C33	25	11	10	14	19	21	24	12	12	20	14	21	17	19	12	16	21	20	25	11
C34	7	14	19	12	25	20	19	15	15	24	22	15	13	23	17	18	22	9	20	17
C35	28	7	23	8	13	22	11	20	26	19	15	19	9	15	15	13	19	15	18	8

APPENDIX IX

COMPARISON OF RANGE OF SCORES FOR THREE MARITAL GROUPS OF
THIRTY-FIVE COUPLES ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY FOR TRAITS G, R, and A

GROUPS

SCORES

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

TRAIT G

Happily-
Married
Having-
Trouble
Verge-of-
Separation

TRAIT R

Happily-
Married
Having-
Trouble
Verge-of-
Separation

TRAIT A

Happily-
Married
Having-
Trouble
Verge-of-
Separation

____ Husbands
____ Wives

APPENDIX X

COMPARISON OF RANGE OF SCORES FOR THREE MARITAL GROUPS OF

THIRTY-FIVE COUPLES ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY FOR TRAITS S, E and O

GROUPS

SCORES

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

TRAIT S

Happily-
Married
Having-
Trouble
Verge-of-
Separation

TRAIT E

Happily-
Married
Having-
Trouble
Verge-of-
Separation

TRAIT O

Happily-
Married
Having-
Trouble
Verge-of-
Separation

APPENDIX XI

COMPARISON OF RANGE OF SCORES FOR THREE MARITAL GROUPS OF THIRTY-FIVE COUPLES ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY FOR TRAITS F, T and P

GROUP	SCORES																													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
TRAIT F																														
Happily-																														
Married																														
Having-																														
Trouble																														
Verge-of-																														
Separation																														
TRAIT T																														
Happily-																														
Married																														
Having-																														
Trouble																														
Verge-of-																														
Separation																														
TRAIT P																														
Happily-																														
Married																														
Having-																														
Trouble																														
Verge-of-																														
Separation																														

APPENDIX XII

COMPARISON OF RANGE OF SCORES FOR THREE MARITAL GROUPS OF THIRTY-FIVE COUPLES ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY FOR TRAIT M

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

TRAIT M

Happily-
Married

Having-
Trouble

Verge-of-
Separation