Attraction, Satisfaction, and Psychological Types of Couples

Nancy S. Marioles
St. Mary's University

Donald P. Strickert
Southern Methodist University

Allen L. Hammer
Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

This study, which won the 1995 Isabel Briggs Myers Memorial Award for Research, revealed that in a large sample of couples, like attracted like, ESTJ men married more often, and INTP men were the most "oblivious." There was also a significant relationship between TDI scale scores and couples' satisfaction.

Abstract

The Type Differentiation Indicator (TDI) was administered to a sample of 426 married and premarital couples along with a large battery of other instruments. Unlike most other studies, this report examined marriage patterns and satisfaction at the level of type, rather than at the level of individual preferences. Questions about marriage patterns included: 1) Do opposites attract? 2) Are certain types likely to be married more often? and 3) What types tend to be more satisfied with their marriages? The question about marital and premarital satisfaction was addressed by using canonical correlation analysis to examine the overall relationship between the couples' scores on the 27 TDI scales and a standard measure of couples' satisfaction. This analysis suggests that couples in which both partners score toward certain poles of the TDI are more likely to evidence greater satisfaction in certain areas of their relationship.

Questions frequently asked by those new to type include: Which are the best types to be married to one another? Did type have anything to do with why I was attracted to my partner? Can type explain why we are having difficulties, or why I am no longer with my partner? Most such questions can be organized into two broad themes: who marries whom; and how satisfied they are once they are married. Although popular books purport to answer these questions (e.g., Keirsey & Bates, 1978), there have been surprisingly few attempts to study the themes empirically. In addition to being of interest to couples themselves, these questions are of interest to type theorists and to marriage and family counselors.

The question of which types are attracted to and marry one another should be of interest to type theorists because of the potential for insight into type dynamics and perhaps even into the process of individ-

uation. If consistent patterns of attraction or marriage are uncovered, we may learn more about the conscious or unconscious needs of the different types. Attraction patterns may also help us to understand the relationship of marriage to individuation. Marriage or intimacy may be partially a means of achieving wholeness. The longing to find the "perfect" mate may represent in part an attempt to perfect the Self; to arrive at the Self through a relationship with the Other. It is the belief that people are attracted to one another in part out of a desire to achieve wholeness that underlies the frequently stated hypothesis that opposites attract (Keirsey & Bates, 1978).

Spoto (1989) discussed the issue of attraction and its relationship to individuation, reporting little evidence of opposites' attracting, or at least marrying, as a way to achieve wholeness. He wrote that although opposites are indeed unconsciously attracted to one

another, such attraction is now usually in the context of short-term extramarital relationships. And in a probably unintended double entendre, he noted that marriage is no longer the "hotbed" of individuation that it may once have been. Spoto believes that people are now, at least consciously, looking for safety, not excitement, in marriage.

Marriage and family counselors are usually less interested in the dynamics of attraction than in the particular problems or issues that might be associated with certain type pairings. Because counselors must deal with the couples' types as given, they want to know how particular problems presented by couples may be related to their type preferences. Counselors can use this information to defuse some of the blaming and anger often expressed by couples in therapy and can help couples objectify the behaviors and see how each person has legitimate needs based on his or her preferences. Marriage counselors also can use type information to identify potential strengths related to preferences that can serve as resources in the therapeutic process.

Sherman (1981) has conducted the most comprehensive research on couples' satisfaction. Counting the number of individual preferences in common, she found that people are more likely to marry types exactly like or similar to their own (more on this later) than they are to marry opposite types. However, her most significant contribution was to delineate preference combinations that reported the most problems in relationships. Differences or similarities on the E-I scale had the most impact on reported problems; male introverts living with an extraverted female reported the most problems.

Hammer's (1987) research also addressed the issue of the relationship between a couple's type preferences and the kinds of problems and strengths they experience. A large number of sentences describing the effects of various combinations of preferences in a close relationship was generated from the literature and from clinical experience. Each of these sentences was rated for accuracy by a group of type experts who had also practiced couples' counseling, by counselors working with couples whose type was known to them, and/or by the couples themselves. A description of particular strengths and weaknesses associated with each possible pairing of preferences emerged. For example, the sentence "When talking, the sensing type may become frustrated by the intuitive type's tendency to be vague and abstract" was rated by all sources as an accurate description of a potential problem between a sensing partner and an intuitive partner.

The research reported in this paper seeks to expand on the work of Sherman (1981) and Hammer (1987) in two ways: first, by examining the questions of both attraction and satisfaction using complete types rather than individual preferences; and second, by using the scales from the Type Differentiation Indicator (TDI; Saunders, 1987) to examine the relationship between type and satisfaction. Because the TDI consists of 27 scales and also yields the MBTI type, it provides a richer source of data with which to examine the effect of similarities or differences on couples' satisfaction. This paper reports the first, exploratory, phase of this research.

Method

Subjects. The total sample participating in some phase of the study consisted of 1,111 individuals, 521 men and 590 women from San Antonio, Texas. The type table for this sample is shown in Table 1. The actual number of couples available for the analyses ($N = 426$) was less than half the number of individuals, because it occasionally happened that one person would volunteer, but his or her partner would later decline to participate. The sample was drawn from two populations: couples in conjoint couples' therapy ($N = 271$) and couples not in therapy ($N = 155$). There were married and premarital couples in both groups. Some of the therapy couples were being treated for physical abuse, child abuse, addictions, depression, and other disorders. Other therapy couples manifested more normative relationship concerns, such as communication problems or lack of conflict resolution skills. The therapy couples included a sample of military personnel and their spouses ($N = 218$ couples) as well as clients from private psychotherapy practices ($N = 53$ couples).

The engaged couples ($N = 80$) were recruited from Catholic premarital classes (36% participation rate) or by their individual priest (90% participation rate). The nontherapy married couples ($N = 75$) were solicited by word of mouth from both civilian and military populations and were included in the sample only if they indicated that they had never been in marital therapy. Volunteers were also sought among graduate students in marriage and family counseling programs ($N = 22$ couples) and from a pool of probation officers ($N = 48$) attending an in-service training program. Although the data were collected from the San Antonio area, the places of origin of military couples in the sample represented almost all geographical regions of the U.S. The sample sizes reported in later analyses do not always match the stated numbers because not all couples were administered the same satisfaction measures and because data were missing from some measures.

Overall, the sample was fairly highly educated, with educational level varying from 6 to 19 years, with a mean of 14 years. Approximately 83% of the sample were Caucasian, 15% Hispanic, 2% Black, and less than 1% Asian. The average length of time that

Table 1. Type Distribution of the Total Sample of Couples.

$N = 1,111$ + = 1% of N

The Sixteen Complete Types

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
$n = 137$	$n = 141$	$n = 58$	$n = 41$
(12.3%)	(12.7%)	(5.2%)	(3.7%)
+ + + + +	+ + + + +	+ + + + +	+ + + +
+ + + + +	+ + + + +		
+ +	+ + +		

ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
$n = 32$	$n = 74$	$n = 66$	$n = 25$
(2.9%)	(6.7%)	(5.9%)	(2.3%)
+ + +	+ + + + +	+ + + + +	+ +
	+ +	+	

ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
$n = 24$	$n = 65$	$n = 99$	$n = 25$
(2.2%)	(5.9%)	(8.9%)	(2.3%)
+ +	+ + + + +	+ + + + +	+ +
	+	+ + + +	

ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
$n = 83$	$n = 134$	$n = 73$	$n = 34$
(7.5%)	(12.1%)	(6.6%)	(3.1%)
+ + + + +	+ + + + +	+ + + + +	+ + +
+ + +	+ + + + +	+ +	
	+ +		

Dichotomous Preferences

E	$n =$	537	(48.3%)
I	$n =$	574	(51.7%)
S	$n =$	690	(62.1%)
N	$n =$	421	(37.9%)
T	$n =$	401	(36.1%)
F	$n =$	710	(63.9%)
J	$n =$	701	(63.1%)
P	$n =$	410	(36.9%)

Pairs and Temperaments

IJ	$n =$	377	(33.9%)
IP	$n =$	197	(17.7%)
EP	$n =$	213	(19.2%)
EJ	$n =$	324	(29.2%)
ST	$n =$	276	(24.8%)
SF	$n =$	414	(37.3%)
NF	$n =$	296	(26.6%)
NT	$n =$	125	(11.3%)
SJ	$n =$	495	(44.6%)
SP	$n =$	195	(17.6%)
NP	$n =$	215	(19.4%)
NJ	$n =$	206	(18.5%)
TJ	$n =$	295	(26.6%)
TP	$n =$	106	(9.5%)
FP	$n =$	304	(27.4%)
FJ	$n =$	406	(36.5%)
IN	$n =$	190	(17.1%)
EN	$n =$	231	(20.8%)
IS	$n =$	384	(34.6%)
ES	$n =$	306	(27.5%)
ET	$n =$	166	(14.9%)
EF	$n =$	371	(33.4%)
IF	$n =$	339	(30.5%)
IT	$n =$	235	(21.2%)

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	n	%		n	%		n	%
E-TJ	117	10.5%	I-TP	57	5.1%	Dt. T	174	15.7%
E-FJ	207	18.6%	I-FP	140	12.6%	Dt. F	347	31.2%
ES-P	89	8.0%	IS-J	278	25.0%	Dt. S	367	33.0%
EN-P	124	11.2%	IN-J	99	8.9%	Dt. N	223	20.1%

Nancy S. Marioles, Donald P. Strickert, and Allen L. Hammer, Attraction, Satisfaction, and Psychological Types of Couples.

couples reported being married was 11 years, with a range from 0 to 47 years. The mean age of the sample was 36, with a range from 17 to 79.

Measures. Form J of the MBTI was administered to both partners in each couple in the sample and scored to produce the 27 TDI scale scores as well as the four-letter MBTI type. Of the TDI scales, 20 are subscales of the four familiar MBTI dimensions. The other 7 scales are known as the Comfort/Discomfort Scales (Saunders, 1987). The internal consistency reliability of the TDI scales ranges from .18 for the Defiant/Compliant scale to .72 for the Logical/Affective scale; the median alpha reliability for the 27 scales is .59.

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) was the measure of relationship satisfaction employed in this phase of the study. The DAS consists of 32 items keyed so that high scores indicate higher agreement or satisfaction. Although the DAS has been factor analyzed, and four subscales have been extracted, the DAS items were treated as individual variables in this study. This approach was used because the DAS items provide a much richer source of concrete descriptive information about a couple's relationship than do the more abstract DAS scales (consensus, cohesion, satisfaction, and affectional expression). Given the lack of empirical research in this area and our hope that the results of this study would be useful to practitioners, the couples' responses at the item level was important. Item 20 (Do you ever regret that you married/lived together was omitted because 87 people, mostly premarital couples, did not answer it. Although the reliability of the individual DAS items is unknown, the reliability of the four DAS subscales ranges from .73 to .94 and the alpha reliability of the total DAS score is .96, indicating a high degree of internal consistency among the items. Given the exploratory nature of this phase of the research and the analysis employed, the use of the individual items was considered appropriate because it allowed us to obtain the maximum amount of information from the data.

Analysis of Attraction. To provide the clearest test of whether opposite or like types tend to attract, an "attraction ratio" (AR) was computed for two subsets of the total sample: couples comprised of exact opposite types; and couples comprised of exactly the same type. The attraction ratio is analogous to the self-selection ratio used in MBTI career research (McCaulley, 1985). The attraction ratio is the percentage of people of one type who marry a person of another type, divided by the percentage of that other type in a base population. A high AR indicates that the pairing occurs more frequently than would be expected given the occurrence of that other type in the base population. For example, of the 30 ISTJ women in the sample of 364 couples, only one was married to an ENFP man, yielding a numerator for the AR of 1 ÷ 30, or 3.3%. The denominator of the AR is the number of male ENFPs in a given base population. For the base population, a national sample of 258 men and 273 women was used (Hammer & Mitchell, 1995). This sample was collected as part of a national representative sampling effort for a number of psychological tests and then matched to the 1990 U.S. census on gender and race. It therefore offers the closest approximation to a national representative sample of MBTI types currently available. Since ENFP men were 6% of this sample, the AR for ISTJ women married to ENFP men is 3.3% ÷ 6%, or 0.55. The AR indicates that this pairing of opposites occurred in the sample with about half of the frequency that one would expect. Note that attraction ratios must be examined for each gender separately--attraction does not necessarily flow in both directions. For instance, even if INFP men choose INFP women more frequently than would be expected (as represented by the frequency of the latter in the base population), the converse is not *necessarily* true.

Because of the exploratory nature of this research and the large number of comparisons, chi-square tests of significance were not computed for each specific pairing. At this point, we were more interested in the overall trend of whether opposites or like types tend to be attracted to one another than whether any specific combination is statistically significant.

Analysis of Satisfaction. To determine the relationship of TDI scale scores to couples' satisfaction, canonical correlation analysis was used (SAS, 1990). This analytic procedure is valuable in exploratory research (Thompson, 1984) because it can be used to: 1) determine whether there is an overall relationship between two sets of variables that may warrant further investigation; 2) identify specific variables in each set that may hold the most promise for further study; and 3) control for the large number of significance tests that would otherwise be necessary using 27 TDI scales and 31 DAS items. Conceptually, canonical correlation analysis is similar to a standard correlation between two variables except that the "variables" being correlated in this analysis are really sets or composites of the original individual variables. Using an iterative procedure, the program weights each of the variables in each set so that the overall correlation between the two sets is maximized. In this study, the weighted DAS items make up one set of variables and the weighted TDI scale scores the other set.

Given the questions of interest to both practitioners and theorists, the focus in this study was the couple as a whole. When using the couple as the unit of

analysis, either summed or difference scores can be used for either the DAS, the TDI, or both. Each provides a different kind of information about the couples' responses. Summed TDI scores indicate which pole of the TDI scale the couple has endorsed. A high summed score means that both partners score toward the right of the TDI scale (toward the I, N, F, or P poles); a low summed score means that both partners score toward the left of the TDI scale (toward the E, S, T, or J poles). For example, on the Gregarious/Intimate scale, a high summed score indicates a preference by both partners toward Intimate; a low summed score indicates a preference by both partners toward Gregarious. DAS summed scores represent how much overall satisfaction there is with various aspects of the relationship. High scores indicate satisfaction by both partners; low scores dissatisfaction by both. Using summed DAS and TDI scores is an attempt to answer the following question: What is the relationship between scoring toward one pole of a TDI scale to the couple's satisfaction with various aspects of the relationship? Note that high summed scores do not mean that the partners have cooperatively arrived at some agreed-upon level of satisfaction; they are calculated from the individual satisfaction scores of each person in the relationship.

Unfortunately, using TDI summed scores also yields a group of couples with "average" scores on a TDI scale. The problem for interpretation is that this group contains two kinds of couples: 1) ones in which both partners scored toward the middle of the TDI scale; and 2) ones in which each partner scored toward opposite poles of the TDI scale. Middle scores on the DAS are subject to the same problem of interpretation. Difference scores on the TDI and the DAS help to overcome some of the limitations on interpretation that might result if only summed scores were used, although they too have limitations in the kind of questions that can be addressed. TDI difference scores address the question of how personality similarities or differences affect the relationship. Low difference scores on a given TDI scale mean that each of the partners scored about the same on that scale, although they do not reveal *where* on the scale they scored. High TDI difference scores indicate that the partners scored near the opposite ends of the scale. For example, TDI difference scores with DAS summed scores would tell whether differences on Gregarious/Intimate yield greater or less overall satisfaction. DAS difference scores reflect not how much overall satisfaction there is with the relationship, but rather how much the partners *agree* that they are satisfied on each item. Since each combination of summed and difference scores on the TDI and the DAS addresses different questions, the canonical correlation analyses were conducted using all four possible combinations of scores.

Results

The two competing hypotheses, that opposites attract, and that like attracts like, were examined separately for men and women. The results are shown in Table 2. With two exceptions, ESTJ men married to INFP women (AR = 6.06), and ESTP men married to INFJ women (AR = 3.03), there is little evidence that opposites attract or marry. There was also a trend for ISTJ men to marry ENFP women (AR = 1.39). An AR of zero indicates that there were *no* couples representing this pair of types in the sample. For both women and men, 9 of the 16 possible pairings of opposite types were not found. On the other hand, the attraction ratios suggest that "like types" do tend to be attracted to and marry each other, especially among intuitive and feeling types. For men, the types most overrepresented in being married to like types were INFPs (AR = 5.26), INFJs (AR = 4.17), and INTPs (AR = 4.17). For women, the most overrepresented combinations were ENFJs (AR = 8.33) and INFJs (AR = 6.25).

Caution is needed when interpreting these ratios. Since attraction ratios are based on percentages, a small change in frequency can result in a moderate to large change in an AR. Although we cannot make too much of the probability of any particular type pairing, the overall pattern or trend suggests that like attracts like, particularly on the S-N and T-F scales.

Satisfaction by Type. We were interested in whether certain types tended to be more or less satisfied with their relationship, regardless of their partner's type. Satisfaction was measured by an item on the TDI answer sheet that asks respondents on a 4-point scale how satisfied they are with their current relationship. However, for the purposes of this analysis, "very dissatisfied" and "somewhat dissatisfied" were collapsed, as were "very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied." Table 3 shows the 16 types for women ranked by the percentage of relationships in which both partners were satisfied. There seems to be no type-related pattern in this list.

Table 4 provides the same ranking for men. In this table, it can be observed that there is a higher percentage of male extraverts in relationships where both partners are satisfied. This observation was statistically significant, with X^2 (1, 364) = 5.2, $p < .03$. With the exception of INFP men, all of the types in the top half of this list are extraverted. The INTP men exhibited, by far, the lowest percentage of relationships in which *both* partners report being satisfied (only 33%). However, it is interesting that 66% of the INTP men said that they *themselves* are satisfied with their relationship.

This disparity between the satisfaction level of partners raised an interesting issue and suggested

Table 2. Attraction Ratios (AR) for
Men and Women Married to Opposite and Like Types.

Type of Woman	AR When Married to the Opposite Type	AR When Married to the Same Type	Type of Man	AR When Married to the Opposite Type	AR When Married to the Same Type
ISTJ	0.56	0.53	ISTJ	1.39	0.36
ISTP	0.00	0.00	ISTP	0.00	0.00
ESTP	0.00	0.00	ESTP	3.03	0.00
ESTJ	0.91	0.97	ESTJ	6.06	1.14
ISFJ	0.60	1.49	ISFJ	0.00	1.15
ISFP	0.00	2.17	ISFP	0.00	0.46
ESFP	0.00	4.55	ESFP	0.00	1.67
ESFJ	0.23	3.23	ESFJ	0.00	1.33
INFJ	0.78	6.25	INFJ	0.00	4.17
INFP	1.19	1.67	INFP	0.66	5.26
ENFP	1.28	1.52	ENFP	0.28	1.23
ENFJ	0.00	8.33	ENFJ	0.00	4.76
INTJ	0.00	2.22	INTJ	0.00	3.85
INTP	0.00	3.57	INTP	0.56	4.17
ENTP	0.00	0.00	ENTP	1.23	0.00
ENTJ	0.00	0.00	ENTJ	0.00	0.00

another way to look at the data. For each type, an index of satisfaction discrepancy was computed that represented the difference between the percentage of one type who say they are satisfied and the percentage of that same type who are involved in a relationship in which *both* partners are satisfied. Although there may be other explanations, it was hypothesized that the greater the difference between the satisfaction level of the partners, the more "oblivious" is the partner with the high satisfaction rating. Although this index is technically a measure of satisfaction discrepancy, discussion of these findings with over 150 participants in our couples' workshops provided anecdotal support for our notion that it could be construed as an index of obliviousness. Values for this index are reported in Table 5 for men and women separately. For men, the largest discrepancies were

found for the INTPs (33%), INFJs (31%), and ISFPs (22%). In other words, in 33% of the couples in which the man was an INTP, the men said that they were satisfied with their relationship, whereas their partners said that they were somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Overall, the discrepancies (the obliviousness?) of women was much lower, the largest being 13% for ENFJs and 12% for ENFPs.

Type and Number of Times Married. A contingency coefficient, a measure of association used to estimate the relationship between categorical variables, was computed on samples of 433 women and 404 men who indicated how often they had been married. The coefficients were .36 for women and .42 for men, suggesting that there is a low to moderate relationship between type and number of times married. Of

**Table 3. Ranking of Types for Women in
Relationships in Which Both Partners Are Satisfied.**

Women	Total N	Percentage of Relationships in Which Both Partners Are Satisfied
ENTJ	7	100%
ESTJ	22	77%
ISTP	8	75%
INFJ	16	69%
ENFJ	24	67%
ENFP	33	64%
ESFJ	62	58%
ISTJ	30	57%
ISFP	23	57%
INTJ	9	56%
INFP	24	54%
ESTP	4	50%
ESFP	22	45%
ENTP	9	44%
ISFJ	67	42%
INTP	4	25%

the women in the sample, 64% had been married only once, 27% twice, 5% three times, 3% four times, and less than 1% had been married five times. Chi-square analyses revealed that no one type was more likely to be married more often than another. For men, 68% had been married once, 25% twice, 5% three times, 1% four times, and 0.5% five times. ESTJs were over-represented among men who had been married more than two times, with X^2 (1, 404) = 6.1, $p < .01$. There was also a trend for ISTJ men to be overrepresented in the frequently married group, with X^2 (1, 404) = 2.5, $p = .12$.

TDI Scores and Couples' Satisfaction. Of the four combinations of TDI and DAS scores possible when using the couple as the unit of analysis--TDI summed scores with DAS summed scores, TDI summed scores with DAS difference scores, TDI dif-

ference scores with DAS summed scores, and TDI difference scores with DAS difference scores--only the combination of summed scores on both sets of variables yielded a significant relationship. Using TDI summed scores and DAS summed scores, a subset of 115 married couples for whom complete DAS data were available was analyzed. Recall that using summed scores for both variables addresses the question of whether similarities toward one pole or the other of the TDI scales are related to couples' combined satisfaction. The results of this analysis are shown in the upper half of Table 6. The adjusted canonical correlation for the first variate was $R = .76$ ($p < .05$). The DAS variables that contributed most to the canonical correlation asked "How often do you. . ." confide in your mate (.52), calmly discuss something (.41), share outside interests (.37), and exchange ideas (.36). The TDI variables that

Table 4. Ranking of Types for Men in Relationships in Which Both Partners Are Satisfied.

Men	Total N	Percentage of Relationships in Which Both Partners are Satisfied
ENTP	9	78%
ESFJ	30	73%
ESFP	24	67%
ENTJ	16	63%
ENFJ	21	62%
INFP	19	58%
ESTJ	33	58%
ENFP	27	56%
ESTP	11	55%
ISTP	13	54%
INTJ	13	54%
ISFP	27	52%
ISFJ	29	52%
ISTJ	64	52%
INFJ	16	50%
INTP	12	33%

contributed the most to the correlation were Guarded/Optimistic (.50), Leader/Follower (-.48), Enthusiastic/Quiet (-.31), Expressive/Contained (-.28), and Carefree/Worried (-.26). These results suggest that couples who indicated greater combined satisfaction in the above DAS variables were ones in which *both* partners score toward Optimistic, Leader, Enthusiastic, Expressive, and Carefree. The TDI composite explains about 20% of the variance in the DAS "confide in mate" item, about 13% of the variance in the "calmly discuss" item, and about 10% of the variance in both "outside interests" and "exchange ideas."

A sample of premarital couples that had completed the DAS was then added to the analysis, bringing the total to 144 couples, and another canonical correlation analysis was performed, again using TDI and DAS summed scores. This analysis yielded a slightly different picture, which is shown in the lower half of Table 6. Although some of the same variables were present as in the married sample, additional DAS and TDI variables emerged that seem to reflect the premarital stage of a relationship. The adjusted canonical correlation between the set of DAS variables and the TDI scales was .66, which has a $p < .07$. The fact that the probability increased slightly even though the sample size increased over the previous analysis suggests that there may indeed be differences between the married and premarital samples that were not explicitly reflected in the analysis. When the sample size of the premarital group is increased, these groups will be analyzed separately. The current analysis does suggest how the two samples differ, however.

The DAS variables that contributed most to the high shared variance between the two variates were:

Table 5. The Obliviousness Index.

Type of Satisfied Person	Percentage of Men of This Type Who are Satisfied, Whereas the Woman is Not	Percentage of Women of This Type Who are Satisfied, Whereas the Man is Not
ISTJ	16%	7%
ISTP	0%	0%
ESTP	9%	0%
ESTJ	12%	9%
ISFJ	14%	10%
ISFP	22%	4%
ESFP	21%	5%
ESFJ	10%	8%
INFJ	31%	0%
INFP	11%	0%
ENFP	7%	12%
ENFJ	10%	13%
INTJ	0%	11%
INTP	33%	0%
ENTP	11%	11%
ENTJ	19%	0%

"How often do you . . ." confide in your mate (.71), share outside interests (.43), agree on a philosophy of life (.42), calmly discuss something (.36), and kiss your mate (.36). The TDI scales that contributed most to the canonical correlation were: Guarded/Optimistic (.45), Expressive/Contained (-.36), Questioning/Accommodating (-.31), Planful/Open-ended (-.31), and Leader/Follower (-.30). These results indicate that couples in which both members score toward optimistic, expressive, questioning, planful, and leader tend to confide in each other, share outside interests, agree on a philosophy of life, calmly discuss something, and kiss each other. Three of these scales may reflect the responses of the premarital couples, since planning, kissing, and questioning might serve as a reasonable description of many premarital relationships. In this analysis, the TDI composite accounts for 32% of the variance in "confide in your mate" and about 12% of the variance in "share outside interests."

The only other analysis that approached significance involved how *differences* between the partners affected overall satisfaction (TDI difference scores with DAS summed scores). This analysis was based on the total 144 married and premarital couples. The adjusted canonical correlation was .60, $p < .22$. Because of the exploratory nature of this phase of the research, these results deserve mention, although they should be interpreted with great caution given the probability level. The DAS variables that contributed most to the shared variance were *agreeing* on: major decisions (.43), laughing together (.42), and that failure to show love was not a problem (.42). The TDI variables making the most contribution to the overall relationship were: Enthusiastic/Quiet (-.47), Initiator/Receptor (-.37), and Scheduled/Spontaneous (.35).

**Table 6. Results of Canonical Correlation Analyses
Using TDI and DAS Summed Scores.**

Sample Canonical R Significance Sample Size	Highest DAS Variables and Loadings	Highest TDI Variables and Loadings
MARRIED ONLY Adj. R = .76 p < .05 N = 115	Confide (.52) Calmly Discuss (.41) Outside Interests (.37) Exchange Ideas (.36)	Guarded/Optimistic (.50) Leader/Follower (-.48) Enthusiastic/Quiet (-.31) Expressive/Contained (-.28) Carefree/Worried (-.26)
MARRIED AND PREMARITAL COMBINED Adj. R = .66 p < .07 N = 144	Confide (.71) Outside Interests (.43) Philosophy of Life (.42) Calmly Discuss (.36) Kiss (.36)	Guarded/Optimistic (.45) Expressive/Contained (-.36) Questioning/Accommodating (-.31) Planful/Open-ended (-.31) Leader/Follower (-.30)

The signs of the loadings suggest that high *differences* on Scheduled/Spontaneous (partners scoring at opposite poles on this scale) and high *similarity* on Enthusiastic/Quiet and Initiator/Receptor (both partners scoring about the same on this scale) are associated with agreeing on major decisions, laughing together, and agreeing that failure to show love was not a problem in their relationship.

Caveats. Treating the couple as the unit of analysis required the use of difference (or summed) TDI and DAS scores. Difference scores always have lower reliability than the original scores from which they are derived, which results in error or "noise" that effectively attenuates or lowers correlation coefficients. Therefore, the coefficients reported in this study may underestimate the relationship between personality and couples' satisfaction.

Another caveat is related to our interest in the responses of the couples to the individual items of the DAS. Although the reliability of the individual items is unknown, two factors serve to mitigate any concern that this may raise. First, the alpha reliability of the total DAS score is very high (.96), suggesting that the items are all highly interrelated. A second, but related factor, is that the canonical correlation analysis used in this study essentially uses a total DAS score for each person derived by combining all of the items after they have been assigned optimal weights.

Although the canonical correlations reported are fairly high, indicating a great deal of shared variance between the set of DAS variables and the TDI variables, the proportion of TDI variance accounted for by its own composite and the proportion of DAS variance accounted for by its own composite is low, ranging from about 4% to 8% depending on the analysis.

This suggests that each composite was not picking up much of the variance available in the raw scores of the original variables. Also, the amount of variance in the DAS accounted for by the entire TDI set is also low (around 4%, depending on the analysis). Such discrepancies sometimes result from a small subset of uncharacteristic variables in one set correlating highly with a small subset of uncharacteristic variables in the other set. However, an examination of the correlations among and between the original variable sets suggests that this was not the case in our data. Thus, although there is clearly a relationship between the two canonical variates—the set of DAS variables and the set of TDI variables—at least one set of variables, the TDI scales, does not seem to constitute a unitary psychological construct. This is not surprising given that the 27 TDI scales were never intended to represent a unitary construct but rather subscales of five separate constructs: the traditional four MBTI preference dimensions and the Comfort/Discomfort scales. This argument does not seem applicable to the DAS variables, however. The high internal consistency of the total DAS score suggests that these items do tap a unitary construct. It is therefore not clear why the canonical variate for the DAS did not capture more of the variance available in the raw scores.

Discussion

Although the frequency of specific type pairings must be interpreted with caution, the overall trend supports the hypothesis that people are more likely to be attracted to and to marry someone of the same type than they are a person of the opposite type. The overall percentage of women married to someone of the opposite type was 5.20%, and it was 4.95% for

men. The percentage of women and men who marry someone of exactly the same type was 9.3% for both genders. Attraction ratios were highest, for both men and women, for intuitive types and for feeling types.

If mate selection occurred purely by chance, the expected percentage for marrying either an exact opposite or someone of exactly the same type would be 6.25%. The percentages obtained in the present sample are very close to the percentages reported by Myers and Myers (1980) for a sample of 375 couples. In that sample, the percentage of couples alike on all four preferences was 9%, and the percentage of couples who shared no preferences was 5%. Myers and Myers also indicated that the most frequent similarity was on the S-N scale. Sherman's (1981) sample showed similar proportions: 8.4% of the couples had all four preferences in common, and 5.4% were different on all four. The degree of similarity in percentages across these three studies is striking, given the variation in the times when the samples were collected and the geographic regions sampled. Although they studied ideal rather than real mates, Rytting, Ware, and Hopkins (1992) also found that similarity was most important on the S-N scale, and little evidence for the hypothesis that opposites attract.

It is interesting to observe that for men, two of the types who tend to marry their opposite, ESTJ and ISTJ men, are also the two types who have been married the most. Although these results were not predicted, post-hoc speculation leads to a possible scenario. This result may be related to the tendency of ESTJ men to make decisions, even about marriage, fairly quickly and perhaps on the basis of too little information. If things go wrong, ESTJs may just as quickly decide to end the relationship. This behavior may be repeated, yielding a pattern of serial marriages. Although impossible to discover in retrospect, it would be fascinating to know the types of each of the spouses of these men. Have they always tended to choose women of the opposite type, and if so, does this have any bearing on the number of times that they have been married? Or, have past unsuccessful pairings with like types led to their present choice of a mate entirely opposite from themselves? It may be possible to answer such questions as the current sample is followed over the coming years.

The analyses addressing the satisfaction questions show that personality variables as measured by TDI scales share a significant amount of variance with couples' combined satisfaction scores. The squared canonical correlations indicated that the shared variance between the two sets of variables ranged from 59% to 76%. For the married-only sample, five TDI scales, Guarded/Optimistic, Leader/Follower, Enthusiastic/Quiet, Expressive/Contained, and Carefree/Worried were found to be the most sig-

nificant contributors to the relationship. On the satisfaction side of the equation, the DAS items "confide in your mate," "share outside interests," "calmly discuss something," and "exchange ideas" were the major contributors to the shared variance. Three of the five TDI scales contributing the most variance to the relationship are Comfort/Discomfort scales. Couples in which both partners score toward the comfort pole of each of these scales tended to have higher combined satisfaction scores. In light of the recent research by Rytting, Ware, and Olszewski (1993), it is interesting that the Guarded/Optimistic scale of the TDI, whose right pole was originally labeled "Trusting" by Saunders (1987), was one of the important contributors to the shared variance. Rytting et al. found that trust was the highest rated component of intimacy in two different samples. The other two TDI scales contributing most highly to combined satisfaction are E-I subscales, with scores toward Enthusiastic and Expressive being associated with higher combined satisfaction. This is consistent with, and provides some refinement of, Sherman's (1981) finding that similarities and differences on the E-I scale had the greatest impact on reported problems. Recall that Myers and Myers (1980) found that the most frequent occurrence of like types marrying was on the S-N scale and that Rytting, Ware, and Hopkins (1992) found that in selecting an ideal mate similarity, the S-N scale was also most important. However, the findings of Sherman and the results of the current study suggest that although the S-N scale may be important for attraction, it may be similarity on the E-I scale that is the most important for staying satisfied in a relationship.

As stated earlier, it was important to test both summed and difference scores because each kind of combined score addresses certain questions that the other does not. Summed TDI scores indicate the effect of *both* partners' scoring toward one pole of the TDI scale on their overall satisfaction. TDI difference scores, on the other hand, show only how similar or different the couple is on a given scale (they index the degree of agreement) but indicate nothing about *where* on a scale similarities occur. TDI difference scores were only marginally significant in one sample. None of the analyses using DAS difference scores were significant. Only TDI summed scores were significant predictors of overall couple satisfaction. This suggests that for satisfaction as measured by the DAS, it is important that both couples score toward the same end of certain TDI scales. The clearest example of this is probably found on the Guarded/Optimistic scale. It is not important that there be a high degree of agreement at any point along that scale; what is important, at least for satisfaction, is that both partners score toward Optimistic (Trusting).

Data collection continues for this project. We are following up with these couples over time to determine who is still married. In addition to examining the longitudinal data, we also plan to analyze the DAS data by MBTI preferences and by type dynamics. Eventually we hope to synthesize these studies into a clearer picture of the role of type in intimate relationships.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Tenth Conference of the Association for Psychological Type at Newport Beach, CA, July 10, 1993.

2. A portion of this research was aided by a grant from the MBTI Research Advisory Board and Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jerron Adams, Margaret Lain, Tom Mareth, and Anthony J. Pogorelc for their assistance and contributions to this research.

References

Hammer, A. L. (1987). *MBTI Relationship Report manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hammer, A. L., & Mitchell, W. (1995). *The distribution of types in the US by gender and ethnic group.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me.* Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books.

McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The selection ratio type table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type, 10,* 46-56.

Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rytting, M., Ware, R., & Hopkins, P. (1992) Type and the ideal mate: Romantic attraction or type bias? *Journal of Psychological Type, 24,* 3-12.

Rytting, M., Ware, R., & Olszewski, W. E. (1993). Psychological type and the meaning of intimacy. *Journal of Psychological Type, 26,* 9-17.

SAS Institute Inc. (1990). *SAS user's guide: Statistics,* Version 6. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.

Saunders, D. R. (1987). *The Type Differentiation Indicator manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Sherman, R. G. (1981). Typology and problems in intimate relationships. *Research in Psychological Type, 4,* 4-23.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38,* 15-28.

Spoto, A. (1989). *Jung's typology in perspective.* Boston: Sigo Press.

Thompson, B. (1984). *Canonical correlation analysis: Uses and interpretation.* Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-047. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.

Contact

Nancy S. Marioles
Department of Counseling and Human Services
St. Mary's University
One Camino Santa Maria
San Antonio, TX 78228-8527

(210) 733-1489

*   *   *

Editor's note: This article is being republished by agreement of and with the authors. The text is identical to that of the article of the same title that appeared in Volume 35 of JPT. The Journal is informed that the previous article listed the authors in the wrong order and that the contact person for reprints and further information should have been Nancy S. Marioles. We sincerely regret the error. Readers and researchers are advised to please use and reference the current article rather than the previous one.