

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION AMONG
ENGAGED COUPLES

by

DAN HUGH MCCAGHREN
'

Bachelor of Arts

Southwestern College

Winfield, Kansas

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
Of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1977

Thesis
1977
M121i
Cop. 2



INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION AMONG
ENGAGED COUPLES

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett

Thesis Adviser.

Arthur Wright

Bernice Kapel

Norman W. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

977082

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments are always inadequate, but I have this need to say thank you to those who had a part in this effort. Thus, it is a pleasure to express my appreciation to those individuals who have assisted, encouraged and directed this project to completion.

Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, stands tall in the gap as my thesis adviser. I owe much to his having served as both academician and friend.

Considerable gratitude is extended to committee members, Dr. Althea Wright and Dr. Bernice Kopel for their consideration and critical reviewing of this paper.

Appreciation is also due Dr. William D. Warde for his aid in the statistical analysis of the questionnaire data.

The friendship of Wayne Matthews and Ken Dye figures prominent as complementary to the realization of this task.

Breathing a sigh of relief and serving as a singular source of understanding, Betty, Rhonda and Ryan must not go unnoticed as the patient ones.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Need for Research	6
Purpose of the Study	10
II. RELATED LITERATURE	13
Interpersonal Perception	13
Communication	19
Personality	21
Mate Selection	27
III. PROCEDURE	31
Selection of Subjects	31
Instrument	31
Attitude Scale	33
Criss-Cross	35
Trait Identification	36
Nervous (Composed)	36
Depressive (Light-hearted)	36
Active-Social (Quiet)	37
Expressive-Responsive (Inhibited)	37
Sympathetic (Indifferent)	37
Subjective (Objective)	38
Dominant (Submissive)	38
Hostile (Tolerant)	38
Self-Discipline (Impulsive)	39
Analysis of Data	40
IV. RESULTS	42
Description of Subjects	42
Examination of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results	44
V. SUMMARY	57
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	61
APPENDIX	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Characteristics of the Subjects	43
II.	T Values Reflecting the Difference Between the Male's Perception of the Intended Spouse and the Self-Perception of the Intended Spouse on Each of the Nine Personality Traits Measured by the T-JTA	47
III.	T Values Reflecting the Difference Between the Female's Perception of the Intended Spouse and the Self-Perception of the Intended Spouse on Each of the Nine Personality Traits Measured by the T-JTA	52
IV.	T Values Reflecting the Difference in the Respondent's Attitude Score and Sex	54
V.	T Values Reflecting the Mean Difference Between the Female's Perception of the Male and the Male's Perception of Himself, Compared With the Male's Perception of the Female and the Female's Perception of Self	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Central to any consideration of marriage are the pressures converging on the American family (Tinkler, 1976). Industrial, urban, role, educational and biologically induced social pressures have thrown the nuclear unit into seriously challenging the Judeao-Christian form and norm. The extent of the tension has given rise to exotic and sometimes gloomy predictions regarding the future of marriage and the family.

The sense of anomie regarding marriage is currently being brought into perspective by family life educators and sociologists alike. Mace (1976) notes that under the current stress, the practice of marriage is alive and well but undergoing a process of adaptation to the cultural mutation of our time. The literature of Gruenbaum and Christ (1976) reflects on the context of the contemporary scene: "It is not the act of marrying that is changing but rather the reasons individuals have for marrying" (p. 1). Bernard in The Future of Marriage (1972) concludes:

Men and women will continue to want intimacy; they will continue to want the thousand and one ways in which men and women share and reassure one another. They will continue to want to celebrate their mutuality, to express the mystic unity that once led the church to consider marriage a sacrament. They will therefore, as far into the future as we can project, continue to commit themselves to each other. There is hardly any probability that such commitments will disappear and that all relationships between them will become merely casual or transient. (p. 269).

Summarily, trends and pressures do not indicate the disappearance of marriage, rather a heightened emphasis upon interpersonal relationships in response to the surrendering of some of its functions to the larger society (Wrong, 1971).

This affirmation of the continuity of marriage, however, can deteriorate into a whistling-in-the-dark if it disregards the magnitude of marital disorganization and dissolution. In the aftermath of contemporary pressures lies an area of concern to family life educators--the conspicuous absence of qualitative relationships in marriage reflected by legal dissolution of the family system and emotional divorce.

Mounting evidence reflects on the health and welfare of the family system. The number of divorces seem to be increasing in the United States and most Western countries. Reiss (1972) reflects that our divorce rate has increased since 1963 more rapidly than it has over the past twenty-five years. In fact, since 1967, the rate of increase has accelerated even further. The number of divorces in the United States now exceeds 1,000,000 per year (U. S. Bureau of Census, 1976).

This greater divorce incidence cannot be minimized but sociological perspective demands that divorce be as intrinsically good or bad, depending on its consequence (Berardo and Nye, 1973). Even in the presence of this objectivity, divorce and the trend toward no-fault divorce, whereby two people may dissolve their marriage simply by mutual consent, rarely proves to be less than tragic and painful to its participants (Berardo and Nye, 1973; Gruenbaum and Christ, 1976). In down-to-earth expression of some of the physiological, psychological and social manifestations of divorce, Goode (1956) writes in terms of difficulty in sleeping, poorer health, loneliness, low work efficiency,

Together with marital dissolution, a companion index reflects something of the interpersonal dynamics within marriage - emotional divorce. Legal severance stands as an overt manifestation of a dysfunctional relationship while this more covert form denotes alienation and isolation within the marital unit (Cuber and Haroff, 1965). With a criterion of successful marriage being the personal happiness of a husband and wife (Sirjamaki, 1968), the literature on incidence of marital dissolution and emotionally defunct marriages stands as indicative of a less than pleasant state of affairs for many marriages.

As to the etiological factors of marital disharmony, since the nuclear family can be said to begin with mate selection (Somerville, 1972) it stands that unwise mate selection lies as the very base of numerous problems and divorce (Stinnett, 1974). Observations by Stinnett and Walters (1976) note that concomitant with mate selection process is the perception that the intended spouse will fulfill each others major needs:

In the youth stage of the mate selection process, the couple becomes convinced that their major needs - emotional, physical and social - will be fulfilled successfully in their relationship. Each feels that the other will meet his needs adequately. This expectation may be realistic and well-founded particularly if the couple have dated each other a long period of time and have done much compatibility testing. On the other hand, an individual's expectation that the other person will successfully meet his needs may be unrealistic and imagined, particularly if they have done very little compatibility testing or have known each other only briefly (p. 3).

The success or failure of this mate selection process cannot be considered an isolated phenomenon devoid of societal impact - the larger society is interested in the result (Goode, 1956). What approach, then, can a couple take to optimize their relationship and improve their

chance of having a vital marriage?

Investigations into the relationship of the premarital dyad can serve to highlight potentially dangerous areas; giving the engaged couple insight from which realistic expectations and interpersonal skills can emerge. In preventive terms, the premarital dyad has a great investment in the whole area of interpersonal perception;

The problem of romanticism and idealization in our society has been a recurrent theme of family sociologists and marriage educators . . . The usual rationale for investigating this subject is the concern that engaged couples imbued with fantasies upon their intended spouse instead of seeing them as they really are. Furthermore, after marriage they will find out the truth and become disillusioned . . . This process of idealization and disillusion is seen as a threat to the institution of marriage and the family insofar as it is held responsible for high divorce rates and one-parent families (Schulman, 1974, p. 139).

The desirable goal of integrating interpersonal perception into the premarital relationship is to emancipate the couple from the deception which often accompanies dating and engagement. At some point in time, the relationship must free itself from what James (1948) identified as the "social self":

The individual has many social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinions he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these groups.

He goes on to state that

. . . our social self-seeking is carried on directly through our amiteness and friendliness, our desire to please and attract notice and admiration, our desire to please and attract notice and admiration, our emulation and our jealousy, our love of glory, influence and power and indirectly through whichever of the material self-seeking impulses prove serviceable as means to social ends (p. 182).

Within this "social self" lies the often illusory nature of the

premarital relationship. The actual self is often sacrificed for the social self by means of courtship diplomacy. Performance becomes the name of the game and the actual self is protected lest divulgence prove "harmful." Social vanity precludes honest revelation in which courtship demeanor is often inconsistent with the actual self. In summary, that family dissolution is occurring with greater frequency and according to Goode (1964) reflective of a failure of one or more members to perform adequately their role obligations, we are prompted to inquire into the pairing process.

Of the many variables that influence the engaged interactional system, this inquiry centers around the degree to which the intended spouse has accurately perceived the emotional traits and needs of the partner-to-be. Consequently, in measuring the interpersonal perceptions of the engaged dyad we shall have some indication both of the relational and communicative processes at work among engaged couples.

Interpersonal behavior is at the very core of the family life discipline and its researchers must stake their claim, not only to better explain family realities but to improve the quality of family relationships. Specifically, Family Life educators must heighten their interest in interpersonal perception because of:

1. The importance of the family in fostering mental health.
2. The family stands as the primary reproductive unit.
3. The intergenerational composition of the family.

All the foregoing point to the need for greater understanding of premarital, marital and parent-child interaction. The complexity of

Inquiring into the interpersonal perceptions of the engaged dyad cannot be minimized as interpersonal perception is the very process by which man knows other persons; observations, attitudes, emotions, abilities, purposes, traits, thoughts and memories - events within the psyche of the person (Laing, 1966).

Need for Research

Cuber and Haroff (1965) suggest two basic types of marriage:

1. Utilitarian - relationships established for purposes other than to express intimate, highly important personal relationships between men and women.
2. Affective - A marital relationship in which the mates are intensely bound together psychologically in important life matters. Their sharing and their togetherness is genuine. It provides the life essence for both the man and woman.

The literature suggests the changing face of marriage toward emphasis upon affective relationships and the emotional dynamics of marital interaction. Mace (1975) affirms that the recurring theme in the literature describing American families and marriage during the last three decades has been the shift from the primacy of fulfilling societal functions to that of fulfilling the emotional needs of the individuals. The traditionally consanguineous family now has as its priority the conjugal unit.

Burgess and Locke (1945) have long characterized this move from Utilitarian to Affective marriages as a transition from "institution" to "companionship:"

This companionship marriage is based on intimacy,

equity and flexible interpersonal interaction; offers a promising new life-style which is in fact the preferred choice of the great majority of men and women in our culture today . . . We have no responsible alternative, therefore, but to apply ourselves to the task of making companionship marriage work for the millions who have chosen it (p. 45).

The equipment needed for success in the affective relationship is "interpersonal competence" - a totally different and highly flexible capacity to handle fluid relational situations and guide them in the direction of growth toward mutually satisfying intimacy (Mace, 1975). The importance of interpersonal competence is further seen in Otto's (1971) delineation of indices for family strength; more especially:

1. The ability to provide for the emotional needs of the family.
2. The ability to be sensitive to the needs of the family members.
3. The ability to communicate.
4. The ability to provide support, security and encouragement.
5. The ability to perform family roles flexibly.

In light of the differentiation of the family with added emphasis upon emotional support, Scanzoni (1972) raises the question as to whether either spouse possesses the requisite skills for interpersonal competence. While Parsons (1968) suggests the atomization of the societal units has unencumbered the family to become more specialized in emotional support, Mace (1975) rhetorically asks whether or not the family has become a 'specialist' in interpersonal competence. Or, in actuality, is there a void within the emotional framework:

What we have been calling the failure of marriage

has rather been the failure of large numbers of individual marriages as they tried to undertake a transition for which the partners concerned simply lacked the basic equipment . . . Multitudes failed dismally because instead of being trained in interpersonal competence they were fed with romantic notions that being 'in love' would assure them of unending bliss (p. 134).

The period of engagement stands as crucial to the interpersonal relationship of a marital unit. Transcending the mere dating stage and yet antecedent to marriage, engagement assumes the establishment of rapport. The data gathered by Lewis (1974) strongly suggests that rapport is vital at this stage of the premarital dyadic formation. Reiss (1960) suggests the parenthetical stage of engagement portends an interpersonal relationship which promotes and fosters increased marital understanding.

The engaged heterosexual couple represents the supposed prototype of their marital relationship and presupposes realization of the courtship function:

1. Contact with field of eligibles.
2. Selection of the right marriage partner (i.e. the person who as compared with others would contribute most to marital adjustment.
3. Mutual adjustment to personalities.

Kirkpatrick (1963) observes that having moved through the selection-rejection process (i.e. 'favorite date'; 'going steady' and 'engaged') the engaged couple has increased understanding of the opposite member of the sex-pair. Ideally, this engaged couple is mature and according to Bowman (1963) "lives in a world of reality" (p. 270); divested of daydreams and unrealistic expectations.

Actuality fails to confirm this notion of mature components.

The often illusory nature of engagement short-circuits the real self. An honest appraisal of the engaged couple is sacrificed in the name of courtship progress. Love, then, is noted as the single most pervasive basis of integration in our marriage system (Moss, 1970). Enamored with fantasies about love and marriage the engaged couple projects temporal extension of the intended spouse. After marriage, reality becomes unavoidable; disillusionment and disappointment set in (Dean, 1962; Pineo, 1968).

Of this premarital naivete, Kirkpatrick (1963) observes:

Sooner or later, members of the opposite sex pair must handle motives of hate, love, jealousy, aggression, dominance, dependence and pride. Assumed roles are replaced in time by roles that reflect more nearly the 'core self' and these roles must be adjusted to the newly revealed 'real' roles of the partner. Thus, there is concealment and self-revelation in courtship and an unfolding series of roles played by a person, each of them calling for role playing and role modification by each partner. A price for knowing and adjustment may be paid sooner or later, either by installment or in a lump sum when disillusionment results from a sudden and drastic readjustment or an image of the other. In general, it may be said, that the more adjusting is done before marriage, the less remains to be done after marriage has taken place (p. 319).

In Lewis' (1974) longitudinal analysis of continuing and dissolved couples, the continuing males and females evidenced significantly greater self-disclosure than the couples who chose to dissolve their relationship. Again, support to Hobart's (1956) suspicion that romanticism limits self-disclosure.

The fear of disclosure is very real and articulated in laymen's terminology by Jourard (1971) in The Transparent Self:

In a poker game, no man discloses the content of his hand to the other players. Instead, he tries to dissemble and bluff. . . (and) in a society which pits man against man, as in a poker game, people do

keep a poker face; they wear a mask and let no one know what they are up to.

He goes on to state

. . . We are said to be a society dedicated among other things, to the pursuit of truth. Yet, disclosure is often penalized. Impossible concepts of how man ought to be - which, make men so ashamed of his true being that he feels obliged to seem different. Yet when a man does not acknowledge who, what and how he is, he is out of touch with reality and he will sicken and die; and no one can help him without access to the facts (p. 37).

In spite of the often illusory nature of the premarital dyad, Clinebell (1970) insists that marriage is "little place to hide inadequacies in our abilities. To relate, cannot be hidden in a relationship which places a premium upon transparency" (p. 3)

Purpose of the Study

Emerging as the distillation of all social contact and posing as the precursor to the most intimate of relationships, engagement merits our attention. Both as a prelude to marriage and by virtue of the very appellation itself, "engagement" presupposes involvement in the dynamics of interpersonal relationships.

Several queries, then, prompt this investigation into the interpersonal competence of the engaged couple:

1. Are the interpersonal communications of the engaged couple operant on an honest and direct level?
2. Are engaged couples in need of being equipped with interpersonal skills coupled with the knowledge of emotional dynamics of need-meeting?
3. Is engagement fostering accurate cognitions on the part of the intended spouse?

4. To what areas might counselors direct themselves in educating the premarital dyad toward greater interpersonal competence?

This paper and the project it represents constitutes an attempt to lend empirical authority to the study of the pairing process. By both investigating and measuring perceptions, an attempt will be made to add to the body of research bearing on marital success.

The specific purposes of this inquiry were:

1. To determine the accuracy of perceptions among engaged couples concerning each of the nine personality traits as measured by the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis:
(a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted)
(c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive-responsive
(inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective
(objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-discipline (impulsive).
2. To determine if there is a relationship between the accuracy of perception concerning the nine personality traits mentioned above and sex.
3. To determine if there is a significant difference in the perception of the partner concerning each of the traits according to sex.
4. To determine the relationship between the Attitude score (which reflects the test-taking bias) and sex.

Limitations

In exploring the premarital interpersonal perceptions, several

limitations surfaced and present themselves for future research:

1. An inherent limitation of this investigation was its inability to yield information regarding the causality of the relationship (why the level of perceptions sometimes varied). A longitudinal study into these couples married life would seem to be required.
2. This study sampled only one type of population - college students. Engaged collegians represent only a fraction of those engaged. Future studies may compare the interpersonal perceptions of other segments of engaged couples (e.g. second marriages; teen-age marriages; non-college population).
3. Data was derived from Middle-West subjects. There was no representation of Eastern, urban, private schools where attitudes may differ as a result of social structure or a different socialization process.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Interpersonal Perception

Happiness of a marriage is related to the partner's understanding of one another, as reflected in their ability to predict each others' responses to a series of items on a personality inventory. In other words, married love is not blind, and ignorance is not connubial bliss. The better each partner understands the others' perceptions of himself and his world, the more satisfactory the relationship (Dymond, 1954, p. 171).

Related strongly to people's success in developing meaningful relationships, is the ability to understand to perceive others accurately (Bullmer, 1974). This ability to understand and predict the behaviors of others is central in responding to others in ways both appropriate to the situation and personally satisfying.

The process by which we form an impression or develop an understanding of another individual is that of interpersonal perception.

Usually, when we form impressions of others, we respond to a great number of observable stimuli. We may take note of such diverse aspects of physical appearance as skin color, hair style, facial features, and body build. The other person's actions, mannerisms, dress, vocal mode, and tone of voice may also be observed. On the basis of these cues, we usually form a rather complete idea or precept, as to what the other person is (Bullmer, 1974, p. 5).

Person perception, then, refers to the processes by which an individual comes to know and to think about other persons, their characteristics, qualities and inner states (Taguiri, 1968). Larson (1974) cen-

ters interpersonal perception around "those aspects of cognitive activity directly related to sensory information received or available at the time a response occurs" (p. 2). Other appellations such as "social perception" and "social cognition" are utilized in the literature. Interpersonal perception is the label this investigator will use in referring to the dyadic process of understanding the other and being concerned with motives, moods, attitudes, needs and behavior of another individual.

Hollander (1971) illustrates interpersonal perception as a loud noise! "The noise could be ignored, Or, if perceived under essentially tranquil conditions it might be interpreted as a car backfiring; under tense conditions of high threat, it might be interpreted as a bomb exploding" (p. 127)

The very act of interpersonal perception entails interpretation. Applying this social interaction to the dynamics of marital and familial interaction, Laing (1966) illustrates:

1. She sees herself as vivacious, but he sees her as superficial.
2. He sees himself as friendly, she sees him as seductive.
3. She sees herself as reserved, he sees her as haughty and aloof.
4. He sees himself as gallant, she sees him as phony.
5. She sees herself as feminine, he sees her as helpless and dependent.
6. He sees himself as masculine, she sees him as overbearing and domineering.

Continuing with interpersonal perception as the interpretation of

other acts of behavior. we might have:

1. She winks at him in friendly complicity and he sees it as seductive.
2. She refuses to kiss him goodnight out of self-respect but he interprets it as a rejection of him.
3. A child who is told by his mother to wear a sweater may resent her as coddling him, but to her it may seem to be simply a mark of natural concern.

Vincent (1973) identifies interpersonal perception from a dating and courtship situation:

The male may think that the female thinks he is lacking in masculinity unless he makes a sexual approach. The female's monologue may include her impression of him as a highly sexed individual and her impression that he won't date her again unless she responds positively to his sexual approach. Consequently, they may engage in coitus before either of them is ready for this experience (p.

Laing (1964) reduces the interpersonal perception of a couple to a dyadic schema with simple notations:

1. The Own person (i.e. male) as M.
 - A. The way the Own person (M) sees himself, $M \rightarrow M$.
 - B. The way the Own person (M) sees the Other (F),
 $M \rightarrow F$.
 - C. The way the Own person (M), sees the Other's (F) view of himself, $M \rightarrow (F \rightarrow M)$.
2. The Other person (i.e. female) as F.
 - A. The way the Other person (F) sees herself, $F \rightarrow F$.
 - B. The way the Other person (F), sees the Own, $F \rightarrow M$.
 - C. The way the Other person (F), sees the Own's (M) view

of herself, $F \rightarrow (M \rightarrow F)$.

Superimposing Laing's notations over the aforementioned interpersonal situation drawn from Vincent's courtship and dating we have the thrust of interpersonal perception:

The male (M) may think that the female (F) thinks he is lacking in masculinity unless he makes a sexual approach, $M \rightarrow (F \rightarrow M)$. The female's (F) monologue may include her impression of him as a highly sexed individual, $F \rightarrow M$, and that he will not date her again unless she responds positively to his sexual approach, $F \rightarrow (M \rightarrow F)$. Consequently they may engage in coitus before either of them is ready for this experience.

Essentially, couples often do not interact with each other but rely upon impressions and projections (Vincent, 1973). Relying upon impressions short-circuits genuine relationships and bogs the dyad down in conflict.

The perceptions of an individual regarding self and spouse have been shown to be associated with marital studies in a considerable number of studies (Preston, Peltz, Mudd and Froscher, 1952; Dymond, 1954; Corsini, 1956; Eastmen, 1958; Luckey, 1960a; Pickford, Signori and Rempel, 1966; Hurley and Silvert, 1966; Taylor, 1967).

The importance of interpersonal perception within the dyadic framework is the positive correlation with courtship progress. Murstein (1972) found that the ability to predict the partner's self is predictive of good courtship progress six months later.

According to Klermer (1970) inherent in a love relationship is the ability to perceive the intended spouses personality needs:

A deep love relationship follows from a casual acquaintance when there is the unusual ability on the part of the individual to sense and fulfill the psychological needs of the other individual. Fancy clothes, expensive autos and aftershave lotion are relatively

impotent when compared to the addicting power of being able to understand, reassure and respond to the other individual (P. 77).

Perceptive analysis of a partner's true emotional dynamics is a critical factor in need-meeting. The relationship which continues to grow stronger with the passing of years is inevitably the one in which each person can recognize and meet the permanent and changing needs of the spouse. The ability to perceive accurately is indispensable to a healthy marital relationship as there are sometimes changes in direction and even in intensity of emotional needs. Thus, Satir (1970) speaks of the family as "nurturing."

Within the area of interpersonal perception and sex difference in perceptions, Murstein (1972) studied 98 couples and within the perceptual scores found the male to be a more important perceptual target than the female. In accounting for this disproportionate distribution of power in favor of the male, Murstein (1972) draws on the historical fact that men have manifested greater control over women than vice-versa and continue to do so despite both economical and social changes. With mate selection being less than democratic and equalitarian, the female stands to lose more by the termination of the relationship than does the male. With this distribution of power, the female focuses on the male's needs to a greater extent than vice-versa and thereby becomes a more accurate predictor.

With 112 couples serving as respondents to the 26 items on the Interpersonal Check List, Luckey (1964) found that satisfaction in marriage was related significantly to the congruency of the husband's self concept and that held of him by his wife, but was found unrelated to the agreements of the concepts the wife holds of herself and that which

her husband holds of her.

Both Murstein (1972) and Luckey (1960a) investigations agree with the antecedent findings of Burgess and Locke (1945) that it is the wife who makes the greatest adjustment in marriage from which the investigators concluded the husband stands as the most important perceptual target in the success of the marriage. "Since the wife does most of the adjusting it is to her benefit to know what she's adjusting to" (Luckey, 1960a, p. 157).

Further research into the sex differences of perception finds social psychologists writing of woman as having "a greater tendency toward stereotyping than men" (Beach and Wertheimer, 1961, p. 367). Exline (1963) has reported that women, more than men, seem to focus more on visual cues. When the option exists, Nidorf and Crockett (1964) report that women seek more information about others than men do.

In short, Luckey (1960a) identifies perception as the basis on which marital expectations, understanding and communication are largely dependent; important to the satisfaction of the marriage. Accurate perceptions foster a more appropriate response to the other as each partner is better able to anticipate the other's feelings and gear expectations accordingly. A determinant in the person perception process is the relationship itself. Pastore (1960a, 1960b) found that the qualities seen in the other depends on how well the one perceiving likes the individual perceived. The tendency to assume similarity seems to be strengthened when the judge (the perceiver) likes the object person (the one being perceived), (Secord, Backman and Eachus, 1964). Our perception of other's feelings have been shown to depend on how we feel toward them (Taguiri, 1968).

Katz (1963) writes that "individuals tend to overestimate the probability of strongly desired traits" (p. 213). Heider (1958) refers to this as the principle of cognitive balance (i.e. high need satisfaction husbands who strongly desire that their wives appear well, tended to overestimate).

In researching self-disclosure, Jourard (1970) devised a questionnaire for measuring the amount of personal information of various types that an individual imparts to others. He found that the tendency to talk about oneself to job associates varied with how much one liked them. Extending Jourard's findings to married couples, Katz (1963) found that the degree to which personality needs are satisfied in marriage is reflected in one's evaluation of and ability to interact effectively with the spouse.

Communication

Vincent (1973) identifies the lack of marital communication as a major source of difficulty in leading to inaccurate perceptions and perceptual disparity. This misunderstanding results from a failure in the communicative matrix.

Consequently, Satir (1970) proposes a dyadic "checking out" of all familial communications to maintain an authentic level of interpersonal relationships as opposed to relying on inferences and intuition. For example, if one spouse remarks:

1. "That picture is ugly, isn't it?"
2. "She is selfish, isn't she?"
3. "Yes, she was feeling such and such."
4. "That certainly is the right way."

5. "Yes, women are like that."

Then, functional communication occurs when clarification is attempted (e.g. "What do you mean when you say that the picture is ugly?"). Verbal interchange is dysfunctional unless the receiver of the message qualifies the message to prevent inaccurate spouse perceptions (Knox, 1971). The marital unit is then operating with specific information and need no longer rely on generalizations, assuming or attributing to the spouse ones own perceptions. Validation of feeling and information must occur or the dyad will attribute motive, intention and experience to the other (Laing, 1966).

Klemer (1970) infers that communication and interpersonal perception are necessarily akin as "perception is directly related to ones own relatibility" (p. 81). Essentially, we do not interact with people but with our impressions of people. This is one of the fundamental difficulties fostering communication difficulties (Vincent, 1973). Vincent (1973) further illustrates the problems arising from relying on impressions rather than communicating:

1. Wife: "You said . . . and furthermore you said it because!"
Husband: "I did not! I said . . . ! I didn't even know!"
2. Wife: "Yes, you did. I know what you think about me. You think . . ."
Husband: "You're wrong! That's not what I think at all. I think that. . ."

Inaccurate perceptions and impressions, then, can be remedied and that only by validation through communication. Lederer and Jackson (1968) identify faulty communication as one of the major causes of breakdown in otherwise workable marriages. Other writers (Ard and

Ard, 1969; Bardill, 1966) have highlighted the importance of open, honest communication and the sharing of feelings and concerns in intimate relationships such as marriage. Back and Wyden (1969) and Brammer and Shostrum (1960) have emphasized the destructive effects on marital stability of quarrels characterized by ineffective communication. Other studies have shown a positive relationship between communication and marital adjustment (Charney, 1969; Karlson, 1960; Levinger and Senn, 1967; Locke, Sabagh and Thomas, 1956; Navran, 1967).

Because of the importance of communication in marriage, D'Augelli, Deyss, Gurney, Hershenberg and Sborfsky (1974) are concerned that dating couples be equipped with communication skills. Even more importantly, they feel, are those engaged couples planning to marry who will need interpersonal skills in managing their relationships.

In a consideration of marital satisfaction as it relates to perception, Luckey (1960a) concluded that when individuals perceive similarly and frames of reference are thus shared, communication is easier and the relationship is more satisfactory.

Personality

Of the numerous factors associated with marital success, personality stands as one of the most important. In identifying four basic needs important in marital relationships of all ages, Stinnett, Collins and Montgomery (1971) identified personality fulfillment as being positively associated with marital success.

Lantz and Snyder (1969) research further indicates that personality characteristics of the marriage partners to be significantly related to marriage success or failure. Though research fails to

identify a single personality type which guarantees marital success, Stroup (1963) does suggest, however, that a generally healthy personality increases the chances for marital success.

In identifying those personality characteristics associated with marriage success, Lantz and Snyder (1969) enumerates:

1. Emotional maturity and stability.
2. Self-control.
3. Ability to demonstrate affection.
4. Considerate of others.
5. Optimistic.
6. Ability to overcome feelings of anger.
7. Willingness to take responsibility.

The literature (Terman (1938; Burgess and Wallin, 1953; Locke, 1956; Burgess and Cottrell, 1939) reports on those characteristics strongly associated with marital failure:

1. An inconsiderate and critical attitude toward others; a tendency to disregard the feelings of others; finding fault with and disapproving of others behavior.
2. Show little interest in others.
3. An unhappy temperament; tendency to be pessimistic rather than optimistic.
4. Tendency to be domineering.
5. Neurotic behavior; tendency to be moody; get feelings hurt easily and become bothered by useless thoughts.
6. An extreme degree of self-sufficiency; tendency to face trouble alone to avoid consulting others.
7. A lack of self-confidence; tendency to doubt ones ability,

worth and judgment.

In Terman's (1939) well-known study of 792 couples, those personality traits which characterized happily married women are:

1. Kindly attitudes toward others.
2. Expect kindly attitudes from others.
3. Does not easily take offense.
4. Not unduly concerned about the impressions they make upon others.
5. Does not look upon social relationships as rivalry situations.
6. Are cooperative.
7. Are not annoyed by advice from others.
8. Frequently have ministering attitudes.
9. Enjoy activities that bring educational and pleasurable opportunities to others.
10. Like to do things for the dependent or underprivileged.
11. Are methodical and painstaking in their work.
12. Are careful in regard to money.
13. Have expressed attitudes that imply self-assurance and a decidedly optimistic outlook upon life.

Contrarily, unhappily married women were expressed as:

1. Characterized by emotional tenseness.
2. Inclined toward ups and downs of mood.
3. Give evidence of deep-seated inferiority feelings to which they react by aggressive attitudes rather than by timidity.
4. Are inclined to be irritable and dictatorial.
5. Have compensatory mechanism resulting in restive stirrings, as evidenced by becoming active joiners, aggressive in

business, and over-anxious in social life.

6. Strive for wide circle of acquaintances; are more concerned with being important than being liked.
7. Are egocentric.
8. Have little interest in benevolent and welfare activities unless these activities offer personal recognition.
9. Like activities fraught with opportunities for romance.
10. Are more inclined to be conciliatory in attitudes toward men than toward women.
11. Are impatient and fitful workers.
12. Dislike cautious types of work that require methodical and painstaking effort.
13. In politics, religion and social ethics are more often radical.
14. Show little interest in others.

Those personality traits characterizing happily married husbands were listed as:

1. Have even and stable emotional tone.
2. Are cooperative.
3. Show attitudes toward women that reflect equalitarian ideals.
4. Have benevolent attitudes toward inferiors and the underprivileged.
5. Are conservative in attitudes.
6. Tendency to be unself-conscious and somewhat extroverted.
7. Show superior initiative.
8. Have a greater tendency to take responsibility.
9. Show a greater willingness to give close attention to detail.

10. Like methodical procedures and methodical people.
11. Are saving and cautious in money matters.
12. Have a favorable attitude toward religion.
13. Strongly uphold the sex mores and other social conventions.

Those personality traits utilized to describe unhappy husbands were similar to those of the unhappy wives:

1. Are inclined to be moody and somewhat neurotic.
2. Are prone to feelings of social inferiority.
3. Dislike being conspicuous in public.
4. Are highly reactive to social opinion.
5. Often compensate for a sense of social insecurity by domineering attitudes.
6. Take pleasure in commanding roles over business dependents or women.
7. Withdraw from playing inferior roles or competing with superiors.
8. Often compensate by daydreams and power fantasies.
9. Are sporadic and irregular in their habits of work.
10. Dislike detail and methodical attitudes.
11. Dislike saving money.
12. Like to wager.
13. More often express irreligious attitudes.
14. More inclined to radicalism in sex morals and politics.

Luckey (1964) summarized the personality traits positively related to marital satisfaction as being : cooperative, generous, conventional and responsible. Those characteristics contributing negatively to marital relationships are those extremes in personality (e.g. dictator-

ial or passive; submissive or demanding).

Under this broad umbrella of personality and its relationship to marital success, Murstein and Glaudin (1966) indicate a good balance of traits as important and that there is some relationship between negative types of personality characteristics and unhappiness in a marital relationship. Literature by Dean (1966 and 1968) suggests the positive correlation between emotional stability and marital happiness. Hicks and Platt (1970) report personality factors as weighing heavily in marital satisfaction - especially in companionship marriages.

In a study of marital satisfaction and the relationship to perceived personality traits of some 80 married couples, Luckey (1964) found those traits positively related to marital satisfaction were: cooperativeness, responsiveness and generosity. Subjects in satisfactory marriage relationships saw both themselves and their mates as predominately warm, loving persons. Lack of marital satisfaction was closely associated with being skeptical, blunt, aggressive, cold and hostile.

In juxtaposition to personality extremes, overall adaptability and flexibility are positively associated with marital success. Such personality elasticity affects the marriage partners ability or non-ability to resolve conflict (Hicks and Platt (1970; Keirn and Tallman, 1972). Clements (1967) is supportive of this and identifies a stable couple as more willing to modify their behavior. Summarily, Hicks and Platt (1970) report personality factors as weighing heavily in marital satisfaction - especially within the confines of a companionship emphasis.

Mate Selection

There can be little doubt that our society is oriented largely toward marriage, as well over 90 per cent of adult men and women are married or will marry before they die (Murstein, 1970). The sociology of marital choice therefore, concerns itself with the question of whom to marry?

The theoretical perspective on mate selection calls to fore such names as Winch (1962); Kirkchoff and Davis (1962); Murstein (1970); Hill and Katz (1958) and Reiss (1960). On the psychoanalytic end of the spectrum, some have propounded marital choice as largely unconscious (Jung, 1964 and Freud, 1957). Opposite these are the theories that marital choice is the result of a conscious decision. Strauss (1946) holds that mate selection occurs on the basis that an individual possesses an image of an ideal spouse and the presence of this image guides the spouse election process.

Sociologists Kernodle (1956); Coombs (1961) and Reiss (1960) place a great deal of stock in sociological variables as race, propinquity, socioeconomic status and educational level as factors determining the pool of eligibles.

Winch's (1958) theory of complementary needs in mate selection embrace the hypothesis that individuals in an attempt to satisfy their own needs, tend to select spouses who will meet the need-pattern. Thus, Winch (1967) hypothesized that highly educated, marry highly educated; Catholics were more likely to marry Catholics and blacks marry blacks, etc. Contrary to Winch's theory of complementary needs, Bowerman and Day (1956); Schellenberg and Bee (1960); Murstein (1976)

and Levenger, Senn, and Jorgensen (1970) offer studies evidencing a homogamy in personality characteristics within the psychodynamics of couple structure. Prior research of Burgess and Wallin (1953) report the tendency for homogamous union regarding the personality traits of engaged couples. Berardo and Nye (1973) report "in no characteristic - personality, social or physical - did this study find statistical evidence that opposites attract" (p. 117).

Kerkchoff and Davis (1962) refined somewhat the study of complementary needs with the advent of their filter model. Their data suggests that a couple's relationship progresses through stages. Social homogamy (race, social class, religion, etc.) serve as the first filtering factor which screens out people from different social categories. The second filter is value consensus. Those who fail to agree on value consensus break off the relationship. From the Kirkchoff and Davis model, Murstein (1970) launched an investigation along similar lines with a slightly different filter model - stimulus, value and role (SVR). SVR involves a series of sequential steps:

1. Stimulus - "In an 'open field' where attraction is not forced, one person may be drawn to another because of his perception of the other's physical, social or reputational attributes" (Gruenbaum and Christ, 1976, p. 175). This stage of the relationship is crucial, for if the other person fails to provoke sufficient attraction (i.e. stimuli), no further contact is sought.
2. Value - After the couple have determined they have sufficient interest in one another, they begin to explore areas of attitudes and values. They assess this value compatibility

usually through verbal interaction..

3. Role - What does one expect of the other sex in a marital relationship? Herein lies the field of inquiry for the third stage. This role stage is the last in the time sequence leading to marital choice.

Katz and Hill (1958) proffered a propinquity model which concluded:

1. People marry within a field of eligibles that is culturally defined. For example, middle-class girls prefer to marry middle-class men.
2. Within normative fields of eligibles, the propinquity of marriage varies directly with the probability of interaction.
3. The probability of interaction is proportional to the ratio of opportunities at a given distance over intervening opportunities.

While love is supposed to override all other considerations, Thaibut and Kelly (1939) and Homans (1961) pioneered the principle of exchange - "If it appears that one could have a choice among several eligible partners, all of whom rank above his comparison level, he would choose the one who would seem to offer the most profit in marriage" (Berardo and Nye, 1976, p. 121). "In weighing the liabilities and assets of a potential spouse, men tend to give more weight to physical attractiveness in a partner than women do, whereas women give greater weight to the professional aspirations of a partner" (Gruenbaum and Christ, 1976, p. 178).

In summation, Berardo and Nye (1976) bring the sociology of mate selection into perspective:

In showing alternative paths to marriage, it is necessary to remember that in actual experience both affective and rational components enter into the decision-making of most individuals. Also, although most individuals move through a considerable time period of increasing involvement, an occasional person makes the decision almost instantly through "love at first sight" or a "rational" decision that this partner provides exactly what one wants in a spouse" (Berardo and Nye, 1976, p. 123).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The data reported in this paper focuses upon college students drawn from Northeastern Oklahoma College and Oklahoma State University. This analysis is based upon the response of these 38 engaged couples to the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis.

The age span ranged from 17 to 24 years. The average amount of time from point of dating to engagement was 14 months. Average time from engagement to projected marriage date was 9 months. The mean age of the males was 21 and the mean age of the females was 20.

These couples were selected in part on the basis of being involved in premarital counseling for the purpose of premarital preparation. Others were located as a result of having attended a premarital preparation seminar conducted on the campus of Northeastern Oklahoma College.

Instrument

The Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (T-JTA) was utilized in this project to determine the interpersonal perceptions of the engaged couples. As a multi-trait analysis designed to measure personality variables or behavioral tendencies. The T-JTA consists of 180 items

equally divided among nine personality traits. Each trait is coupled with its opposite: (a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted) (c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive-responsive (inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective (objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-disciplined (impulsive). These traits represent attitudes and feelings which play a significant role in personal adjustment and interpersonal relationships. The T-JTA traits are defined on pages

To measure the construct validity of the T-JTA, correlations were computed with other personality tests. The personality tests selected for comparison with the T-JTA were the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Correlations between the T-JTA and the EPPS and the MMPI were reported and did support the construct validity of the T-JTA traits (The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, 1970)

The T-JTA possesses adequate internal consistency and stability over two weeks' time but "the test was designed primarily to provide an evaluation in visual form showing a person's feelings about himself at the time when he answered the questions" (Taylor, 1968). The T-JTA Attitude Scale was constructed by correlating items with the MMPI K Scale and selecting items which best predicted K scores on the basis of multiple regression analysis. There was a marked, high correlation between the T-JTA Attitude Scale and the MMPI K scale which suggests the Attitude Scale should be useful in determining the test-taking bias of individuals completing the T-JTA (The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, 1970). The Mental Measurements Yearbook summarizes the T-JTA as a "carefully constructed test which might very well be use-

ful in individual, premarital and marital counseling" (p. 959).

While personality profiles are not presented as a panacea to marital or premarital adjustment, they may provide a means of identification and opportunity for exploration of the dyadic relationship (Stephens, 1968). Various scales have been developed to measure marital phenomena. (e.g. Burgess and Cottrell, 1939; Locke, 1956; Burgess and Wallin, 1944; Katz, 1963) Blood (1969) is careful to indicate that these scales are concerned with:

the skill component of success in marriage. For example items deal with happiness, family background, personal intelligence, education, income, religiosity, and sociability. These contribute to an individuals marital success to be sure, but they affect his chance of marrying anyone. They fail to measure the compatibility of one particular couple (p. 59).

Continuing with Blood's observation, the emotional dynamics have to a great extent been omitted by the paper and pencil predictors. In juxtaposition to these social components (i.e. economic, religious, education, etc.) the very thrust of interpersonal perception and the T-JTA in particular is within the psychodynamics of the forming dyad.

Attitude Scale

One of the arguments against pencil-and-paper tests of emotionally meaningful matters is the subjects are aware they are to reveal private feelings. The extent of disclosure of both socially desirable and undesirable traits is under the subjects control of just how much he shows or hides (Laing, 1966).

Of the tests designed to predict and measure some degree of marital success (e.g. Burgess, Wallin, 1953), the test items are transparent

or biased towards socially desirable responses (Schulman, 1974). Furthermore, Schulman adds:

Even the most naive respondent could tell where he or she was answering in a way that would justify or condemn the marriage. If we presume that engaged couples have a strong emotional investment in believing that their marriage will succeed, then it seems probable that they will be biased toward giving socially desirable responses (p. 139).

In addition to the multi-trait analysis, the T-JTA inventory contains 20 items consisting of subjective estimations of the inventory. This test-taking bias is reflected in the Sten score. While not precluding "transparency" or the selection of "socially desirable" answers, the Sten score does reflect the test-taking bias and the reluctance to be objective.

The Attitude Score obtained on this scale will fall into one of three attitudinal categories: (a) high (b) neutral (c) low. The Neutral category includes scores lying within the area of one Standard Deviation below and above the Mean. When the score falls within this middle range:

...the indication is that the person has answered the questions in a frank, open, and straightforward manner, and that there was little tendency to be over-critical or overly favorable to self. It may therefore be assumed that there has been little test-taking bias shown by the individual (Taylor, 1968, p. 10).

A high score on the Attitude Scale indicates:

...a strongly defensive feeling on the part of the person taking the T-JTA. For whatever reason, the individual is unable or unwilling to see or rate himself honestly and objectively and has given himself 'the benefit of the doubt' in responding to the questions...When the Attitude Scale is very high such results may in fact be revealing only wishful thinking on the part of the individual...the determination to make a favorable impression even at the expense of the truth. (Taylor, 1968, p. 10).

Opposite the individual who is bent on proclaiming his own superior virtues by over-evaluation is the individual who answers the T-JTA in a self-depreciating manner. Low scores on the Attitude scale may reflect a tendency to appear worse than he actually is. When a low score appears in the rating of the intended spouse, there exists the possibility that he has been overly critical of the person described.

MID Score

The answer sheet is constructed to provide for one of three possible alternative responses to each item:

+ MID -

1. --- Plus (+) means "decidedly Yes" or "Mostly so."
2. --- MID means "undecided."
3. --- Minus (-) means "decidedly no" or "mostly not so."

The MID column, then, expresses indecision about an item and reflects lack of understanding or a vague perception. The MID scores, become valuable clinically in that they pinpoint specific areas of insufficient cognitions and serve as indicators of lack of knowledge. In administering the T-JTA profile, the subjects were specifically instructed to avoid MIDS whenever possible. These instructions were also specified on the front of the test booklet.

T-JTA Criss-Cross

This psychological profile has been constructed so that an individual may respond to an item as it applies to self or as it may apply to a fiance. The Criss-Cross is a method in which one person records his

impression or evaluation of another. Each subject answered the 180 questions as they apply to the intended spouse. The Criss-Cross is used as a series of interlocking profiles of self-evaluations superimposed over spouse-evaluation; distinguishing areas of accurate or disparate perceptions within the couple relationship - calling attention to how much or how little the two understand each other.

Trait Identification

In order to realize the purpose of this field of inquiry the T-JTA was selected to measure interpersonal perception. This psychological inventory consists of 180 items which are equally divided among the nine personality traits measured by the profile. Each of the nine traits is paired with its opposite:

Nervous (Composed)

This scale is defined as a state or condition frequently characterized by a tense, high-strung or apprehensive attitude. Its opposite, Composed, is characterized by a calm, relaxed and tranquil attitude on life.

Depressive (Light-hearted)

Depressive is here defined as being pessimistic, discouraged, or dejected in feeling - tone or manner. The items provide indications or feelings of being unwanted, of not belonging, of being unimportant or unappreciated as well as a tendency to be easily disheartened by criticism and discouraged because of a lack of self-confidence. Its opposite Light-hearted, is characterized by a cheerful and optimistic

attitude.

Active-Social (Quiet)

A delineation of this scale projects an Active-Social person as being energetic, enthusiastic and socially involved. A subject rating high on this scale would be considered a "go-getter" keeping very much "on the go." Antithetical to this type personality are the indicators showing preference for a more inactive, restful, quiet life, for being alone rather than with people and for little participation in social activities.

Expressive-Responsive (Inhibited)

Spontaneous and affectionate are here referred to as Expressive-Responsive. Questions in this category are designed to measure the ability to express warmth, friendliness and cordiality as well as personal and intimate expressions of such feelings. Subjects high in this category tend to be more friendly and responsible in contacts with people. Conversely, Inhibited is portrayed by restrained, unresponsive or repressed behavior. Tending towards the Inhibited end of the continuum reflects the inability to express tender feelings and the tendency to be reserved and repressed.

Sympathetic (Indifferent)

This scale is here defined as being kind, understanding and compassionate. The items measuring a Sympathetic quality include the capacity for empathy, forgiveness, compassion and a sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others. Sympathy includes a sense of concern.

The antithesis, Indifferent, is expressed by the indicators, insensitivity and unfeeling attitudes; a tendency to be strict, thoughtless, inconsiderate and slow to recognize the needs of family and friends.

Subjective (Objective)

The Subjective personality is defined as being emotional, illogical and self-absorbed. The items in this category include indications of emotionality which tend to interfere with impartial and objective thinking. Because of neurotic sensitivity, the Subjective personality often lacks the ability to judge the situation realistically. Specific items include tendencies to be overly jealous, suspicious or self-conscious as well as the tendency to mis-interpret the motives of others. Acute subjectivity short-circuits the ability to think and act logically and frequently indicates preoccupation with self. At the other extreme, Objective is that fair-mindedness, reasonable and logical attitudes.

Dominant (Submissive)

The items under Dominant include those characteristics which are indicative of ego-strength, such as being influential with others. It includes self-assurance, confidence and leadership. The Dominant scale measures the ability to show initiative. In contrast, Submissive is indicated by the tendency to follow, to rely too much on other people, to give way to their wishes and seek peace at any cost and to be easily persuaded or taken advantage of by others.

Hostile (Tolerant)

The Hostile scale is intended to reflect the critical, argumentative and punitive personality. Subjects will be projected as high on this scale when they show a tendency to be critical or overly inconsiderate in attitude or manner. Those attitudes are more specifically measured by items which include the tendency to be superior, overbearing and impatient. Hostile reactions may "tell others off." Tolerance, on the other hand, is measured by items which show respect for other human beings and freedom from prejudice.

Self-Discipline (Impulsive)

Controlled, persevering and methodical are indicators of the self-disciplined. Characteristics of neatness, orderliness, the ability to organize and plan, the inclination to set goals and avoid frequent shifts. The person high on this scale controls his impulsiveness to obtain defferred advantages. A low level of self-discipline reflects a tendency to vascillate in projects and seldom follow through. In short, an uncontrolled, changeable and disorganized personality type.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses to be examined were:

1. There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning each of the nine personality traits measured by the T-JTA: (a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted) (c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive-responsive (inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective (objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-disciplined (impulsive).
2. There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning each of the nine personality traits enumerated by the T-JTA.
3. There is no significant relationship between sex and the respondent's Attitude score (which reflects the degree of test-taking bias in rating self and spouse on the total responses to the 180 items on the T-JTA).
4. Females are significantly more accurate in their perceptions of the intended spouse than vice versa concerning each of the nine personality traits enumerated by the T-JTA.

Analysis of Data

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the background characteristics of the respondents. Percentages and frequencies were

also used to examine the respondent's self-rating and rating of fiancée on each of the nine personality traits as measured by the T-JTA.

The t-test for related samples was used to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse concerning each of the nine personality traits measured by the T-JTA: (a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted) (c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive-responsive (inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective (objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-disciplined (impulsive).
2. There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning each of the nine personality traits enumerated by the T-JTA.
3. There is no significant relationship between sex and the respondent's Attitude score (which reflects the degree of test-taking bias in rating self and spouse on the 180 items in the T-JTA questionnaire).
4. Females are significantly more accurate in their perceptions of the intended spouse than vice versa concerning each of the nine personality traits enumerated by the T-JTA.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

Table I presents a description of the 38 engaged couples who participated in this investigation. The respondents range in age from 17 to 23 years of age with the greatest distribution falling in the age category 19 to 20 years (52.63%). The smallest proportions were in the age categories 17 to 18 years (9.21%); 21 to 22 years (28.91%), and 22 to 23 years (9.21%).

The average amount of time from point of dating to time of engagement was 14 months. Elapsed time from engagement to projected marriage date was 8.8 months.

The respondent's range in dating was from 2 to 24 months. The greatest per cent fell in the category 9 to 16 months (39.47%). The other categories realized the following distribution: 1 to 8 months (34.21%); 17 to 24 months (26.31%).

The range of engagement was from 1 to 24 months. The category 1 to 8 realized the greatest distribution with 23 couples (60.52%) falling into this range. The engaged category of 17 to 24 months included 5.3% of the couples.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variables	Classification	No.	%
Age	17-18 Years	7	9.21
	19-20	40	52.63
	21-22	22	28.94
	23-24	7	9.21
Sex	Male	38	50.00
	Female	38	50.00
Length of Dating Relationship	1-8 Months	13	34.21
	9-16	15	39.47
	17-24	10	26.31
Length of Engaged Relationship	1-8 Months	23	60.52
	9-16	13	34.21
	17-24	2	5.16

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning each of the nine personality traits measured by the T-JTA: (a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted) (c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive-responsive (inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective (objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-disciplined (impulsive).

The t test for related samples was used to examine this hypothesis. The results are presented below.

Hypothesis 1 (a). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait nervous (composed).

The T-JTA consists of 20 statements for each of the nine personality traits. In order to obtain accuracy of perception, the mean score for the male's perception of the intended spouse and the female's perception of self were compared from which a mean difference emerged.

As Table II indicates, there is no significant disparity between the way the female rates herself (14.05) and the male's perception of her (15.13).

Hypothesis 1 (b). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait depressive (light-hearted).

Table II reveals a female self-rating of 11.31 on the T-JTA trait depressive (light-hearted). Compared with the male's spouse rating of 11.34, no misperception seems evident as the mean score of

.03 yields no significant difference. In responding to the 20 items on this Trait, the male accurately perceived his intended spouse in terms of her tendencies to be either an optimistic personality, characterized by a cheerful attitude or a personality characterized by feeling of being unwanted and rejected.

Hypothesis 1 (c). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait active-social (quiet).

Exposing the data of T-JTA trait active-social (quiet) to the t test for related samples resulted in no significant difference in the male's perception of the intended spouse concerning her behavioral tendencies toward social participation and her self perception. A female self rating of 26.21 and the male's spouse rating of 25.53 resulted in a mean difference score of .68.

Hypothesis 1 (d). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait expressive-responsive (inhibited).

With regards to how the female feels about herself concerning her ability to be spontaneous, affectionate and capable of intimate expressions, a mean score of 31.71 emerged. The male's perception of her produced a mean score of 32.05. The mean difference of .36 reflected no significant difference and suggested little misperception by the male on this personality trait.

Hypothesis 1 (e). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait sympathetic (indifferent).

The male's evaluation of the female concerning her capacity for empathy, forgiveness, compassion and sensitivity to the needs of others, at 32.63, coincides with the female's evaluation of herself, 33.47. A mean difference of .84 did not reflect any significant difference.

Hypothesis I (f). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait subjective (objective).

In applying the t test to the data for T-JTA trait subjective (objective), no significant difference resulted from the male's rating of the fiancée versus her rating of self. The female scored herself at 14.92 while the male perceived her at 13.95, a mean difference of .97. Again, the male appears an accurate perceiver concerning this personality trait of the intended spouse.

Hypothesis I (g). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait dominant (submissive).

Regarding the personality trait dominant (submissive), reflecting the ego strengths of the subject, the female rates self at 19.71 while the male provides a spouse rating of 19.65. Concerning her tendencies toward being confident and self-assured, the male has a disparity score of but .06, indicating no significant difference existed.

Hypothesis I (h). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait hostile (tolerant).

Table II indicates no significant difference existed when the t test was applied to the female's self-rating and the male's rating of

her on the hostile (tolerant) trait. While the female rates herself at 8.95 the male envisions her at 10.05, with a mean difference of 1.1. Here again, no significant difference existed.

Hypothesis 1 (i). There is no significant difference between the male's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait self-discipline (impulsive).

Concerning the data on trait self-discipline (impulsive) the male expresses his largest misperception with a mean difference of 2.82. The male overestimates her and perceives her as being higher on the self-discipline scale than she perceives herself. The t value yielded a significant difference at the .05 level. The male rates his intended spouse at 24.74 and perceives her as a rather controlled and persevering personality type while the female rates herself at a lower score of 21.92.

TABLE II

T SCORE REFLECTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MALE'S PERCEPTION OF THE INTENDED SPOUSE AND THE SELF-PERCEPTION OF THE INTENDED SPOUSE ON EACH OF THE NINE PERSONALITY TRAITS MEASURED BY THE T-JTA

Trait	No.	Mean Score	Mean Difference	t	Level of Sig.
Nervous					
Male	38	15.13			
Female	38	14.05	1.08	.65	n.s.
Depressive					
Male	38	11.34			
Female	38	11.31	.03	1.32	n.s.

TABLE II (Continued)

Trait	No.	Mean Score	Mean Difference	†	Level of Sig.
Active-Social					
Male	38	25.53			
Female	38	26.21	.68	.51	n.s.
Expressive-Responsive					
Male	38	32.05			
Female	38	31.71	.36	.32	n.s.
Sympathetic					
Male	38	32.63			
Female	38	33.47	.84	.65	n.s.
Subjective					
Male	38	13.95			
Female	38	14.92	.97	.69	n.s.
Dominant					
Male	38	19.65			
Female	38	19.71	.06	.49	n.s.
Hostile					
Male	38	8.95			
Female	38	10.05	1.10	.50	n.s.
Self-Discipline					
Male	38	24.74			
Female	38	21.92	2.82	2.30	.05

Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning each of the nine personality traits enumerated by the T-JTA.

The † test for related samples was used to examine this hypothesis

with the results presented below.

Hypothesis II (a). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait nervous (composed).

The t test for related samples was utilized in determining if there was a significant difference in the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait nervous (composed). The male evaluated himself at 13.37 while the female perceived him at 9.58. A mean difference of 2.79 is significant at the .02 level indicating the female tends to underestimate his tendencies towards apprehension and tension.

This finding may be due to a sex role expectation that males internalize regarding not revealing their emotions or "holding them in" for fear of being thought of as less than masculine. This being true his fear of disclosure would make an accurate perception difficult.

Hypothesis II (b). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning the T-JTA trait depressive (light-hearted).

The difference between the female's misperception of the male regarding T-JTA trait depressive (light-hearted) is significant at the .01 level. The male scores himself at 10.16 and the female perceives him at 6.79. A mean difference score of 3.19 is the largest disparity score the female realizes in her estimations of the intended spouse.

This mean score of 3.19 may reflect Jourard's findings (1971) in a series of studies published over a six year period using a self-disclosure questionnaire that the male role will not allow him to dis-

close inner experiences resulting in men relating more impersonally to others than do women.

Hypothesis II (c). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait active-social (quiet).

Table III discloses a mean difference score of 2.18; a disparity reflecting no significant difference between the male's estimation of himself at 26.45 while the female evaluates him at 28.63.

Hypothesis II (d). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait expressive-responsive (inhibited).

In trying to evaluate the male's behavioral tendencies concerning his ability to express warmth and gestures of cordiality, the female mis-perceives the intended spouse by a mean difference of 3.08 reflecting a significant difference at the .01 level. While the male scored himself at 28.47, the female overestimated him at 31.45. This rating may reflect "wishful thinking" on the part of the female.

Hypothesis II (e). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait sympathetic (indifferent).

Table III indicates the female's accurate perception of the male regarding his being kind, understanding and sensitive. While the male rates self at 29.66 the female perceives him at 30.55. No significant difference is indicated.

Hypothesis II (f). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of

the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait (subjective (objective)).

When this hypothesis was subjected to the t test for related samples, a significant difference at .01 level was found, reflecting a significant disparity regarding the male's self image and the female's image of him. The males place themselves at 12.47 while the females underestimate them at 9.58 with a mean difference of 2.89.

Males evidently have a greater tendency to being overly jealous and self-conscious than females perceive. The females are placing the males towards the objective end of the continuum which coincided with a stereotypical image of males as breadwinners in the instrumental role. Females expect their intended spouses to think and act more logically than they really do.

Hypothesis II (g). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait dominant (submissive).

In examining the difference between the female's perception of the male and the male's self-perception on trait dominant (submissive) a mean difference of .13 resulted. The male's self-rating was 22.81 and the female's rating of the male was 22.68, indicating no significant difference.

Hypothesis II (h). There is no significant difference between the female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait hostile (tolerant).

No significant difference was found between the male and female scores on the male's behavioral tendencies on trait hostile (tolerant). As indicated in Table III a mean difference of 1.92 emerged.

Hypothesis II (i). There is no significant difference between the

female's perception of the intended spouse and the self-perception of the intended spouse concerning T-JTA trait self-discipline (impulsive).

Again the female overestimates the male in that she scores him at 24.50 while the male places himself at 22.47. Table III shows a mean difference of 2.03 which is not significant.

TABLE III

T SCORE REFLECTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FEMALE'S PERCEPTION OF THE INTENDED SPOUSE AND THE SELF-PERCEPTION OF THE INTENDED SPOUSE ON EACH OF THE NINE PERSONALITY TRAITS MEASURED BY THE T-JTA

Trait	No.	Mean Score	Mean Difference	t	Level of Sig.
Nervous					
Male	38	12.37	2.79	2.60	.02
Female	38	9.58			
Depressive					
Male	38	10.16	3.19	3.15	.01
Female	38	6.97			
Active-Social					
Male	38	26.45	2.18	1.61	n.s.
Female	38	28.63			
Expressive-Responsive					
Male	38	28.47	3.08	2.77	.01
Female	38	31.45			
Sympathetic					
Male	38	29.66	.89	.92	n.s.
Female	38	30.55			

TABLE III (Continued)

Trait	No.	Mean Score	Mean Difference	t	Level of Sig.
Subjective					
Male	38	12.47	2.89	2.85	.01
Female	38	9.58			
Dominant					
Male	38	22.81	.13	.12	n.s.
Female	38	22.68			
Hostile					
Male	38	12.08	1.92	1.49	n.s.
Female	38	10.16			
Self-Discipline					
Male	38	22.47	2.03	1.92	n.s.
Female	38	24.40			

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference between sex and the respondent's Attitude score (which reflects the degree of honesty in self-rating and spouse rating on the total responses to the 180 items on the T-JTA).

The t test for related samples was used to examine this hypothesis and the results are presented below. Exposure of this data to the t test found no significant difference to exist in the Attitude score on the total T-JTA questionnaire according to sex, as Table V indicates. The mean female Attitude score on the male was 25.10 while the mean

male Attitude score regarding the female was 22.97. With a t value of 1.34, no significant difference was found.

Concerning self-rating the mean Attitude score for males was 22.47 while the female's self-rating was 22.39. A mean difference of .08 indicated no significant difference.

The T-JTA Attitude scores fall into three categories:

1. Low Scores (0 to 17)
2. Neutral Scores (18-33)
3. High Scores (34-36)

Both self and spouse ratings fall into the Neutral category reflecting an aura of forthrightness and honesty in responding to the 180 items on the T-JTA questionnaire. This degree of candor calls into question the literature's emphasis on the prevalence of romanticism and idealization among engaged couples.

TABLE IV

T SCORES REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RESPONDENT'S ATTITUDE SCORE AND SEX

Sex	No.	Mean Attitude Score	Mean Difference	t	Level of Sig.
Self Rating					
Male	38	22.47	.08	4.98	n.s.
Female	38	22.39			
Spouse Rating					
Male	38	22.97	2.14	1.34	n.s.
Female	38	25.11			

Hypothesis V. Females are significantly more accurate in their perceptions of the intended spouse than vice versa concerning each of the nine personality traits enumerated by the T-JTA: (a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted) (c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive-responsive (inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective (objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-discipline (impulsive).

The t test for related samples was used to examine this hypothesis and the results are presented below. Table V reflects no significant difference in the accuracy of the interpersonal perceptions of males and females. These findings are not in agreement with other literature (Murstein, 1972; Luckey, 1964; Burgess and Locke, 1945) suggesting that the female is a more accurate perceiver than the male.

Utilization of the t test for related samples resulted in a mean difference score of interpersonal perception. Mean difference scores ranged from .24 on trait active-social (quiet) to 2.34 on T-JTA trait nervous (composed). No significant differences were realized on any of the traits.

Although these findings do not agree with previous research, they may portend a more equalitarian relationship between sexes. This is perhaps an indicator that the disproportionate distribution of power in favor of the males is declining.

TABLE VI

T VALUES REFLECTING THE MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FEMALE'S PERCEPTION OF THE MALE AND THE MALE'S PERCEPTION OF HIMSELF, COMPARED WITH THE MALE'S PERCEPTION OF THE FEMALE AND THE FEMALE'S PERCEPTION OF SELF

Personality Trait	No.	Mean Difference Score	t	Level of Sig.
Nervous	38	2.34	1.53	n.s.
Depressive	38	1.68	1.37	n.s.
Active-Social	38	.24	.23	n.s.
Expressive-Responsive	38	1.53	1.36	n.s.
Sympathetic	38	.26	.02	n.s.
Subjective	38	.26	.02	n.s.
Dominant	38	1.34	1.32	n.s.
Hostile	38	1.21	1.30	n.s.
Self-Discipline	38	.52	.57	n.s.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to measure the interpersonal perceptions of engaged couples concerning personality traits. The sample was composed of 39 engaged collegians drawn from Northeastern Oklahoma College and Oklahoma State University. The age classification ranged 17 to 24 years.

The instrument utilized for this inquiry was the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (T-JTA). This multi-trait analysis was designed to measure personality variables or behavioral tendencies. This scale consisted of 180 items equally divided among nine traits: (a) nervous (composed) (b) depressive (light-hearted) (c) active-social (quiet) (d) expressive responsive (inhibited) (e) sympathetic (indifferent) (f) subjective (objective) (g) dominant (submissive) (h) hostile (tolerant) (i) self-disciplined (impulsive).

The t test for related samples was used to reflect the differences between the female and male accuracy of perception of the intended spouse on each of the T-JTA traits. The variable of sex was correlated with the Attitude score to measure the test-taking bias of the respondents.

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the respondent's background characteristics. Mean scores on the nine T-JTA traits and Mids were obtained according to self and spouse-rating in order to

determine those areas of accurate, disparate and insufficient cognitions.

To ascertain the Attitude score (reflecting the test-taking bias) mean scores were utilized to reflect the degree of honesty in rating self and spouse.

The results of this study were as follows:

1. On eight of the nine T-JTA personality traits, the males proved significantly accurate in their perceptions of the female. On the T-JTA trait self-discipline (impulsive) the mean difference score of 2.82 implied a significant misperception at the .05 level.
2. According to t values, engaged females realized significant misperception on four of the eight T-JTA traits: (a) nervous (composed) at .02 level (b) depressive (lighthearted) at the .01 level (c) expressive-responsive (quiet) at the .01 level (d) subjective (objective) at the .01 level.
3. Mean Attitude scores reflecting the test-taking bias on self and spouse reflect honesty in the subjects responses to the 180 items on the T-JTA.
4. Concerning the accuracy of perception among engaged couples, there is no significant difference between males and females in perceiving the intended spouse.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The major conclusion which may be drawn from the results of this study is that with the emphasis on interpersonal competence (Mace, 1975; Cuber and Haroff, 1965; Burgess and Locke, 1945) engaged college couples

are not reflective of this emphasis upon affective relationships in their interpersonal perception. Unable to perceive correctly the intended spouse, results in need-meeting deficiencies.

To enhance the emotional dynamics of their relationship and optimize, ultimately, their marital relationship, engaged couples might well be exposed to the T-JTA and other instruments to foster increased mutual understanding and enhance need-perceiving capabilities.

Further studies might concern themselves with:

1. Background information which might give insight into etiological factors for inaccurate perception or accurate cognitions.
2. A large sample.
3. A study allowing for a greater distribution of persons representative of other socio-economic levels.
4. A longitudinal study of these couples into their married life.

The engaged couple often finds itself in a labyrinth of myth and romanticism which tends to confuse expectations of the marital relationship. What is vital today is not that professionals have a solution to marital problems, but that they help couples toward a clearer perception of their relationship. Precisely at this juncture, interpersonal perception and instruments such as the T-JTA can prove valuable by examining the region of behavioral tendencies. With engaged couples predicting future behavior on the basis of rather limited information, Murstein (1970) states the dilemma:

What will it be like to eat the spouse's cooking day after day? Will the spouse be able to keep a cool head when the baby refuses to drink the formula and cries to the point where husband and wife feel they are going berserk? Will the spouse be of comfort the

day the boss fires the individual for alleged indifference on the job?

Educators and counselors can help extricate the engaged dyad from the less than authentic and sometimes grossly confused relationship by equipping them with such communication skills that would negate relying on inferences and impressions. When the premarital unit is operating with specific information they need no longer rely on generalizations, assuming or attributing to the spouse their own misperceptions. Interpersonal skill training for engaged couples would serve as preventive measures to preclude some marital disruption. Those in the helping professions need not wait for marital pathology to surface before taking therapeutic measures. Premarital enrichment may well occur with the teaching of interpersonal attitudes and skills which the couple can apply to their present relationship and also to the forthcoming marital relationship.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, G. "Marriage Prediction Revisited." Long Island Consultation Center Journal, V (1967), 38-46.
- Ard, D. N., and C. C. Ard. Handbook of Marriage Counseling, Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1969.
- Bach, G. R., and P. Wyden. The Intimate Enemy, New York: William Morrow, 1968.
- Bardhill, D. R. "A Relationship Focused Approach To Marital Problems." Social Work, II (1966), 70-77.
- Beach, L., and M. Wertheimer. "A Free Response Approach to the Study of Personal Cognition." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LXII (1961), 367-374.
- Berardo, F., and I. Nye. The Family: Its Structure and Interaction. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1973.
- Bernard, Jessie. The Future of Marriage. New York : World Publishing Co., 1972.
- Blood, Robert O. Marriage. 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Brammer, L. M., and E. L. Shostrom, Therapeutic Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
- Bullmer, K. The Art of Empathy: A Manual for Improving Accuracy of Interpersonal Perception. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1975.
- Burgess, E., and P. Cottrell. Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1939.
- Burgess, E., and H. Locke. The Family: From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1945.
- Burgess, E., and P. Wallin. "Predicting Adjustment in Marriage from Adjustment in Engagement," American Journal of Sociology, II (1944), 737-751.
- Burgess, E., and P. Wallin. Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: Lippincott, (1953), 208-209.
- Bowman, H. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

- Charney, I. "Marital Love and Hate." Family Process. VIII (1969), 1-24.
- Clements, W. "Marital Interaction and Marital Stability: A Point of View and a Descriptive Comparison of Stable and Unstable Marriages." Journal of Marriage and Family, XXIX (1967), 697-702.
- Clinebell, Howard, and Charlotte Clinebell. The Intimate Marriage. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Coombs, R. "A Value Theory of Mate Selection." Family Life Coordinator. X (1961), 51.
- Corsini, R. "Understanding and Similarity in Marriage." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), 327-332.
- Cristal, H. and F. Tucker. "Managing Child Abuse Cases." Social Work, XX (1975), 392-395.
- Cuber, J., and P. Haroff. The Significant Americans. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1965.
- D'Augelli, A., C. Deyss, B. Guerney, B. Herschenberg, and S. Sborofsky. "Interpersonal Skill Training for Dating Couples." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XXI (1974), 385-389.
- Dean, D. "Psychotherapy and Romantic Love." American Journal of Psychotherapy, XVI (1962), 441-451.
- Dean, D. "Emotional Maturity and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (1966), 37-43.
- Dean, D. "Alienation and Marital Adjustment." Sociological Quarterly, IX (1968), 186-192.
- Dymond, R. "Interpersonal Perception and Marital Happiness." Canadian Journal of Psychology, VIII (1954), 164-171.
- Eastman, D. "Self Acceptance and Marital Happiness." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII (1958), 95-99.
- Evans, R. Conversations With Carl Jung. Princeton: Von Nostrand Reinhold, 1964.
- Exline, R. V. "Explorations in the Process of Person Perception: Visual Interpretation in Relation to Competition, Sex and the Need for Affiliation." Journal of Personality, XXXIV (1963), 14-20.
- Fersch, E., and J. Vering. "Divorce: Legal Requirements v. Psychological realities." in H. Gruenbaum and J. Christ (eds.), Contemporary Marriage: Structure, Dynamics and Therapy. Boston: Little Brown and Company, (1976), 103-120.

- Freud, S. "On Narcissism." In the Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. transl. and ed. by J. Strachey with others. London: Hogarth and Institute of Psycho-Analysis, XIV (1957), 90.
- Goode, W. "Dissolution of Family Role Systems." The Family. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964.
- Goode, W. After Divorce. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.
- Gruenbaum., and J. Christ, Contemporary Marriage: Structure, Dynamics and Therapy. Boston; Little Bown and Company, 1976.
- Heider, Fritz. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hicks, M., and M. Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties: in C. Broderick's A Decade of Family Research and Action, (1970), 553-554.
- Hobart, Charles W. "Disagreement and non-empathy During Courtship: A restudy." Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (1956), 317-332.
- Hollander, Edwin. Principles and Methods of Social Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press. 1971.
- Homans, G. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Form. New York: Harcourt, 1961.
- Hurley, J., and D. Silvert. "Mate-image Congruity and Marital Adjustment." Proceedings of the American Psychological Association Convention, (1966), 219-220.
- James, Williams. Psychology. Cleveland: Fine Editions, Press, 1948.
- Jourard, Sidney. The Transparent Self. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.
- Karlson, G. Adaptability and Communication in Marriage. New: Prentice Hall, 1960.
- Katz, A. "Implications of incongrous Perception." Journal of Marriage and Family Living, (1963), 205+210.
- Katz, A. M., and R. Hill "Residential Propinquity and Marital Selection: a Review of Theory, Method and Fact." Marriage and Family Living, XX(1958), 27-35.
- Keirn, D., and I. Tallman. "Spousal Adaptability: An Assessment of Marital Competence." Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXIV (1972), 247-256.

- Kerckhoff, A. C., and K. E. Davis. "Value Consensus and Need Complementarity in Mate Selection." American Sociological Review, XXVII (1962), 295-303.
- Kernodle, W. "Some Implications of the Homogamy-Complementary Needs Theories of Mate Selection for Sociological Research." Social Forces, XXXVIII (1956), 145.
- Kirkpatrick, C. The Family. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1963.
- Klemer, Richard H. Marriage and Family Relationships. New: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Knox, David. Marriage Happiness: A Behavioral Approach to Counseling. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1971.
- Kormavsky, M. "Blue-Collar Marital Disorganization." in Ira Reiss's Readings On the Family System. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., (1972), 489-502.
- Kotlar, S. "Middle-Class Marital Role Perceptions and Marital Adjustment." Sociology and Social Research, 1L (1965), 284-291.
- Laing, R. D. Self and Others. England: Pelican Press, 1961.
- Laing, R. D. Interpersonal Perception. New York: Springer Publishing Co, 1966.
- Lantz, H., and E. Snyder. Marriage. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Larson, Lyle. "Toward a Conceptual Framework of Multi-Level Interpersonal Perception in Families" Unpublished manuscript, University of Toronto, 1974.
- Lederer, William and Don Jackson. The Mirages of Marriages. Toronto: W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- Levinger, G., and D. Senn. "Disclosure of Feelings in Marriage." Merril-Palmer Quarterly, XIII (1967), 237-249.
- Lewis, Robert A. "A Longitudinal Test of a Developmental Framework for Premarital Dyadic Formation." Journal of Marriage and the Family. XXXVI (1974), 16-20.
- Luckey, E. "Marital Satisfaction and Congruent Self-Spouse Concepts." Social Forces, XXXIX (1960), 153-157.
- Luckey, E. "Implications for Marriage Counseling of Self-Perceptions and Spouse Perceptions." Journal of Counseling Psychology, VII (1960), 3-9.

- Luckey, E. "Marital Satisfaction and its Concomitant Perceptions of Self and Spouse." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XI (1964), 136-145.
- Locke, H., G. Sabauth, and M. Thomas. "Correlates of Primacy Communication and Empathy." Research Studies of the State College of Washington, XXIV (1956), 116-124.
- Mace, D., and V. Mace. "Marriage Enrichment: Wave of the Future." Family Coordinator, XXIV (1975), 132-136.
- Mangus, A. R. "Marital Satisfaction and its Association with Congruence of Perception." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960) 49-54.
- Moss, A. "Premarital Dyad." in C. Broderick's A Decade of Family Research and Action, (1970),
- Murstein, B., and V. Glaudin. "The Relationship of Marital Adjustment to Personality: A Factor Analysis of the Interpersonal Check List." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (1966), 37-43.
- Murstein, G. "The Relationship of Mental Health to Marital Choice and Courtship Progress." Journal of Marriage and the Family. XXIX (1967), 447-461.
- Murstein, B. "Stimulus-Value-Role: A Theory of Marital Choice." Journal of Marriage and the Family. XXXII (1970), 465-48.
- Murstein, B. "Person Perception, Marriage Adjustment and Social Desirability." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. (in press).
- Navran, L. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, VI (1967), 173-184.
- Nindorf, L. J., and W. H. Crockett. "Some Factors Affecting the Amount of Information Sought about Others." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XL (1964), 98-101.
- Otto, H. A. "What is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living, XXIV (1962), 77-81.
- Otto, H. A. "A Criteria for Assessing Family Strengths." Family Process, II (1963), 329-339.
- Parsons, T., "The Normal American Family" in M. Sussman's Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, (1968), 36-46.

- Pastore, N. "Attributed Characteristics of Liked and Disliked Persons." Journal of Social Psychology, LII (1960), 157-163.
- Pastore, N. "A New Note on Changing Toward Liked and Disliked Persons." Journal of Social Psychology, (1960), 173-175.
- Pickford, J., E. Signori, and H. Rempel. "The Intensity of Personality Traits In Relation to Marital Happiness." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (1965), 458-459.
- Pineo, A. "Disenchantment In Later Years of Marriage" in M. B. Sussman (ed.) Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, (1968), 393-402.
- Preston, M., W. L. Peitz, E. H. Mudd, and H. Bo Froscher. "Impressions of Personality as a Function of Marital Conflict." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 326-336.
- Reiss, I. Readings On the Family System. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Reiss, I. "Toward a Sociology of the Heterosexual Love Relationship." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), 139-145.
- Satir, Virginia. Conjoint Family Therapy: A Guide to Theory and Technique. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, Inc. 1964.
- Scanzoni, J. Sexual Bargaining: Power Politics in American Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Schellenberg, James A., and Lawrence S. Bee. "A Reexamination of the Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), 227-232.
- Schulman, Marion. "Idealization in Engaged Couples." Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXVI (1974), 139-141.
- Secord, P. F., C. W. Backman, and H. T. Eachus. "Effects of Imbalance In Self-Concept on the Perception of Persons." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LXVIII (1964), 442-446.
- Sirjamaki, J. "Cultural Configurations In the American Family." In Marvin Sussman's Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, (1968), 65-71.
- Somerville, Rose. Introduction to Family Life and Sex Education, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Stinnett, Nick. "Mate Selection." Unpublished manuscript, Oklahoma State University, 1974.

- Stinnett, N. J. Collins and J. Montgomery. "Marital Need Satisfaction of Older Husbands and Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (1970), 428-433.
- Stinnett, N., and Jim Walters. "An Important Decision." unpublished manuscript, Oklahoma State University, 1976.
- Strauss, A. "The Ideal and the Chosen Mate." American Journal of Sociology, LII (1946), 204.
- Stroup, A. Marriage and Family: Developmental Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Stuckert, R. P. "Role Perception and Marital Satisfaction: A Configurational Approach." Marriage and Family Living, XXV (1963), 415-419.
- Taguiri, R. "Person Perception." Handbook of Social Psychology. (Second Edition), Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley, (1968), 395-449.
- Taylor, Robert. Manual: Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis. Los Angeles, California: Psychological Publications Associates, 1967.
- Taylor, B. "Role Perception, Empathy and Marriage Adjustment." Sociology and Social Research, LII (1967). 22-34.
- Thaibut, J., and H. Kelly, The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley, 1939.
- Terman, Lewis. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1938.
- Tinkler, R. "Pressures Converging on the American Family." Unpublished manuscript, Abilene Christian University, 1976.
- U. S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstracts of the United States. 96th ed. Washington, D. C. : Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Vincent, Clark. Sexual and Marital Health: The Physician as Counselor. New York: Addison, 1973.
- Worthy, M., A. L. Gary, and G. M. Kahn. "Self-Disclosure as an Exchange Process." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, XIII (1969), 59-63.
- Winch, Robert. Mate Selection. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Winch, Robert. "Another Look at the Theory of Complimentary Needs in Mate Selection." Journal of Marriage and the Family. XXIX (1967), 756-762.

Wrong, Dennis. "The 'Break-up' of the American Family." in B. Adams and T. Weirath (eds.) Reading On the Sociology of the Family. Chicago: Markham (1971), 79-82.

APPENDIX

TAYLOR-JOHNSON TEMPERAMENT ANALYSIS

QUESTIONS

Mark your answers on the answer sheet. Do not mark on this booklet.
Please answer every question.

1. Is . . .by nature a forgiving person?
2. Does . . .take an active part in community affairs or group activities?
3. Is . . .relatively calm when others are upset or emotionally disturbed?
4. Can . . .put himself sympathetically in another person's place?
5. Does . . .have a marked influence on the thinking of family or associates?
6. Does . . .prefer a restful, inactive vacation to an energetic one?
7. Does . . . have difficulty concentrating while reading or studying?
8. Does . . .prefer to be a follower rather than a leader in group activities?
9. Does . . .lead a quiet life, without becoming involved in many relationships outside of home and work?
10. Does . . .take the initiative in making arrangements for family outings and vacations?
11. Does . . .make many unrealistic plans for the future, which later have to be abandoned?
12. Does . . .feel compassion for those who are weak or insecure?
13. Does . . .enjoy belonging to clubs or social groups?
14. Does . . .seek to keep peace at any price?
15. Is . . .easily bothered by noise and confusion?
16. Does . . .avoid physical exertion and strenuous activity?
17. Does . . .usually appear composed and serene?
18. Is . . .seriously concerned about social problems, such as poverty and unemployment, even when not directly affected by them?

19. Does . . . like to keep on the move in order not to waste time?
20. Is . . . a well-organized person who likes to do everything according to schedule?
21. Is . . . sensitive to the feelings and needs of any member of the family who is ill?
22. Does . . . act deliberately rather than impulsively?
23. Is . . . highly competitive in games, business, or personal relations?
24. Does . . . prefer to be alone rather than with people?
25. Does . . . feel uneasy when riding or driving in traffic?
26. Does . . . exercise regularly in order to keep in condition?
27. Is . . . more excitable than most people?
28. Does . . . like to entertain guests at home?
29. Does . . . like to be in charge and supervise others?
30. Is . . . extremely neat and orderly?
31. Is . . . so self-assured that at times it is annoying even to friends?
32. Does . . . quickly recover composure after an accident or other disturbing incident?
33. Does . . . move briskly and with energy?
34. Would . . . prefer to accept an unfair situation rather than complain?
35. Do noisy, active children get on . . .'s nerves?
36. Is . . . quick to know when someone needs encouragement or a kind word?
37. Is . . . the kind of person one might call a "self-starter" or a "go-getter"?
38. Does . . . often allow tension to build up to the point of feeling "ready to explode"?
39. Does . . . need encouragement and approval in order to work effectively?
40. Does . . . frequently use medication to aid in relaxation?
41. Does . . . stand up for his rights?

42. Does. . .have a wide variety of interests?
43. Does. . .like to let people know where he stands on issues?
44. Is. . .relatively free from worry and anxiety?
45. Does. . .like to have plenty to do?
46. Is. . .deeply concerned about the welfare of others?
47. Does. . .worry a great deal about health?
48. Is. . .self-confident in most undertakings?
49. Is. . .too soft-hearted to be a strict disciplinarian?
50. Does. . .tend to rely on others when there are decisions to be made?
51. Do many people consider. . .to be incapable of deep feeling?
52. Does. . .find it easy to give way to wishes of others?
53. Is. . .a sympathetic listener when someone needs to talk about himself?
54. Is. . .always trying to convert someone to a particular point of view?
55. Is. . .considered an industrious and tireless worker?
56. Does. . .have any nervous mannerisms such as nail-biting, foot-tapping, etc.?
57. Is. . .the kind of person to whom others turn in time of stress or trouble?
58. Does. . .find it difficult to follow a definite plan?
59. Does. . .insist on prompt obedience?
60. Does. . .believe that everyone is entitled to a second chance?
61. Does. . .get into difficulty occasionally because of some impulsive act?
62. Does. . .suffer from indigestion or loss of appetite when worried or under tension?
63. Is. . .easily taken advantage of by others?
64. Does. . .limit himself to one or two friends?

65. Does. . .find it difficult to relax because of a restless need to be constantly busy?
66. Is. . .easily tempted by a bargain?
67. Does. . .like to speak in public and enjoy the challenge of a debate?
68. Does. . .seek release from tension by excessive smoking eating, or drinking?
69. Is. . .easily moved to pity?
70. Does. . .sleep well, and find it easy to relax when sitting or lying down?
71. Would. . .take a special interest in helping young people who are frequently in trouble?
72. Is. . .regarded as a "high-strung" person?
73. Is. . .quick to sense another person's feelings and moods?
74. Is. . .very empathic and forceful in voice and manner?
75. Does. . .often have "the jitters" for no particular reason?
76. Does. . .prefer to read or watch television after a day's work, rather than go out or engage in social activities?
77. Does. . .make plans well in advance of the event and carry them out?
78. Does. . .prefer to listen and observe rather than take part in discussions?
79. Does. . .enjoy taking chances?
80. Does. . .get tense and anxious when there is much work to be done in a short time?
81. Does. . .think our nation concerns itself too much with the needs and suffering of people in other countries?
82. Does. . .enjoy activity and excitement?
83. Does. . .prepare a budget and make every effort to stay within it?
84. Would. . .do everything possible to protect an animal from neglect or cruelty?
85. Does. . .find it difficult to say "no" to a persuasive salesman?

86. Does . . . have little interest in other people's emotional problems?
87. Is . . . interested in people and in making new friends?
88. Is . . . considerate and understanding when dealing with an elderly person?
89. Would people refer to . . . as a person who is "always on the go"?
90. Does . . . think it unnecessary to apologize after hurting someone's feelings?
91. Is . . . able to express affection without embarrassment?
92. Is . . . apt to make thoughtless, unfeeling remarks?
93. Is . . . thought of as a warm-hearted, outgoing person?
94. Does . . . often feel left out or unwanted?
95. Does . . . have a place for everything and everything in its place?
96. Is . . . free from racial and religious prejudice?
97. Does . . . feel disillusioned about life?
98. Is . . . openly affectionate with members of the immediate family?
99. Does . . . sometimes become so emotional as to be unable to think or act logically?
100. Does . . . find it difficult to express tender feelings in words?
101. Is . . . hopeful and optimistic about the future?
102. Does . . . tend to analyze and dwell on inner thoughts and feelings?
103. Is . . . understanding when someone is late for an appointment?
104. Does . . . have phobias or a deeply disturbing fear of any object, place or situation?
105. Does . . . tend to be reserved in manner?
106. Does anyone ever complain that . . . is "bossy" or unreasonable?
107. Do people sometimes accuse . . . of being illogical?
108. When . . . offers a suggestion, is it apt to be more helpful than critical?
109. Does . . . reach conclusions only after looking at all sides of a question?

110. Does . . . find any discussion of sexual matters difficult or embarrassing?
111. Does . . . have a quick temper?
112. Does . . . express appreciation and pleasure when looking at beautiful things?
113. Is . . . inclined to be argumentative?
114. Does . . . sometimes get the uncomfortable feeling of being stared at or talked about?
115. Does . . . like to stick to one job until it is finished?
116. Are there times when . . . feels discouraged or despondent over lack of progress or accomplishment?
117. Is . . . inclined to "tell people off"?
118. Does . . . feel that life is very much worth living?
119. Does . . . tend to be suspicious of people's motive and actions?
120. Is . . . apt to be too hasty in making decisions?
121. Does . . . find it difficult to be friendly and responsive in contacts with people?
122. Does . . . have a deep respect for all human beings?
123. Is . . . easily embarrassed?
124. Is . . . inclined to stop and think before acting?
125. Does . . . tend to be impatient with someone who is frequently ill?
126. Is . . . always working toward some future goal?
127. Is . . . bothered at times by feeling unappreciated or by the idea that "nobody cares"?
128. Does . . . readily show tenderness to children?
129. Is . . . apt to be sarcastic when annoyed with someone?
130. Does . . . often dwell on past misfortunes?
131. Is . . . apt to keep feelings "bottled up inside"?
132. Does . . . feel contempt for men who seem unable to make a living?
133. Is . . . very methodical about keeping records of personal and business affairs?

134. Is . . .likely to be jealous?
135. Is . . .often so low in spirit as to be close to tears?
136. Does . . .find it hard to accept criticism or blame?
137. Is . . .frequently depressed because of personal problems?
138. Does . . .speak with animation, enthusiasm, or frequent gestures?
139. When deeply disturbed about something, has . . .ever contemplated suicide?
140. Is . . .inclined to carry a grudge?
141. Does . . .have many friends and acquaintances?
142. Is . . .often troubled by a lack of self-confidence?
143. Does . . .find it difficult to express sympathy to someone in sorrow?
144. Is . . .logical in thinking and speaking?
145. Is . . .considered lenient and easy-going?
146. Is . . .easily disheartened by criticism?
147. Does . . .frequently tend to dominate those around him.
148. Does . . .feel a bit uncomfortable when expected to express enthusiasm over a gift?
149. Is . . .quick to forgive a mistake and overlook a discourtesy?
150. Is . . .a fair-minded, reasonable person?
151. Is . . .a talkative person?
152. Does . . .often have "the blues" or feel downhearted for no apparent reason?
153. Does . . .work methodically and deliberately?
154. Does . . .frequently misinterpret what others do and say?
155. Does . . .at times suffer extreme physical exhaustion resulting from emotional conflicts?
156. Is . . .overly critical of some member of the family?
157. Does . . .feel self-conscious with most people?

158. Does. . .often make such blunt, cutting comments that someone's feelings are hurt?
159. Does. . .smile or laugh a good deal?
160. In voting, does. . .study personalities and issues, sometimes supporting a candidate of another party?
161. Is. . .superior or overbearing in attitude toward others?
162. Is. . .thought of as being overly sensitive?
163. Does. . .feel free to discuss personal problems as well as joys with close friends?
164. Is. . .slow to complain when inconvenienced or imposed upon?
165. Is. . .inclined to daydream about things that can't come true?
166. Does. . .often decide to do things on the spur of the moment?
167. Does. . .find it difficult to get over an embarrassing situation?
168. Does. . .find it hard to break a habit such as smoking or over-eating?
169. Does. . .often feel discouraged because of a sense of inferiority?
170. Is. . .inclined to be shy and withdrawn?
171. Does. . .have periods of idleness when it is difficult to find any reason for either physical or mental effort?
172. Does. . .maintain that most people are "out for all they can get"?
173. Does. . .avoid letting emotion influence sound judgement?
174. Does. . .find it difficult to be complimentary to members of the family?
175. Is. . .especially self-conscious and concerned about what others might think?
176. Does. . .often feel depressed by memories of childhood or other past experiences?
177. Does. . .'s interest often shift from one things to another?
178. Does. . .feel restrained and inhibited in a love relationship?
179. If called upon, would. . .be fair and impartial in helping others to settle their differences?

180. Does . . . have periods of depression which last for several days or more without apparent reason?

VITA

Dan Hugh McCaghren

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION AMONG ENGAGED COUPLES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Dallas, Texas, October 27, 1942, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond H. McCaghren. Married in 1963 to Betty Ann Barnett. The father of two children: Rhonda Denise and Ryan Douglas.

Education: Graduated from Rylie High School, Dallas, Texas in May, 1960. Graduated from York College in May, 1963 with Associate of Arts. Completed requirements for Bachelor of Arts at Southwestern College with major in Religion. Completed requirements for the Master of Science at Oklahoma State University in May, 1977.

Professional Experience: Served as minister for Church of Christ in Ponca City, Oklahoma from 1967 to 1970. Director of the University Center, Church of Christ, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1970 to present. Attended American Institute of Family Relations, Los Angeles, California, 1973. Attended Marriage Communications Lab, Springfield, Illinois, 1976. A member of the Institute of Family Strengths.

Professional Organizations: Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, National Council on Family Relations, Omicron Nu.