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PREFACE

Marriage

This institution...
perhaps one should say enterprise
out of respect for which
one says one need not change one's mind
about a thing one has believed in,
requiring public promises of one's intention
to fulfill a private obligation:
I wonder what Adam and Eve
think of it by this time,
this fire-gilt steel
alive with goldenness;
how bright it shows--
"of circular traditions and impostures,
committing many spoils,"
requiring all one's criminal ingenuity
to avoid!
Psychology which explains everything
explains nothing,
and we are still in doubt.

The Complete Poems of
Marianne Moore
New York: Macmillan Co.
1967, p. 62

My appreciation and gratitude go to
Professor Richard Coan for his sustained interest
and help in this endeavor.
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ABSTRACT

The chief purpose of this investigation was to synthesize the three areas that had proven fruitful within the field of marital happiness, namely, need theory, role theory, and interpersonal perception. This synthesis had two chief purposes. One purpose was the amalgamation of the concepts homogamy and complementarity by indicating where each would occur within any given marriage to maximize happiness. Homogamy referred to spouses possessing similar amounts of a given need. Complementarity was of two kinds. Intraneed complementarity referred to spouses possessing dissimilar amounts of a given need. Interneed complementarity referred to spouses possessing similar amounts of two different but complementary needs. Four interneed complementary pairs were studied: dominance/deference, aggression/abasement, nurturance/succorance, and exhibition/affiliation. The second purpose was an attempt to validate a segment of Parsonian theory which fuses need theory and role theory into an integrated system. The experimental design was constructed so that role behaviors could be directly related to marriage specific needs.

Thirty-three couples were administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), the Locke-Wallace
Marital Adjustment Test (short form), and a marriage questionnaire designed by the investigator which made use of the same fifteen needs as are found on the EPPS.

Results indicated that intraneed homogamy as well as need complementarity had a relationship to neither need satisfaction nor marital happiness; hence, as defined and measured, the "intraneed" concept was not a meaningful one. The results dealing with interneed complementarity were much different. When complementarity existed for the following need pairs, husbands had less than half their needs satisfied: (H=husband, W=wife) H-deference/W-dominance, H-abasement/W-aggression, H-succorance/W-nurturance, and H-affiliation/W-exhibition. Complementarity on the need pair H-succorance/W-nurturance correlated with a lack of marital happiness for wives. These four sets of complementarities can be interpreted as representing "wife-dominant" marriages. "Husband-dominant" marriages (specifically, H-dominance/W-ddeference) correlated with wives' need satisfactions in deference, order, autonomy, abasement, nurturance, and heterosexuality. They indicated that husbands have relatively few needs satisfied in what were defined as "wife-dominant marriages" while in "husband-dominant marriages," wives have many needs satisfied.

For marital happiness and agreement between spouses regarding the amount of need satisfaction desired from one another there was a substantial correlation (.645 for husbands, .629 for wives). In examining this relationship
more closely, only the wives' marital happiness is discussed for the sake of brevity, although, as can be seen from the correlation coefficients, it applies equally well for the husbands'. That there is agreement between the wives' desired need satisfactions and the husbands' prediction of same is chiefly a result of the husband's awareness of the wife's role expectations for him with regard to the meeting of her needs. It is this awareness or knowledge that is called a "new" kind of empathy inasmuch as "empathy" as it has been defined and measured in previous marital research has involved only prediction of the mate's self description in terms of needs or traits. These results also serve as an empirical validation of Parsons' theory that roles are inextricably bound up with needs and serve to organize them.

The data also indicated that marital happiness was associated with need satisfaction for only three of fifteen needs for husbands (exhibition, succorance, heterosexuality). Marital happiness was associated with need satisfaction for all but two of fifteen needs (order and endurance) for wives. These differences suggest vastly different role expectations that husbands and wives hold for one another and vastly different role enactments that they hold for themselves if they are interested in their mates' happiness in the marriage.
INTRODUCTION

What makes marriage partners happy is a more recent concern of social scientists than what makes these partners marry each other. Investigations pertaining to the latter issue, begun by Pearson in the 1890's, provide little help in understanding the more recent one, begun by Hart and Shields in 1926. This is not unexpected if one considers that attempting to account for the variables underlying a feeling state, namely, happiness, is a different operation than accounting for choice behavior, namely, taking marriage vows with a particular person on a particular date. Before dealing directly with marital happiness, a brief sketch of marital choice behavior, also referred to as assortative mating, is presented.

Prior to 1930, only a few studies that had any recognizably scientific methodology were addressed to the problem of "who marries whom," e.g., Harris (1912) and Kirkpatrick (1921). Psychiatrists at this time, as even now, focused on the problem of marital disharmony. They had little to say about non-pathological mating. Exceptions are Freud (1925, 1927) who viewed marital choice as revolving around the problem of narcissism, and Flugel (1921, 1945) who believed
that the "love object selected tends to bear a resemblance to the original childhood prototype ego ideal" (Flugel, 1945, p. 103).

From these beginnings evolved a plethora of investigations during the next three decades dealing with assortative mating. This entire area has been masterfully reviewed and integrated by Jacobsohn and Matheny (1962), who divided all the literature they reviewed into eight general categories:

1. Demographic and ecological variables.
   a) age b) sex c) propinquity
2. Legal and statutory variables.
3. Socioeconomic variables.
   a) social class b) religion c) race
d) education e) occupation
4. Social conditions (e.g., wars, business cycles)
5. Marital status
6. Significant others
   a) parents b) peer groups
c) mass media and culture heroes
7. Personal attributes
   a) physical traits b) behavioral traits
c) complementary needs
8. Freudian contributions

Within the personal attribute category are a large variety of variables. Studies within this area indicate
that people tend to marry people who are like themselves in height, weight, hair and eye color, health, attractiveness, intelligence; and personality variables such as temperament, attitudes, values, interests, sophistication and social competence. Hence, homogamy, or what is referred to as the "birds of a feather" hypothesis, prevails throughout the literature in this area. The three studies that follow, however, argue for a somewhat more narrowly circumscribed role for the homogamous function, or at least suggest that the homogamy that stems from living in a new sociological milieu may be more potent than other demographic variables.

In a comparison of couples who met and married at college with those who met in their parental homes before attending college, Leslie and Richardson (1956) found the met-at-home group to be more homogamous. No homogamous tendency was found among the couples who met and married while on campus. The campus situation, the authors speculate, involves an emphasis on democratic norms and encourages the association of persons from different backgrounds (p. 120).

In another study of campus marriages (Coombs, 1962), in this case, Mormons at the University of Utah, forces in the parental home were shown to exert an influence toward homogamy. Eighty-seven percent of couples who had lived at home during courtship chose a mate of similar religious background. When only one of the pair lived at home the percentage dropped to seventy-nine percent. When neither
lived at home the percentage was sixty-three. With regard to homogamy in socioeconomic level, 83.75 percent of those living at home chose a partner of the same or next contiguous socioeconomic level as compared to seventy-one percent when only one lived at home and sixty-six percent when neither lived at home.

A final study that examines marital choice contingencies as a function of attendance of a college distant from one's home is by Kerckhoff (1964). His study of engaged girls at Duke University showed that as girls progressed from their "serious boy friend" to fiance there was less than one third as many changes from homogamy to heterogamy as changes from heterogamy to homogamy at each point of transition. The dimensions examined were education, social class, religion and urbanity. In general, girls who had been socially and geographically stable, who were from small cities and who had fathers with lower occupations tended to be homogamous to a greater extent than their opposite. In referring to a homogamous 'field of eligibles' (a term coined by R. F. Winch) from which one chooses a mate, Kerckhoff concludes, "It is necessary to explore carefully the degree to which the field of eligibles is a field of availables or a field of desirables" (p. 296).

In addition to these studies that point to the delimiting parameters of homogamy, there are other investigations within the areas of need theory, role theory, and
A Brief History of Marital Happiness Studies

Some clarification of the term marital happiness is needed before reviewing studies in this area. Studies use different definitions and different criteria. One definition that has had wide currency states that the happy marriage is "one in which the patterns of behavior of two individuals are mutually satisfying" (Burgess and Cottrell, 1936, p. 47). The most frequently used criteria have been the following four: (1) permanence of the union, (2) adjustment of the couple, (3) happiness of the husband and wife, (4) satisfaction of the couple with the marriage and the spouse (Burgess and Wallin, 1953). With full realization of the pitfalls involved, the writer has treated as comparable criteria, the many different usages and definitions, except when they are so aberrant as to do violence to the concept of marital happiness as a whole. In keeping with the literature, the terms happiness, satisfaction, adjustment, and compatibility are used interchangeably.

The first attempt to determine how well a characteristic (age) could predict marital happiness was in 1926, by Hart and Shields. Another early contributor was Davis (1929), who linked marital happiness with the wife's health,
education, and lack of sex experience before marriage. In the same year Hamilton (1929) reported four conditions significant for marital satisfaction: (1) the wife have a brother or brothers, (2) the spouses have equal education, (3) the wife physically resemble the husband's mother, (4) the wife have no sexual intercourse prior to marriage, as Davis had found. Pursuing the importance of a resemblance between husband's wife and husband's mother, Hamilton (Hamilton and McGowan, 1930) reported that ninety-four percent of those husbands marrying women having a resemblance to the husbands' mothers (seventeen percent of the entire sample) indicated they were happy in their marriages. Of men marrying women physically unlike their mothers, only thirty-three percent were happy. Hamilton also found a slightly greater likelihood of happiness for men marrying women with their mother's disposition. The implication of this finding for Freudian theory, specifically the Oedipal conflict, is not made by the authors, nor do they provide additional information to make speculation profitable by others.

Marital happiness studies in the next twenty-five years made huge strides. Much of the research, in terms of scope, breadth, and sample size, was very ambitious. Frequently there were sufficient data and results to warrant publication of a book or at least a series of articles, many of which have become classics in the field. These include
the studies of Terman (Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness, 1938), Burgess and Cottrell (Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage, 1936), Kelly ("Marital Compatibility as Related to Personality Traits of Husbands and Wives as Rated by Self and Spouse," 1941), Locke (Predicting Adjustment in Marriage, 1951) and Burgess and Wallin (Engagement and Marriage, 1953).

Terman began his probing of marital success by comparing married and divorced couples on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory (Terman and Buttenweiser, 1935a). He found that one quarter of the items discriminated between the groups. He also examined the relationship between parental relationships and marital happiness. Combining the Bernreuter and the Strong Interest Blank, Terman (1938) obtained correlations with marital success ranging from .35 to .42 for husbands and wives. In a later study of marriages of more than five hundred gifted persons (Terman and Oden, 1947) somewhat higher correlations were obtained, but such factors as financial condition, premarital social participation, premarital sexual behavior and engagement history were included. These results were substantially replicated by Burchinal (1959) using a much different sample.

Investigating the role of sexuality in marital satisfaction, Terman (1951) found that orgasm adequacy in wives correlated only .26 with their total marital happiness and .20 with the happiness of the husband.
Burgess and Cottrell (1936) relied heavily on background material including subculture pressures, social types, economic factors and response patterns. Specific significant items that related to their couples' compatibility were the happiness of the parents' marriage, conflicts and attachments to all family members, rated attractiveness to the opposite sex, religious training, discipline, punishment, happiness in childhood, family background, education and income of father. Combining background data plus factors after marriage, they achieved a .61 correlation with marital success although the greatest part of the variance was accounted for by the background data which correlated .56 with marital happiness by itself.

Burgess and Wallin (1953), employing the Thurstone Neurotic Inventory with one thousand engaged and six hundred and sixty-six married couples reported correlations with marital success of .25 for men and .18 for women. Generalizing from their study as well as Burgess's earlier work and the above studies of Terman, they presented the following list of characteristics as decisive in differentiating happy from unhappy marriages (1953, p. 536):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happily married</th>
<th>Unhappily married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emotionally stable</td>
<td>emotionally unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate of others</td>
<td>critical of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yielding</td>
<td>dominating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>companionable</td>
<td>isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-confident</td>
<td>lacking self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotionally dependent</td>
<td>emotionally self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both studies Burgess found that in happy marriages wives made the greater adjustment, a finding that continually emerges from the literature. The length of marriage and the presence or absence of children was not found to be significant.

E. L. Kelly (1940, 1941), working with engaged and married couples, found low but significant correlations between all spouses and slightly higher correlations for happily married spouses. In a follow-up study (Kelly, 1955) the investigator found that the personalities of the marriage partners did not become more alike after twenty years of marriage.

Abstracting many of the above studies, Frumkin (1953) lists three significant factors dealing with the family and marital adjustment: (1) Parents of both spouses had happy marriages, (2) each spouse had a strong attachment to both parents, and there was a lack of conflict in their relationships, (3) parents had wholesome attitudes toward sex and provided spouses with a good sex education.

This brief history of marital happiness studies reveals an evolutionary trend from a focus on material prior to a couple's marriage to data gathered from the ongoing marital relationship itself. This has generated an interest in personality traits, interests, values, the self concept, the concept of the ideal mate, and attitudes within the marital process. These variables are reviewed in this same order.
Personality Traits

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) was found to be a useful tool by Karlson (1951). He found a negative correlation (-.21 for men and -.34 for women) between the Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) scale of the MMPI and marital happiness, indicating that those who have a tendency to be rebellious and aggressive are less happy. Substantiating these results is a study by Swan (1953) which found that more happily married couples scored lower on the Pd scale as well as on the Psychasthenia (Pt) and Hypomania (Ma) scales, with the low Pt score (indicating an absence of anxiety or morbid introspection) the most significant. On the three scales the couples tended to move in the direction of the wife's marital satisfaction rather than that of the husband's, indicating that the wife's satisfaction apparently counts more than the husband's in determining the degree of pair satisfaction. The author's data also revealed that those spouses who were more dissatisfied with their marriages than were their partners showed a higher score on a separate anxiety index and internalization or somatization ratio. Further study (Swan, 1957) indicated that the greater the difference between spouses' scores on the Pt scale, the less happy the marriage. In combination with Swan's other findings, this would seem to indicate that although chances for a happy marriage are better if neither spouse has anxiety, if one spouse is
highly anxious, he or she will be happier with an equally anxious spouse.

In a recent study (Pickford, Edro, and Remple, 1966) using the Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey happily married spouses scored high on the factors of general activity, restraint, friendliness, and personal relations. Unhappily married spouses scored low on the factors of emotional stability and objectivity.

**Interests**

Interests have been one of the most productive variables in accounting for marital happiness. Kirkpatrick (1937, 1958; Kirkpatrick and Hobart, 1954) has been the most instrumental researcher in promoting the concept. Drawing partially on an idea suggested a few years earlier by Bernard (1933), Kirkpatrick (1937) presented a list of a large number of interests to each spouse (e.g., discussing politics, playing with children), asking each to check those interests that he or she enjoyed doing alone, and then presenting the same list of interests a second time, asking each to check those interests he or she enjoyed doing with the spouse. The amount of communality of interest proved to be a sensitive indicator of the couple's rating of their marital happiness ($r = 0.63$). The significant aspect of this measure is its indirect quality. Kirkpatrick found this interest rating correlated with Terman's prediction scale $0.74$. 
and with a rater's evaluation of respondents' marital happiness .65.

Frumkin (1953) compared Kirkpatrick's indirect assessment of marital happiness with Burgess and Cottrell's direct method, correlating each with a marriage adjustment schedule. The direct scale correlated .31 for husbands and .24 for wives while the indirect scale correlated .83 for husbands, .87 for wives with the validating criterion. Frumkin went a step further with the Kirkpatrick items by dividing them into significant and insignificant categories (significant: demonstrating affection, discussing intimate personal experiences, training children, etc.; insignificant: house cleaning, observing outdoor sports, discussing scientific topics, etc.) He found that when spouses exaggerate the degree to which insignificant interests are considered mutual interests, there is lack of marital adjustment. He also found that unadjusted spouses overemphasize mutuality of interest, regardless of their significance. Frumkin believes this is explained by a conservativism on the part of the well adjusted spouses in checking interests.

Consistent with these findings is Benson's (1952) study which indicated that the prevalent pattern among happy spouses is a mutuality of interest in home, children, romantic love, sexual relations, and religion. Prevalent among unhappy spouses was a pattern of mutuality of interest in community activity, making money, and comfort or ease.
He found, in addition, little relationship between the number of common leisure time interests and adjustment in engagement of marriage. In a later study (Benson, 1955) the investigator found that partners may feel that interests are mutual when in reality they are not. These data are in contrast to Budd's (1959) whose research indicated that when couples are asked to predict their spouses' interests, they do not slant them in the direction of their own interests.

A final study in this area, one done very early (Richardson, 1939) found empirical support for the rather obvious observation that the areas of interest that spouses share with each other are different from the areas of interest they share with friends. This finding, however, did not lead social scientists until the 1960's to the realization that their understanding of marital interaction would be furthered only when they focused on marriage specific variables, be they interests, needs, or roles.

Values and Attitudes

In examining the literature dealing with marital happiness as a function of values and attitudes, one encounters the problem that at times these variables are difficult to differentiate from role expectations, which are more appropriately discussed in their own context.

There are several studies dealing with assortative mating and values. Schooley (1936) found that spouses'
homogamy with regard to values was less than homogamy with regard to intellectual traits. Studying marriage longitudinally, she observed that couples grew more alike in economic and religious values (and, incidentally, became more neurotic), but that political attitudes and attitudes toward communism showed no change. In another longitudinal study (Kelly, 1961) in which there was a twenty year reassessment of specific attitudes toward the ideal marriage, a general shift toward neutrality of the items was found. Two items that did become more essential were religion and child discipline.

Snyder (1964) also examined attitude homogamy as a result of marital interaction, using as his sample 561 rural high school students, forty of whom later married a member of their high school class. He measured attitudes in fourteen areas of behavior (which seem to be the equivalent of "values" in other studies) such as church attendance, divorce, social drinking, etc., as well as the individual's attitude toward peers, family, and community. By obtaining data prior to marriage, the author attempted to control for the effect each couple's interaction may have had on their attitudes. His results showed that attitude similarity of the couples was not very high. In their attitudes relating to behavior, peers, and family they were similar to each other slightly more than fifty percent; in their attitudes toward their communities they were more dissimilar than
similar. To determine the degree of selectivity, Snyder compared those who selected each other as marriage partners with those whom they did not select. The field of eligibles was considered to be the high school class of which the individual was a member. The homogamous attitudes of the couples and the attitudes of each member of the class, by sex, were tabulated to determine the percentage of the class whose attitudes were the same as those of the couple. Results showed that slightly less than one third of the homogamous attitudes were found to be unique to the couple. Attitudes pertaining to the family showed less similarity and those pertaining to the community showed most similarity. Snyder concluded "attitude similarity must be the result of the adjustive interaction shared by the couple, and not necessarily an affinity present at the onset of marriage" (p. 335).

Another researcher concerning himself with assortative mating as a function of values is Schellenberg (1963) who specifically tested the theory suggested by Winch, that the only homogamy comes from the natural limitation of the field of eligibles. Using the Allport Vernon Test of Values, he compared natural couples with artificial couples who were matched on the basis of similar social characteristics. He found that the control group accounted for a significant amount of homogamy (fifty percent) but a "substantial degree" remained unexplained.
similar. To determine the degree of selectivity, Snyder compared those who selected each other as marriage partners with those whom they did not select. The field of eligibles was considered to be the high school class of which the individual was a member. The homogamous attitudes of the couples and the attitudes of each member of the class, by sex, were tabulated to determine the percentage of the class whose attitudes were the same as those of the couple. Results showed that slightly less than one third of the homogamous attitudes were found to be unique to the couples. Attitudes pertaining to the family showed less similarity and those pertaining to the community showed most similarity. Snyder concluded "attitude similarity must be the result of the adjustive interaction shared by the couple, and not necessarily an affinity present at the onset of marriage" (p. 335).

Another researcher concerning himself with assortative mating as a function of values is Schellenberg (1960) who specifically tested the theory suggested by Winch, viz. 1, that the only homogamy comes from the natural limitation of the field of eligibles. Using the Allport Vernon Test of Values, he compared natural couples with artificial couples who were matched on the basis of similar social characteristics. He found that the control group accounted for a significant amount of homogamy (fifty percent) but a "substantial degree" remained unexplained.
Examining marital happiness and values, Bowerman (1957) divided marital values into nine separate areas, computed a marital adjustment score within each of the areas, and then correlated each with an overall marital adjustment score. The adjustments for all value areas (e.g., philosophy, recreation, child rearing) correlated .40 with each other, indicating that happiness in one area does not account for the marital happiness in another. Each area correlated with total adjustment between .47 and .64. Adjustment within the area of family oriented values, as contrasted with personal oriented values and values dealing with relationships outside the immediate family group, had the highest correlation with total adjustment.

Locke (1947) also found that happiness in one area did not correlate highly with happiness in another. Studying divorced couples, his data further indicated that twenty-five percent of them had a fair adjustment in many areas, but maintained one value or attitude which made the entire marriage no longer viable.

A review of the literature by Trost (1967) led him to conclude that homogamy does not operate for values between spouses, but perceived homogamy on similarity of values does. Relevant to these results is a description of a survey made by Elmo Roper (Bernard and Lobsenz, 1967). Roper found that "Americans are often mistaken about the values they believe their mates see in them. . . . Wives tend to overrate
the importance to their husbands of homemaking skills and sexual attractiveness; husbands underrate intelligence and common interests as qualities their wives most appreciate in them" (p. 150).

Coombs (1961), in a theoretical article, views all mate selection as centering around value. He speculates, "Persons will seek their informal social relations with those who uncritically accept their basic values and thus provide emotional security" (p. 52). A person possesses a value system which serves, "either consciously or unconsciously," as a criterion for mate selection (unconscious values is a problem to which the author does not feel obliged to address himself). Coombs believes that the value theory explains the homogamy tendency and either encompasses or supplants other existing theories. He analyzes other theories of mate selection and explains their application to value theory:

a) propinquity: As persons come together in certain areas and participate in common activities, they tend to become alike in their values systems and consequently become more "eligible" as compatible mates.

b) parental image: When an individual chooses a mate similar to himself, a correlation would be expected between the values of his mate and those of his parents in that the parents are agents of socialization.
c) complementary needs: The limitation of this theory is that it applies only when marriage partners are chosen voluntarily or mutually. Value theory takes into account external controls on mate selection. Mate selection is still influenced by values regardless of whether the decision is made by the individual or his parents.

d) ideal mate conception: The "ideal mate" is merely a visualized combination of all one's basic values projected into one "ideal" person.

The position Coombs accords value, Newcomb (1956) gives to attitude. He states, "While I regard similarity of attitude as a necessary rather than a sufficient condition, I believe that it accounts for more of the variance in interpersonal attraction than any other single variable" (p. 579). Byrne and Blaylock (1963) using Newcomb's ABX model, found similarity of attitude between husbands and wives, although assumed similarity was greater than actual similarity. Levinger and Breedlove (1966) substantiated this latter finding and found that assumed agreement was positively correlated with marital satisfaction.

Self Acceptance

In this section terms like self acceptance, self adequacy, and self adjustment are treated as equivalents. In a review of Terman's research, Burgess (1939) noted that in unhappy marriages there was a lack of self confidence in the husband but not in the wife. He also found it important to
differentiate between self confidence and self sufficiency. Self confidence made for good adjustment; self sufficiency did not. Senoussi (Senoussi, Comrey, & Coleman, 1957) found that low self opinion in both spouses, as well as passivity in the male, were significant factors in marital unhappiness.

Kelly's (1941) research showed that a high degree of marital satisfaction was associated with a tendency for both husband and wife to rate themselves above average on personality traits. His data also revealed that among the more happily married couples both husband and wife rated spouse as superior to self, with some indication that this factor is more true of wives' ratings of their husbands. That the concept of the husband is more crucial is supported by Von der Lippe's (1965) study which suggested that for both sexes the concept of the husband and father for wives, and the concept of self and father for husbands is a more significant determiner of marital compatibility than is the concept of the wife held by either spouse.

Snyder (1966) investigated marital selectivity and adjustment prior to mates' selection of each other. He found that within their field of eligibles, homogamy prevailed for couples with respect to self, social, and total adjustment. Aller (1962) examined the role of adjustive mechanisms in student marital happiness. He found self control and responsibility correlated with marital adjustment for husbands, self control alone for wives. She also found a .26 correlation
between grade point average and marital adjustment for husbands, a -.25 correlation for wives.

Gravatt (1964), using only female students, found courtship success related to (a) agreement between self concept and ideal self and (b) agreement between self concept and parent of the same sex.

Jacobsohn (1952) found that homogamy existed not only basically and predominantly between adjusted individuals, but also between neurotic individuals as well. He found, however, that heterogamy existed between the latter on the level of symptoms. These symptoms, Jacobsohn explains, refer to adjustive mechanism rather than source traits, as for example, the domineering husband who marries the quiet inadequate woman (heterogamy) when both are burdened with the source trait of feelings of inadequacy (homogamy).

Goodman (1963, 1964) administered high and low self accepting couples the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. His results were of three kinds:
1. High self accepting couples were similar in need structures when the needs dominance, nurturance, and succorance were considered.
2. Low self accepting couples were complementary in need structure, especially on dominance, dominance and deference, nurturance, and nurturance and succorance.
3. The highest degree of relationship between needs in both groups were found when the needs nurturance and succorance were considered.
In another study involving the EPPS (Saper, 1965) couples were divided into a high and low anxious group on the basis of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and then compared on the Edwards' needs. The low anxious group had greater needs for deference and affiliation. The high anxious group had greater needs for abasement, aggression and autonomy. The low anxious group had a much higher K scale score on the MMPI, which the author views as defensiveness.

Eastman (1958) found marital happiness related to self acceptance, acceptance of others, psychological status (feelings of superiority or influence) in both subjects and their mates. He also found that wives influence their husbands' marital happiness regardless of their own happiness.

In a joint problem solving task with their spouses (Kenkel, 1961) husbands who were self confident performed at a much higher level than did those lacking in confidence.

The only nonsignificant finding in this area is Hurlburt's (1960) study in which the relationship between self attitude and marital adjustment was not found to be correlated. For husbands, interestingly, procreational referents of self attitude (i.e., self mentioned as father) were positively related to marital adjustment.
Ideal Mate

Many "ideal mate" studies do not provide much data regarding marital happiness because they deal with the ideal mate of single or engaged persons and do not later measure the ideal mate concept after marriage, or assess the marital happiness of the subjects originally studied. They are, however, not without value. Prince (1961) for example, showed that males and females wanted essentially the same qualities in a marriage partner, and that both sexes agreed that selfishness and inconsiderateness are the most undesirable characteristics in a mate. In a later study (Prince and Baggaley, 1963) using the EPPS with single, unattached males and females, there was also a similarity in what both sexes desired, namely, that prospective mates should rate high on endurance, nurturance, and affiliation. They wished to avoid mates showing traits of aggression and abasement. The data also suggested that personality needs of the ideal mate were similar to the individual's own need patterns.

One of the earliest ideal mate studies was by Strauss (1946 a). He found that personality traits played a more important role in the selection of a real mate than did ideal physical characteristics. Both criteria figured prominently, however, only in the initial stages of mate selection; they were later discarded in favor of more realistic criteria.
Udry (1965) dealt directly with the influence of the ideal mate image on mate selection and mate perception. He found that mate perceptions of engaged persons, although highly inaccurate, bore little resemblance to the ideal mate perceptions of unengaged single persons. His data also indicated much less similarity between mate perception and self perception than the similarity for unengaged persons between ideal mate and self perception. The mate perception of engaged persons was in between self and ideal mate perception. Udry concludes, "Ideal mate images are therefore probably of little importance in mate selection; neither are they salient features in the perception of a selected mate" (p. 481).

King (1961) has shown that for newly wed couples (for women more than for men, and for those over age forty more than for those under) there is an "idealizing" process in which newlyweds see their spouses as approaching the ideal mate image originally designated.

A final study in this area (Murstein, 1961), revealed that unhappy husbands describe their ideal spouses (paradoxically) as competitive-narcissistic. He also found that happily married wives described themselves and their ideal mate as not being mistrustful or rebellious, and they described their husbands as dominant.
Parental Identification

While this area may be potentially fertile for adding to our knowledge of marital happiness, at present the actual number of studies is very small. Tharp (1963) has reviewed some studies which, while they do not speak directly to the point of marital happiness, have allowed him to make relevant hypotheses.

The earliest study in this area is one mentioned in the introduction to this paper (Hamilton and McGowan, 1930) in which men who married women physically resembling their mothers were happier than those who did not. Strauss (1946 b) found three traits in which there was a high correlation (.55) between a spouse and his parent, not necessarily of the same sex. These traits were a sense of duty, self confidence, and a "getting over" anger easily.

Luckey (1960 a, 1960 b, 1960 c, 1960 d) found that husbands in satisfactory marriages identified themselves with their fathers to a significantly greater degree than did those in less satisfactory ones. These results were not found for the identification of wives with their mothers. She goes on to say that this kind of sex difference lends support to the assumption that in satisfying marriages there is a relationship between wife and husband that reflects the relationship between parent and child, in that the wife sees her husband as "father" and he, too, sees himself as "father." Wives can continue comfortably in a dependent
role relationship with the husband much as they did with the father; husbands who would like to continue a filial relationship with their wives cannot do so as easily. Although a discussion of complementary needs is a bit premature here, this kind of explanation would lead us to speculate that nurturance-succorance complementarity should operate in happy marriages only when the husband is nurturant and the wife succorant. In a somewhat more "fleshed out" version of Luckey's thesis, Tharp (1963) describes the maximally happy marital situation as follows: "Husband and wife agree that he is as he wishes to be, namely, like his father; and as she wishes him to be, namely, like her's" (p. 5).

This concludes the section of studies that have been conducted in a non-interaction framework. An examination of the dates of these studies, in comparison with those that follow, shows many more conducted prior to the mid 1950's. Background information and attribute data such as were gleaned in marital success prediction studies have given way simply because they could not account for enough of the marital happiness. Wallen and Hill in 1951 stated that approximately seventy-five percent of the factors that accounted for marital success were left unaccounted for by these studies. They make the point that studies that were actuarially focused, reached prematurely into the realm of prediction, to the net detriment of understanding how actual marriage pairs who succeed in marriage achieved success.
They believe that these studies "fail to translate traits and factors into mechanisms and processes of marriage adjustment and to show how they operate in a given marriage situation" (p. 342).

For these reasons the interaction approach to marital happiness has become more emphasized; i.e., marital happiness as related to the interaction of self-spouse perceptions, self-spouse needs, and self-spouse role expectations and role enactments. These three areas were first identified by Tharp (1963) in a review of the literature. Since the time of his publication there has been a wealth of studies (as can be seen by comparing his eighty-six item bibliography with the two hundred and forty-three item bibliography of this paper). The great variety of studies has also made it necessary to go beyond Tharp's three divisions although the review still essentially retains this integrity.
NEEDS

Prior to a review of the literature of needs and their relation to marital satisfaction, a discussion of the "need" concept is important. Within the need theory framework needs have long been treated as identical processes which could all be added together or subtracted from one another because they were judged equivalent. A closer look, however, at the multitudinous ways in which the concept of need is employed makes it rather clear that this mathematical legerdemain is not appropriate, regardless of the ultimate status we grant to the need concept (such as epiphenomenal artifacts of regnant processes or a reified non-reductionistic existence). The inappropriateness of "need mathematics" stands out in bold relief if we try to consistently employ the language surrounding needs in a meaningful way. Let us take for our example the idea of a need as a container. If the need under discussion is aggression, then the container begins as full, and the satisfaction of the need drains the container (e.g., when someone dissipates energy by being verbally or physically abusive). If the need is succorance then the model becomes an empty container which, when satisfied, becomes full. When we come to a need like affiliation, then to retain the container concept, we must speak of an emptying out of one container into another, and, at the same
time, a taking in from another container. Finally, when we talk about need achievement, the container concept, despite its all too procrustean nature, cannot handle the need.

A second difficulty in this area is that the conceptualizing and generating of needs differs so greatly from investigator to investigator and from theorist to theorist. This has led to such a proliferation of either "basic," "cardinal" or "prepotent" interpersonalized needs that "one would be tempted to sack the whole effort on the grounds of parsimony alone" (Saper, 1965, p. 310).

These two problems are mentioned to draw attention to the inherent difficulties in extracting data and collating studies in a meaningful way.

Studies that deal with specific needs and marital happiness and do not address themselves to the question of homogamy-complementarity (which is covered in a separate section) are relatively few in number. One of these studies (Langhorne and Secord, 1955), using married college couples, found wives to have greater needs for succorance and achievement, husbands to have greater needs for order and nurturance. The authors believe that these results may be in large part a function of the sample's being a collegiate one. They further speculate that the wife's high need for achievement may be a disguised way of saying she wants money or status.

Using the EPPS, Levinger (1964) found husbands higher
on autonomy and affiliation, wives higher on nurturance and succorance. When the EPPS was revised so that the marital partner was the reference object, there were no differences. In other words, both partners showed a markedly lower desire for autonomy and acknowledged a far higher desire for interdependence, for giving nurturance to, and for receiving succorance from, a spouse.

Foote (1956) points out that studies purporting to measure specific spousal needs must allow for the fact that different needs may come into prominence at different life stages. This point is also made by Winch (1952). A very specific instance of this process is illustrated in a study (Buxbaum, 1967) of need nurturance in wives after their husbands had suffered a stroke. Those wives who had higher need nurturance indicated that this need was satisfied to a greater degree and that their marriages were happier during the time their husbands were aphasic than did wives low in need nurturance. The author concludes, "It may well be the factor of nurturance in wives is equally important when dealing with other disabilities or other life stresses that radically alter a husband's role within the family" (p. 242). The author fails to add what would seem to be the natural corollary to this speculation, i.e., when husbands of high nurturant wives feel well, their wives feel relatively unneeded and unhappy.
In a study (Herz, 1964) comparing married couples who sought professional help for their marriages with a separated or divorced group, husbands in the latter group scored higher in need achievement; wives in both groups demonstrated stronger need for love, attention and understanding than did husbands. Among couples still living together there were greater unmet needs for freedom from guilt and for understanding. Sexual satisfaction by itself was not found to be a sufficient reason for a couple's staying together rather than separating. Certain individual need dispositions of partners were found to be associated with marriage stability. Respondents from the "stable" marriages had high deference needs for the mate. The husbands tended to be high in self-esteem, and the wives tended to look up to their husbands. Stably married wives had low dominance needs and low achievement needs. Stable spouses also had lower needs for autonomy than did the divorce applicants. Within the divorce applicant sample, it was possible to compare the couples who later dismissed their divorce application with those who finalized their separation. In the dismissal group the wife appeared to have a primary part in the continuation of the marriages, as indicated in the couples' need scores. In the dismissal group the husbands tended to score low and the wives high in need affiliation. Husbands' scores were higher and wives' scores lower on need autonomy, than the respective scores of husbands and wives in the divorced group.
In a study of need satisfaction and perception in relation to interaction of married couples (Katz et al., 1963) husbands with high satisfaction in their marriage described their wives more favorably, achieved higher scores on a coordination task with their wives, showed more acceptance of wives' suggestions in making judgments and made more self disclosures about their anxieties to their wives. They also described themselves significantly more favorably than low satisfaction husbands. These relationships were not observed in wives except for the finding that high need satisfaction wives rated their husbands more favorably.

One need framework that seems useful in investigating marital relationships is the Fundamental Interpersonal Relation Orientation (FIRO) devised by Schutz (1960). This schema begins with the basic proposition that every person orients himself in characteristic ways toward other people, and knowledge of these orientations allows for understanding of the individual behavior and interaction of the person (Schutz, 1960, p. 7). It is presented in some detail here because as a method of analysis it synthesizes many of the best elements of need theory and role theory.

The basic postulate of the FIRO is that every individual has three interpersonal needs: (1) inclusion—the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with respect to interaction or belongingness, (2) control—the
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One need framework that seems useful in investigating marital relationships is the Fundamental Interpersonal Relation Orientation (FIRO) devised by Schutz (1960). This schema begins with the basic proposition that every person orients himself in characteristic ways toward other people, and knowledge of these orientations allows for understanding of the individual behavior and interaction of the person (Schutz, 1960, p. 7). It is presented in some detail here because as a method of analysis it synthesizes many of the best elements of need theory and role theory.

The basic postulate of the FIRO is that every individual has three interpersonal needs: (1) inclusion—the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with respect to interaction or belongingness, (2) control—the
need to maintain a satisfactory relation with respect to control and power, (3) affection—the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to love and affection. For each need or dimension two aspects may be distinguished: (1) the individual's expressed (E) behavior, i.e., the behavior he initiates toward others and (2) the individual's wanted (W) behavior, i.e., the behavior he prefers others to express toward him. "Compatibility" is the central concept used in the theoretical explanation of the individual's interaction. There are two main types of compatibility: (1) interchange compatibility, based on similarity of needs and (2) originator compatibility, based on complementarity within a given need area. **Interchange compatibility** refers to the mutual expression of the "commodity" (inclusion, power, or affection) of a given area; it exists when the participants agree as to the desirability of the commodity, regardless of who initiates interaction. If one participant likes to be close and personal, for example, and the other does not, interpersonal disharmony and frustration would very likely result; hence, **interchange compatibility** does not exist. With respect to **originator compatibility** A's and B's needs are defined as compatible to the degree that A wishes to receive the amount that B wishes to express (Levinger, 1964, p. 155). Thus, for maximum **originator compatibility**, the preferred behavior regarding
originating and receiving should be complementary between the members of the dyad.

Employing this method Schutz has demonstrated that compatible groups of naval trainees (cited in Hare, 1962, pp. 182-183) and college students (Schutz, 1960), have greater task efficiency. It also has been demonstrated that when therapist and patient are compatible (Sapolsky, 1960) the outcome is better and that in a verbal learning situation, Ss compatible with the experimenter learned more (Sapolsky, 1965).

Borello (1966) combined Schutz's schema with parts of Winch's need complementarity hypothesis in his investigation of psychosocial factors related to marital adjustment and task efficiency. He first demonstrated that there was no overall difference between groups of high and low compatible couples on marital adjustment, and no difference between groups on personal or need measures. He then found that social background (race, religion, education, class nationality) and need compatibility must both be taken into account to make spousal similarity a useful measure. He found that "birds of a feather" marriages (homogamous in background and compatible in needs) as well as "opposites attract" marriages (heterogamous in background and noncompatible in needs) are likely to be more happily married than are couples in which spouses are both similar and different in these two dimensions of background and need complementarity. There was also
evidence that there are two kinds of happy marriages which are quite different from each other. Happiest "birds of a feather" are the most task efficient while the happiest "opposites attract" are the least task efficient in the "opposites" group. Borello also found that the wives' marital satisfaction was a more significant variable than the husbands', and that need complementarity is more crucial in some areas than in others (e.g., inclusion originator).
In its broadest form, complementarity theory states that people seek out others who make up for a lack in their own personality. Freud (1925) was one of the first to note this process when he observed in his own practice that narcissistic and anaclitic persons tended to marry each other. He believed that the main conceptual source for complementarity theory was to be found in the projection of the ego ideal. This position was later reiterated by Flugel (1945) and Wilson (1958). Some empirical support for the theory was found by Martinson (1955) who demonstrated that women who marry, in contrast to those who remain single, have greater feelings of ego deficiency. Complementarity (also called heterogamy to contrast with homogamy) found its most staunch and vocal support from R. F. Winch. As far back as 1939, Winch was building a case for this theory. For his master's thesis (1939) Winch compared the marital happiness of couples with the presence or absence of traits in each of the spouses. He found the following significant combinations:

1. On the trait "easily moved to tears" the best combination for adjustment is where the man is easily moved to tears and the woman is not.
2. On "making friends easily" the most unfavorable combination is where the woman does and the man does not.

3. On "feelings of inferiority" the poorest adjustment is where the man is troubled with feelings of inferiority and the woman is not.

4. On "frequent daydreaming" the poorest adjustment is a daydreaming man and a non-daydreaming woman.

In a second article Winch (1941) attempted to show, using engaged couples, that marital happiness is not due to a halo effect, but rather personal characteristics and satisfactions present before marriage.

Moving to a more finalized version of his theory, Winch (1955a) believed that mate choice through complementarity operates so that the person is selected who gives the greatest promise of providing maximum need gratification. Homogamy exists, according to Winch, only with respect to social characteristics which establish a field of eligibles upon which the complementarity process operates. Complementarity may be of two kinds:

Type I. The need or needs in A which are being gratified are different in kind from the need or needs being gratified in B.

Type II. The need or needs in A which are being gratified are different in intensity from the same needs in B which are being gratified (Winch, Ktsanes, and Ktsanes, 1954, p. 243).
In the study designed to test these hypotheses (Winch, Ktsanes, and Ktsanes, 1954) Winch used as his sample 25 married monogamous middle class undergraduates at Northwestern University. From an analysis of the individual life experiences of the Ss, Winch and his associates constructed series of several combined sets of variables dealing with personality needs. The task they set for themselves was to determine whether the matched couples would manifest complementary need patterns (see Tharp, 1963b, for a complete description of design, methodology, and statistical analysis). They used case histories, TAT protocols, need interviews, and full case conferences, all revolving around twelve of Murray's needs. From a long, belabored set of statistical techniques, the application of which is uncompelling at best, Winch concluded (1955a) "The bulk of evidence, therefore, supports the hypothesis that mates tend to select each other on the basis of complementary needs" (p. 554).

From a qualitative analysis of case histories, Winch (1958) believed that further confirmation was given to two basic dimensions operating in marital patterning, namely, dominance-submissiveness and nurturance-receptiveness. This dichotomy was also identified by Roos (1957) and Ktsanes (1955). Tharp laconically comments on this two dimensional discovery, "One cannot fail to note the correspondence between the polarities and marital sex roles as ordinarily conceived" (1963b, p. 11).
In attempting to further substantiate the complementarity hypothesis, Ktsanes (1954, 1955), a Winch disciple, displayed a curious handling of data in which he discarded almost 15% of it which showed "idiosyncratic patterns." He then took the remaining data from marital couples, derived four personality patterns, pushed them through many variations, and then proceeded to demonstrate that the couples do not fit into the patterns he himself derived. In this manner he derived support for the complementarity hypothesis.

Many of the findings and conclusions of Winch and his associates simply do not stand up to empirical or theoretical reexamination. There are a few studies, however, and portions of a few more, which cannot entirely be dismissed. These studies follow. Katz, Cohen and Castiglione (1963) found that husband's need succorance and wife's need dominance were complementary with regard to the husband's acceptance of his wife's judgment. The lack of correlation between complementarity and wife's acceptance of husband judgment is consistent with two previous studies (Katz et al., 1963; Katz, Glucksberg, & Krauss, 1960).

Kerckhoff and Davis (1962), in using an abbreviated version of Schutz's FIRO scale, found complementarity. Schutz's schema, however, is a considerable conceptual distance from Murray's need system that Winch employed. In another study (Moos and Spiesman, 1962) marital couples complementary on dominance-submission completed tasks more
effectively than non-complementary pairs. Task completion, of course, is not the same as marital happiness.

On a study employing groups in stable and unstable marriages, the need pair nurturance-deference showed more complementarity among couples in stable marriages. Much less supportive of Winch's position, but still not willing to dismiss the complementarity hypothesis is Murstein (1961). Studying newly-wed and middle aged couples, his data favored homogamy for the middle aged couples, while evidence for newly-weds was inconclusive in that neither homogamy nor complementarity was supported. Theorizing a bit beyond his data he suggests that needs appear to change as a function of time, and that adequate marital adjustment requires both complementary and homogamous components in the marriage partners. This belief is also expressed by Rosow (1957) who, in addition, discusses needs operating in different areas.

In addition to the above studies there are a pot-pourri of isolated findings from studies that also support complementarity. Using Jungian concepts, Gray (1949) found complementarity in marital couples, but no meaningful statistical analysis was performed on the data. One study (Stuart, 1962) yielded evidence showing a searching on the part of single people for a mate with characteristics which they do not possess. Huntington (1958), extrapolating from unspecified research and speculation, proposes an addition to Winch's theory. He states, "partners gain satisfaction
through reliving in their marriages the same conflicts which they experienced in their youth in interaction with their parents, provided that the outcome of the conflicts in the marriage is to allow them to master the anxiety which is associated with the conflicts" (1958, p. 44). He goes on to argue the marital relationships are highly configurated; essentially the same sequences of interaction occur again and again between marital partners. Heiss and Gordon (1964) while not confirming complementarity, did find that homogamy did not add to marital satisfaction.

Having attempted to give Winch's position its due, what follows is empirical evidence and methodological criticism which are all but complete in their dismissal of the complementarity hypothesis as currently stated. Blazer (1963) began by attempting to reinforce Winch's position. After analyzing his data he discovered that they not only failed to support complementarity, but rather strongly suggested that people who have similar relative strengths on the same need or similar needs tend to marry, and that there is some association between increasing similarity of need patterns and greater marital happiness.

Bowerman and Day (1956) found more evidence for homogamy than complementarity within the same needs, but evidence for neither principle on different need matchings. Katz, Glucksberg, and Krauss (1960) found homogamy and need
satisfaction for abasement, autonomy, affiliation, and nurturance. One pair of unlike needs were negatively related, husband succorant-wife nurturant, which meant that the greater the husband's need for succorance (for help, affection, sympathy), the less was the wife's need to provide these measures. This negative correlation certainly argues against complementarity.

Hobart and Lindholm (1963) replicating a part of Winch's study, found a .28 correlation between homogamy and marital adjustment.

Saper (1965) tested out Winch's most basic assumption, viz., that husbands who are assertive choose wives who are receptive. To test for assertiveness he combined the needs achievement, exhibition, autonomy, dominance and aggression. To test for receptiveness he combined deference, affiliation, succorance and abasement. All needs were measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The correlation between wife's receptiveness and husband's assertiveness was -.54. This correlation strongly suggested that receptiveness in wives was associated with reduced assertiveness in husbands, i.e., the wife's display of needs to follow, affiliate and help others, as well as her willingness to accept blame, covaries with the husband's tendency not to display needs to achieve, exhibit, be independent, aggressive and dominate others. This finding is directly antithetical to Winch. Husband's receptiveness compared
with wife's assertiveness correlated -.36, indicating the same process. There was also a slight negative correlation between husband's succorance and wife's nurturance, also opposite to the complementarity hypothesis. Within the same needs, autonomy and aggression were homogamous for spouses.

Other researchers whose data supported homogamy or failed to support Winch include Ford (1948), Knoedler (1953), Bowerman (1957), Schellenberg and Bee (1960), Phillips (1966) and Trost (1967b).

Winch's studies receive their most lethal blows from the hands of Tharp (1963) who attacks Winch's sampling, ratings, statistics, results, and research philosophy. Commenting on research philosophy, referring to Winch's dozens upon dozens of statistical analyses, Tharp dryly states, "Almost any set of data, if sufficiently badgered, can be exhausted into submission" (p. 11). Simpson (1962), reviewing Winch's book (Mate Selection, a Study of Complementary Needs) is less detailed than Tharp, but nearly as devastating. Addressing himself to Winch's methodology, Bolton (1961) states

In view of the fact that Winch uses Murray's set of personal needs and that the TAT was devised for getting at just these needs, the fact that the TAT ratings were not only the least favorable of these sources of data used by Winch to test his complementarity hypothesis, but were actually more often than chance contrary to his hypothesis, casts considerable doubt on his findings. (p. 235)

Borello (1966) is critical of Winch with regard to the latter's failure to guard against possible contamination of
ratings by the rater's knowledge of the subject. He also mentions, in a choice example of understatement, "In view of (Winch's) basic premise that potential spouses are drawn together on the expectation that each would provide the other with maximum need gratification, the absence of a marital satisfaction measure would appear to be noteworthy" (p. 43).

Another of Winch's critics, Kernodle (1959) addresses himself to Winch's thesis that homogamy ends with demographic variables (the field of eligibles). Kernodle argues that needs, too, have sociological, cultural and subcultural variance; hence homogamy could also be operating for such psychological factors.

Levinger and Tharp have also explored the inherent weaknesses in complementarity theory itself. Levinger (1964a) raises conceptual issues of three kinds. The first is that there is a logical confusion in the accepted conceptual distinction between complementarity and similarity of needs. He demonstrates this point by assuming the "existence of a person, the perfect embodiment of Aristotle's ethical man, all of whose needs exist in perfect moderation." With regard to this man Levinger comments, "None of this man's needs could be complemented, since needs of different intensity would be either too high or too low" (p. 54).

His second point is there exists no explicit theoretical basis for deciding which needs are complementary with which others. Lastly, he refers to the source of satisfaction
of any person's needs. An implicit assumption in marriage studies is that need-fit pertains primarily to the marital relationship itself, yet the method of assessing the needs is usually general. And, Levinger points out that "it is by no means necessary that an individual use the same pattern of need gratification within and outside the marital relationship" (p. 56).

Empirical support for Levinger's final point is provided by Rychlak (1965). In his study, Ss, after having participated in two small group problems, selected a most and least preferred co-participant for three role relationships: Boss, employee, and peer. Complementarity was both avoided and literally sought after within different role relationships by the same S. High orderly Ss made a distinction of this sort. When choosing a potential boss, they preferred having one with personal stability and little need to experience novelty and change in daily routine. On the other hand, when selecting a neighbor their preference went in the other direction. "It is as if the orderly individual is fundamentally attracted to the changeable individual, but wants to relate to him only after working hours, when he has the protection of informality and economic independence" (p. 339). Two pairs of complementarities, nurturance-succorance, and exhibition-affiliation, existed regardless of the type of co-participant selected.
Tharp (1964) points out that although Levinger has clarified the complementarity issue, the complementary need hypothesis is still one based on faith, rather than empirical support. Inasmuch as marriage more readily lends itself, according to Tharp, to concepts such as expectations, perceptions, and actions specific to a particular situation, and these all pertain to the concept of role, the operations used to measure specific roles are more appropriate than those "traditionally employed to assess needs," specific or not.

It seems clear from the foregoing empirical and theoretical analyses than the complementarity hypothesis must be greatly decreased in scope and increased in focus to serve a useful function.
ROLE THEORY

The application of role theory to marital interaction is a relatively recent development, although its potential value was realized as early as 1948 by Kuhn who remarked,

In any particular pair, marital adjustment is not so much a matter of discrete traits of personality and separable items of background culture as it is a matter of the adjustment of the multifold, common and complementary roles which each member plays, expects to play, and expects the other to play. It is in these roles that personality, society and culture meet. Here is the crux of the whole significance of assortative mating, for matching with respect to social context has meaning at the human level only if the particular social context in question has prepared or failed to prepare the members of the pair to play parts that will be mutually and reciprocally satisfying. (p. 360)

Role analysis has been found to be fruitful even with engaged couples (Hill and Waller, 1951) by examining (1) the dominant role patterns each brings to the marriage, from which congruity and compatibility could be inferred and checked empirically from the engagement history, and (2) the flexibility of role playing, involving ability and willingness to shift roles.

Others providing theoretical frameworks for "marriage as roles" are Mangus (1956), Kirkpatrick (1958), who also provides a review of the literature, and Dyer (1962). With this new framework comes new terminology. Burchinal (1959) adds the concept of role deprivation. Role deprivation
occurs when (1) present role satisfactions are less than present role expectations or (2) when present role satisfactions are less than anticipated marital role satisfactions. Role deprivation can lead to either role change (e.g., high school age marriages arising from adolescent role deprivation) or role rejection (e.g., divorce).

Couch (1958) speaks of role consensus which represents the degree of agreement among members of a group on what they feel are the obligations of each member. His research suggests that the wife has to do more adjusting to bring about consensus. *Bechill (1962), in comparing married and divorced groups reported significantly greater role incongruity, difference in perception of the same roles by spouses, in the divorced group. This group also experienced greater intrapersonal role confusion, the difference between a person's expectations and enactments. His data is in agreement with Kotlar's (1961), who found that although adjusted and unadjusted couples had very similar conceptualizations of ideal marital roles, spouses in the adjusted group perceived themselves as conforming more to their own expectations than in the nonadjusted group. Dividing her entire sample by sex, she also found that women more consistently conformed to their own role expectations than did men.

New concepts often bring forth new techniques. Providing both is Nathaniel Hurvitz (1959, 1960a, 1960b) who has been able to apply role theory to marriage with
considerable success with his concept of marital strain which is measured by a scale he devised, the Marital Roles Inventory. Roles have two aspects: (1) Each spouse's performance of his own role. (2) Spouse's expectations of how the other spouse will perform her role. These two aspects allow for a comparison of the performance of one mate compared with expectation of the other. Marital strain or Index of Strain is the difference between performance and expectations of roles by a given couple. An Index of Deviation is also employed in which the difference is measured between the rank order assigned to the roles by a given spouse and the sample's modal rank ordering of the same set of roles.

Correlations were found between the husband's Index of Strain (IOS) and his marital happiness as well as between the husband's IOS and the marital adjustment of the wife. Such correlations were not found for the wife's IOS and the marital adjustment of either herself or her spouse. Wives had significantly lower indices of strain, but were quite similar to their husbands on the Index of Deviation (IOD). Hence, there was a tendency for husbands and wives who agreed about the rank order of roles for one spouse to agree about the rank order of the other. There was also a significant correlation between IOS and IOD, i.e., husbands and wives who performed their roles differently from the modal rank order experienced increasing strain the more they differed from them. This finding is in contrast to Tharp (1963) who
believes that marital adjustment depends upon the roles operating within a particular marriage.

In a later study, Hurvitz (1965) examined marital strain, role deviation, control roles and their relationship to marital adjustment. There was no clear cut association between kinds of control roles (e.g., authoritarian, democratic, etc.) marital strain, and marital adjustment. He did find, however, that wives who have control roles which are male, authoritarian, conservative and traditional, with authority lodged in the husband and father, with concomitant attitudes of male superordination and female subordination are more likely to be happy than wives who have control roles which are democratic, liberal and companionate. These data support research by Strodbeck (1951) in which the latter showed that in dyadic relationships, one spouse must be dominant for an effective relationship. Both studies stand in contradistinction to Lu's (1952) investigation which indicated that either husband or wife in the dominant role tends to be correlated with low marital adjustment. Conversely, equalitarian roles were associated with high marital adjustment scores.

In continuing with investigations of husband-wife expectations, the research of Stuckert (1963) becomes relevant. Stuckert found that marital satisfaction of wives was related to the extent to which their perceptions of their husbands' expectations correlated with the husbands' actual
expectations. In the case of the husbands, the similarity between their own role expectations and those of their wives was the most important factor. Departing from these findings was one group of wives who were satisfied with their marriages even though they did not perceive their husbands' role expectations accurately. This particular group, however, was the only one in which the husbands perceived their wives' expectations accurately. This finding would seem to support the notion that in a happy marriage, at least one spouse has to do some accurate perceiving. Stickert's data also indicated that accurate perception may detract from marital satisfaction if the two marriage partners have widely differing expectations of the roles of husband and wife. On the other hand, inaccurate perception may not result in dissatisfaction if the spouses define their marriage as being typical of marriages in general, thus lending support to Hurvitz's results with his Index of Deviation.

Another role centered technique, the Yale Marital Interaction Battery (YMIB), has been developed by Buerkle (Buerkle and Badgley, 1959). The YMIB consists of common marital situations in which each spouse can take the role of the other or not do so. The more the spouses take the role of the other the greater their scores. The weighted scores of both spouses on each item comprise the interaction pattern. The scale distinguished between couples who were happily married and those whose marriages were in trouble.
Unhappily married couples were significantly lower role takers. This led Buerkle to study altruism (Buerkle, Anderson, and Badgley, 1961), defined as deference and respect for the spouse's personal feelings (but not moral or ethical attitudes). This study revealed that husbands scoring higher on altruism were better adjusted. Well adjusted husbands expected to defer; this was not the case for well adjusted wives. Buerkle also found that well adjusted couples expected conformity by the husband to middle class reference groups outside the family. Adjusted husbands were more likely to submit to the wife's dominance over personal activities; well adjusted wives, however, were more deferential and respectful of their spouses' judgment.

Similar to Buerkle's study is that of Hobbs (1961) who investigated the role standpoint in marital conflict situations. Role standpoint was defined as the point of view the individual takes in a social situation and by which he orients his behavior relative to that situation. Subjects were parents of college freshmen. Although women responded more altruistically than men, the level of marital adjustment was highest in cases where both spouses were altruistic. The most frequent pattern of conflict resolution was one in which the husband adopted an egoistic viewpoint and the wife adopted an altruistic viewpoint. The least frequent pattern was one in which both spouses adopted
egoistic viewpoints. Another investigator (Hock, 1961) found that role taking accuracy of spouses was related to the congruence of self-spouse perception.

In examining the initial adjustment process among newlyweds (all of Mormon faith) with respect to role expectations, Cutler and Dyer (1965) have noted differential response patterns. When husbands had their expectations violated the predominant method of handling the situation was to adopt a "wait and see" strategy, hoping that adjustment would occur as a function of time. This strategy was the most prevalent when the husbands' expectations regarding the frequency of sexual intimacy were violated. Wives, more often than husbands, indicated that they talked about their violated expectancies more openly in an attempt to effect adjustment.

Spiegal (1957) has attempted to provide a theoretical framework for understanding the role expectation and violation process. He begins by maintaining that a high level of equilibrium is afforded by role systems in which spousal role expectations are not disappointed. Role systems move toward disequilibrium, i.e., failure of spouses to confirm each others' expectations, for one or more of the following reasons: (1) cognitive discrepancy--one or both persons may not be familiar with the required role, (2) discrepancy of goals, (3) allocative discrepancy--questioning of person's right to the role he wishes to occupy, (4) instrumental
discrepancy—insufficient instrumental prerequisites such as money, (5) discrepancy in cultural value orientation. The failure of spouses to confirm expectations is so disruptive that it is initially accompanied by processes of restoration or reequilibrium by role induction—persuading the partner to take the expected role which will restore equilibrium or by role modification—changing the roles of both partners, with role expectation established on a mutually new basis.

That role conflicts and marital happiness negatively correlate is clearly supported by Ort (1950) who found a -.83 correlation between them. His also obtained a .40 correlation between marital happiness of husbands and wives. As in previously cited research, there were no significant differences found between high and low marital satisfaction groups with respect to role expectations for self and for mate. Patterns of behavior, however, were found to be different for the two groups in resolving differences. The high satisfaction group typically stated: "We talk out our differences logically, thus preventing heated arguments." In contrast, a typical quotation from the low group was, "I pout when I'm angry and if the argument doesn't go my way I stop talking" (p. 698).

In most of the above studies roles have only been important in a general way, i.e., the amount of agreement or disagreement or the number of mutual or violated expectations
has been the focus. In the studies that follow the investigators are interested more in the content of the roles, although they may only impose a loose structuring even at this level. An excellent case in point is the treatment of marital relationships by Parsons and Bales (1955). In marital relationships, Parsons postulates, role differentiation revolves on two axes, namely, power and instrumental-expressive. Inasmuch as in marriage, Parsons believes, power equalization is the norm (the norm in theory but not in practice it should be added) it is within the instrumental-expressive dimension that there are important differences. Following male-female role differences that grow out of child socialization, the masculine personality tends more to the predominance of instrumental interests, needs and functions, while the feminine personality tends more to the primacy of expressive interests, needs and functions. Therefore, "within the social interaction of marriage, men assume more technical, executive and 'judicial' roles, women more supportive, integrative, and tension managing roles" (p. 101).

Empirical investigation of this Parsonian hypothesis has yielded mixed results. Stimson (1966), specifically testing the hypothesis that a successful group requires an instrumental and expressive leader, did not find confirming results. Role differentiation did not occur in any systematic way in the marital dyad. In a different approach to the
problem Kenkel (1961), found that self confident men, in a joint problem solving task with their spouses, performed as many or more expressive actions as their wives. These results suggest that self confidence allows the individual to depart from the traditional role of his sex. Self confident females specialized less in social emotional behavior, also confirming the above speculation. These wives also had a greater influence, and out performed and out talked their husbands on problem solving activity.

Another researcher (Kotlar, 1962) found that for both adjusted and unadjusted couples, the ideal wife is perceived as having greater amounts of expressive qualities in her role, and the ideal husband to have greater amounts of instrumental qualities. In actual role assessment, a reversal of these roles was indicative of marital maladjustment. The poorly adjusted spouses also perceived themselves and their mates as lacking in sufficient expressive qualities to make for integrative marital relations. The investigator concludes, "Masculine and feminine marital roles are still differentiated and are not becoming reversed" (p. 193).

Zybon (1966) did not find consensus between spouses on general, expressive, and instrumental roles to be associated with the continuance of their marriage. Husbands, however, ranked instrumental roles, wives expressive roles, as more important than did their spouses, as did the couples studied by Farber (1957). Levinger (1964b) found few
differences between spouses in marriage goals (affection and companionship emerging as the most important), a mutuality of social emotional activity, but also some task specialization. Not speaking directly to the expressive-instrumental role conceptualization, but relevant to the discussion is a study (Langhorne and Secord, 1955) of the categorized responses of five thousand college and university students with respect to what they desired in a mate. Closely following traditional patterning, women were more concerned than men with receiving affection, love, sympathy, and understanding from their spouses; males were more desirous of having a spouse who was neat and tidy around the home, who would adjust to a routine, avoid friction, be even-tempered, home loving, reasonable and dependable, and who would make a good impression on their husband's friends.

Instrumentality and expressiveness are two among many roles available to spouses. Tharp (1963) set for himself the task of identifying all the role dimensions within the marital relationship. He began by factor analyzing a forty-eight item questionnaire administered to a middle-aged, intelligent, educated, mature, monogamous population. The items dealt with (1) how important for the ideal marriage husbands and wives felt these items to be (which measured expectations) and then (2) how well husbands and wives felt they and their spouses actually played out these roles (which measured role enactments). Factor analysis revealed that
role dimensions were not the same for the two sexes; and, in some instances, role enactments were different from role expectations. Twelve general factors emerged for each group with sufficient overlap to group them into five dimensions:

1. External relations: Includes social activity and community affairs.

2. Internal instrumentality: Refers to the efficient functioning of the family's household affairs, i.e., how much and how well the work of the house is done.

3. Division of responsibility: Role-sharing, social influence, masculine authority and division of influence. Measurement on the social influence role describes whether the husband or wife should have more influence in deciding the family's social and recreational activities. A factor unique to women in this area, both in expectations and enactments, was the area of masculine dominance. Tharp also points out here that relative influence (dominance or power) does not emerge as a factor. Therefore it was not meaningful to inquire after a "husband-dominant" or wife-dominant" marriage.

4. Sexuality: Includes premarital chastity, sexual fidelity and sexual gratification. Unique to husbands, all the folklore on the subject notwithstanding, was the covariance of intimacy or love with sexual gratification.

5. Solidarity: Factors of intimacy, social and emotional integration, togetherness, understanding, and companionship.
Within this dimension husbands distinguished between togetherness expectations and role sharing expectations. In other words, the husband who values personal togetherness may or may not wish to extend this principle to sharing responsibilities for child rearing and family decision making. Wives, however, who valued togetherness were very likely to expect to "share roles" (p. 400). Wives also included parental adequacy in the intimacy factor, when such was not the case for men.

It is difficult to relate Tharp's work to other studies. In order for this data to be maximally utilized, more so than for other research, one would have to continue within his original framework. The importance this study has for marital happiness is circumscribed by the fact that marital life space, which Tharp measured, is not the same as marital happiness life space. In other words, the wife may spend most of her time cooking, cleaning and taking care of the children, and for her not to do this might be disastrous for the marriage, but it may well not be the stuff of which her marital happiness is made.

Roles and role conflicts for oneself and for other family members change, just as do needs, depending upon the stage of the marriage and the age of the partners. This problem has been investigated by Taylor (1964) who compared three groups of wives, under age 30, 32-40, and over age 40, in five different areas: exercise of domestic skills,
family organization, love and affection, maintenance of self, and social relationships. Wives rated these areas in terms of expectations of actual self, ideal self, and expectations of husband, children, parents, in-laws, and friends. The wives under age thirty perceived husbands as placing more emphasis on maintenance of self (concern with one's appearance, intellectual and emotional identity) than they actually or ideally would. The 32-40 group ideally emphasized social relationships more than their husbands were perceived to. In the over forty group, husbands were perceived as emphasizing social relationships more than wives ideally would. Areas of intra-role conflict, the discrepancy between ideal and actual role, differed for the three groups. The under thirty group were in most conflict over maintenance of self, the middle group over exercise of skills, and the over forty group also with maintenance of self. Hence the middle group, ages 32-40, were most concerned as wife and mother. For all groups, sixty percent or more experienced no conflict between the role demands of others and the role demands of self, with the very important exception of their husbands' demands.

Taylor and Tharp tried to describe the specific content of role dimensions. Bolton (1961) has attempted to theoretically account for the general form in which roles develop. He takes the symbolic interactionist viewpoint that mate selection is a relationship which is built up through sequences of interactions characterized by advances, retreats,
and turning points. The outcome of the contacts of the two individuals is not mechanically predetermined by their personality characteristics or social backgrounds. Bolton delineates five types of developmental processes in the pre-marital relationships of newly married couples that he studied. Type I) Personality meshing process: mutual emphasis on personality "fit." Type II) Identify clarification process: the relationship brings a clarification of one or both individual identities. Type III) Relation centered process: both members are intent on building a strong relationship and often ignore personality differences. Type IV) Pressure and intrapersonal process: one individual puts pressure on the other member. Lack of congruity is met by role playing and romanticism. Type V) Expedience centered process: strongly felt pressure to marry on part of one or both members. Personality "fit" and mutuality of values are only superficially considered.

The development of one specific role, namely, authority, has been described by another researcher (Ingersoll, 1948). Through contact with parental figures during the formative years, authority roles are learned by the individual and tend to be projected into the authority role interaction between himself and his marriage partner. The integrated authority role for each partner as learned in response to parental control tends either (1) to be enacted (in the "self" or "other" form) if the expectations are complementary,
(2) to be modified through interaction if the partner's expectations differ or (3) to be influenced by other factors, personal or situational conditions which may affect variations in authority interaction.

Silverman and Hill (1967) have tried to explain roles, or more specifically, task allocation, in such a way as to fit two different marital groups, one American and one Belgian. They compared three theories in an attempt to account for patterns of task allocation: (1) cultural prescription—failed to explain either American or Belgian findings; (2) availability theory (the more available a spouse is to perform family tasks, the most tasks he is likely to perform) best explained American task allocation, but was useless in explaining Belgian findings; (3) family development theory (places availability theory into time perspective over the family life cycle) best explained both American and Belgian variations in task allocation. Task performance, task specialization and adherence to gender definitions of task assignments were shown to vary in both settings in the size and composition of the family over its life cycle.

The only other cross cultural study, though not dealing with task allocation is that of Michel's (1963) which compared interaction in French families with those of American families, using the data gathered by Blood and Wolfe (1960) who studied a Detroit sample. The chief significant findings deal with the wife's satisfaction which was correlated with
1. The husband's income: Direct linear relationship for the French sample; diminishes after $7,000 for U. S. sample (explanation - the successful husband neglects his wife).

2. Education: The greater the education the greater the wife's happiness for both samples.

3. Husband's help with housework: Direct linear relationship for French sample; diminishes after three chores or more for the U. S. sample.

4. Decision making: The wife's satisfaction was greater in equalitarian marriages in both samples.

Also attempting to provide explanation for task allocation or role expectation, although in terms of self attitude, is Hurlburt (1960). He analyzed ninety-eight couples' responses to a questionnaire dealing with self attitude, evaluation of marital adjustment, and role expectations for self and spouse. He concluded, "It appears as though those roles which have the cultural support for one sex, and which are being challenged for institutional support by the general movement of egalitarianism, seem to mean more for whichever sex lacks the institutional support for these roles" (p. 1659). For husbands, this included the subroles of taking care of children; for wives, the subroles of economics, politics, recreation, and social activities. The relationship between self-attitude and marital adjustment of wives was not significant. For husbands, procreational referents of
self-attitude were positively related to marital adjustment. This meant that husbands were better adjusted who mentioned their child rearing role in the marriage.

Soysa (1962) found that women with a high degree of independence reported conflict in their attempt to coordinate their roles of homemaker, career woman, and good citizen.

Studies that make use of role theory and employ more complicated formulations than "enactments" and "expectations" are few. One such study is Levinger's (1964b). Comparing high and low-satisfaction groups Levinger found happily married couples showed more socially supportive behavior, less rejecting behavior, reported higher frequency of communication, talking with each other more on nine of eleven topics (two exceptions being "bad feelings" and "money matters"). For husbands, sex satisfaction was most related to general satisfaction; for wives, marital communication was most related to general satisfaction. A factor analysis yielded four satisfaction factors: general satisfaction, social emotion satisfaction, sexual satisfaction and task satisfaction. General satisfaction accounted for the greatest portion of variance.

Buerkle (1960) has employed an interesting technique in assessing role perceptions of self. He asked happily married spouses to respond to the "Twenty Statements Test" which has each subject ask himself "Who am I?" and then to
list the first twenty answers that come to mind. Answers are divided into two basic categories—categories which refer to groups and classes whose limits and conditions of membership are common knowledge are called consensual; those which refer to groups, classes, attributes and traits or any other matter which would require interpretation by the respondent to be precise or to place him relative to other people are subconsensual. Examples of the consensual variety are "student," "girl," "Baptist," "oldest child," "studying engineer." Examples of the subconsensual category are "happy," "bored," "pretty good student," "too heavy," "good wife," "interesting."

Spouses in the adjusted group were more consensually oriented than in the unadjusted group. In practically all unadjusted cases, the consensual score was well below the mean for the adjusted group. The consensual scores are believed by Buerkle to be a direct representation of the extent to which the subject is consensually anchored in his society. The developers of the test, sociologists Kuhn and McPartland (1954) explain that effective communication between interactants depends upon their demonstrating a high percentage of consensual definitions of a situation, an assumption central to the symbolic interactionist position they hold.

A final study dealing with roles and communication (Bricklin and Gottlieb, 1961) found that three facets of the
Rorschach human movement (M) response can successfully predict certain aspects of marital compatibility. The smaller the difference in number of M responses between a husband and wife, the fewer the nonconcordance in M qualities (e.g., aggressive, passive, blocked, compliant) and the fewer the sex confused and distorted M, the greater is the probability that compatibility will improve as communication between husband and wife increases. Human movement responses are viewed by the authors as prototypal life roles and the above Rorschach "facts" are believed to be equivalent clinically to the ability of each mate to accept the most stable and deeply entrenched personality traits of the other. They reflect the "ability for true, deep, and complex communication, and the ability to assume mature psychosexual roles in life" (p. 301). When the husband and wife earn a poor compatibility score, the authors feel that communication between them should be discouraged and/or the mates should be urged to enter individual psychotherapy.

Goldman (1956) also points out the hazards of encouraging communication which can intensify marital difficulties where one partner is extremely submissive and masochistic, where one partner is coercive, dominating or sadistic, where one partner has a weak ego and inadequate sense of self; where in either partner the inner defenses and controls are sufficiently weak that an intense emotional reaction may get out of hand.
Most researchers today are becoming increasingly enthusiastic about the application of role theory to marital interaction. Exceptions are Kimmel and Havens (1966) who are of the conviction that to the extent that role relationships are focused upon in research, teaching and counseling, they "replace real communication and mutual identification" which they believe to be at the core of a happy marriage. Kirkpatrick (1958), also attempting to minimize the importance of roles, demonstrated that dates did better than mates in empathy with respect to attitudes toward marriage and marriage roles.
PERCEPTION

In the preceding areas, few studies have dealt with dyads other than marital couples which have had relevance for marital interaction. This is not true for the interpersonal perception area. Few marital happiness researchers, however, have built upon or attempted to validate these two-person interperception studies. Four of these studies, despite no substantive link to marriage, appear to have considerable relevance. The conclusions of these studies are briefly sketched.

1. When we are aware of what our own personal characteristics are we make fewer errors in perceiving others (Norman, 1953).

2. Secure Ss (compared with insecure Ss) tend to see others as warm rather than cold (Bosom and Maslow, 1957).

3. We are more likely to like others who have traits we accept in ourselves and reject those who have the traits we do not like in ourselves (Lundy, Katkousky, Cromwell and Shoemaker, 1955).

4. (Corollary to Lundy et al.) Rephrasing Lundy et al. (1955), it could be said that for people we like, we tend to perceive more accurately the ways in which they are similar to us and are less accurate in viewing the unlike ways. For people we do not like, however, we tend to see them as
different from ourselves; we perceive most accurately their traits that are unlike our own, and their similar traits less accurately.

Studies dealing with perception and marital happiness usually address themselves to one of the following topics: Marital happiness as a function of

1. Congruence or similarity of self perceptions.
2. Congruence of self and spouse perceptions.
4. Projection--Spouse's perception of mate that is the same as spouse's perception of self but is not in keeping with his mate's perception of herself.
5. Assumed similarity--Spouse's perception of mate that may be the same as the mate's perception of self but is in keeping with the spouse's perception of himself.

Self descriptive congruency among happily married couples has been found by Kelly (1941), Preston, Peltz, Mudd and Froscher (1952), Corsini (1956a, 1956b), Eshleman (1965) and Hurley and Silvert (1966). These latter investigators used perceived EPPS needs and found only a low correlation with marital happiness when combining all fifteen needs. They did find, however, that similarly perceived need intraception (psychological mindedness) between mates correlated by itself with marital happiness.

Self-spouse congruency refers to agreement of perception with regard to self perception and perception of self by
spouse. It has been found to correlate with marital happiness by Dymond (1954), Preston et al. (1952), Mangus (1957), and Luckey (1960a). Luckey (1961) also found that among happily married spouses there is greater congruence between one's ideal self and the perception of one's spouse. Kogan and Jackson (1964) found that wives who see themselves as being quite close to their ideal selves see their husbands as being like themselves whereas those who view themselves less favorably perceive their husbands as being different. They also measured wives' self perceptions in comparison with wives' perceptions of husbands (assumed similarity). There was neither complementarity nor similarity in their perceptions. Wives who perceived themselves as being more like their husbands also turned out to be more like a description of someone else's husband. This led the authors to believe that social desirability may have been an important factor. Assumed similarity was found to be operative for the perceptions of husbands with their wives but not vice versa by Farber (1957). Examining assumed similarity within specific dimensions, Kotlar (1965) found that adjusted husbands and wives saw themselves as more similar in dominance and un-adjusted spouses perceived themselves as unalike on this dimension. Kotlar also found for self-spouse congruence unadjusted wives perceived themselves as affectionate-submissive individuals, but were perceived by their husbands as having hostile-dominant attitudes. For unadjusted husbands this discrepancy
was also present. There was also a significant correlation between low discrepancy for husbands and marital adjustment which was not found for wives. Kotlar (1961) found that adjusted wives were perceived by themselves and their husbands as being more dominant (defined as efficient, self-confident, responsible and independent, and aggressive) than was the case for unadjusted wives. Unadjusted husbands were perceived as more hostile. For the total sample, the correlation between marital adjustment and self-spouse discrepancy score was -0.30 and highly significant.

The study indicated that the concept of the ideal spouse as dominant (using the above definition) is a cultural norm against which spouses are viewed as either acceptable or unacceptable. Thus, congruence of perception is related not so much to empathy as it is to similarity of role conceptualizations of adjusted spouses. They perceive themselves as having similar role attitudes which are in conformity with cultural ideals and norms.

Assumed similarity has been dealt with as a measure of projection (Cowden, 1955; Mitchell, 1959) social distance (Fiedler, 1953) and a generalized mental set (Cronbach, 1955). Hurley and Silvert (1966) examined still another type of congruence (I see you vs. you see me). In the areas of achievement and endurance, marital happiness was positively associated with the husband's describing his wife as having more of these qualities than she described him. In need
affiliation husbands were reported by their wives to be more friendly and outgoing than husbands described their wives in the well adjusted group. Self-spouse congruence (I see me vs. you see me) was not found to be associated with marital happiness.

Eleanore Luckey, (1964b) found that among satisfied married couples spouses perceived themselves and their spouses as warm, cooperative, responsive and generous, and conventional. Dissatisfied spouses (1964a) described their spouses (but not themselves) as having intense qualities, and as being decidedly skeptical and distrustful, blunt and aggressive. In a longitudinal study (Luckey, 1966) her data indicated that the longer that couples were married the less favorable personality qualities they saw in their mates (although the greatest length of time married in her sample was only eight years). This process was true for couples who found their marriages satisfying as well as for those dissatisfied. She also found that overall marital satisfaction was negatively related to the number of years married, but positively related to the number of years of education of the spouses.

A subtopic in perception is empathy or the accurate prediction by one spouse of his mate's self perception. Hurley and Silvert (1966) found empathy more highly correlated with marital adjustment (.55) than with self concept congruence (I see me vs. you see you .34). Dymond (1954) tested
fifteen couples for their ability to predict respective spouse's responses to fifty-five items from the MMPI. Scores were then related to the happiness of the marriage as rated by marital partners and outside judges. Happily married groups were significantly more accurate in their predictions. Unhappily married groups tended to underestimate the difference between themselves and their partners.

Udry (1963) employed an empathy measure, although he was actually using a perceptual approach to study complementarity. He questioned two assumptions usually made in complementarity theory, namely, that certain combinations are reciprocally gratifying and that measurable traits are the basis for selection and interaction. Engaged and married spouses filled out the Sixteen Personality Factor Test and then answered it in the way they perceived their mates would respond. The data showed prediction of spouse's self perception tended to exaggerate existing personality differences in both samples. Mates, however, did not perceive one another as opposite, nor were they opposite on any trait. This finding casts further doubt on Winch's type I complementarity. He found that perception of the mate involved projection of one's own traits. This tendency was most predominant among engaged persons and especially among females. It is interesting to note that females had a greater tendency to project but also had the greatest accuracy of perception. Accuracy was greater among married than engaged couples.
Udry did a follow-up study (1967) with these same couples to see if they married or broke their engagements over a five year period. Using discriminant function analysis, he measured the contribution of individual personality, personality match, and mate perception to discriminate between those who married and those who separated. No contribution was found for individual personality, personality match, accuracy of mate perception, or perception of mate similarity. Engaged men, however, were likely to break engagement if they saw their partners as conventional, emotionally unstable, and self controlled. Udry remarks, "It appears that the girl who gets her man is perceived by him as being a 'swinger'" (p. 275).

Mitchell (1959) examined the role of empathy in combination with assumed similarity. He obtained a negative correlation between sensitivity to partner (empathy) and assumed similarity. This finding indicated that spouses tended to score low on sensitivity to partner when they scored high on assumed similarity (projection). If, however, husband and wife do rate themselves similarly then they will be more accurate in predicting each other's self ratings (Norcutt and Silva, 1951).

Cowden's (1955) study produced similar results. Cowden examined empathy and projection with a personality inventory filled out for self and predicted responses of mate. The amount of projection was determined by
partialling out the empathy (accurate predictions), and the empathy score was obtained by partialling out the projection. He found that empathy and projection appeared side by side and coexisted. The high degree of similarity between ratings (.55) helps to explain how the two processes coexist; in both of them the "other person" being judged is perceived as a function of one's own self image.

Some studies utilize several kinds of perceptions. Corsini (1956 a, 1956 b), for example, measured husbands' and wives' self perceptions, husbands' predictions of wives' self perception, and husbands' predictions of wives' perceptions of husbands, and the reciprocal of these for wives' perceptions. He found:

1. No evidence that happiness in marriage is a function of empathy (predicting spouse's self perception)
2. No evidence that happiness in marriage is associated with similarity of self and spouse perceptions (self-spouse congruence)
3. Marital happiness was associated with similarity of self perceptions.
4. Marital happiness was related to the conformity of men to their self perception of the masculine role. Such parallel data was not the case for women.

Corsini's interpretation of marital happiness and self similarity was that either spouses who see themselves similarly are more likely to be happy; or, the opposite
interpretation is also compatible, namely, spouses who are happily married tend to become similar with respect to their self perceptions.

Preston et al. (1952) found that
1. Happily married partners exhibited materially higher self-spouse congruence than did unhappily married spouses.
2. Self ratings of husbands and wives revealed negligible correlations.
3. Happily married couples showed more evidence of a lack of realism in personality appraisal of themselves and their partners.

The foregoing data, according to Preston, are the direct result of the fact that people on opposite sides of a conflict situation have more opportunity to take note of their opponents as different rather than similar to themselves, whereas persons with strong affective feelings (such as love) promote a wish for identification and to see their partners as similar rather than different from themselves.

A. B. Taylor (1967), using the Interpersonal Check List, found, as in the previously cited research, greater similarity between self perception and spouse's perception of that self for well adjusted couples. A closer examination of her data revealed that there was both a difference in pattern and intensity of perception between the adjusted and unadjusted groups. Within the adjusted group there was
more empathy on the wife's part (greater ability to predict husband's self perception). Correlating this empathy with the marital satisfaction within the adjusted group, indicated that empathic accuracy is more significant for marital adjustment with respect to perception of the husband than perception of the wife. This finding is congruent with other literature reviewed.

Taylor also found that in the adjusted group (1) The discrepancies were less between the husband's self perception and his prediction of his wife's perception of him. (2) The discrepancy was less between the husband's perception of his wife and his prediction of his wife's self perception. Both (1) and (2) were equally true with respect to wives. Taylor indicates that these intra-individual perceptions may characterize marital partners' attitudes about their communication. Or, with respect to the unadjusted group, "they may be stating that they are not communicating about who they are and for some this represents a significant factor in their relationship" (p. 30). An alternative hypothesis which the author does not suggest is that the self-knowledge of these poorly adjusted mates is low, and they are therefore unable to acknowledge qualities about themselves that their spouses veridically perceive. Taylor lastly made up an index composed of discrepancy scores on (1) self-perception vs. mate perception, (2) empathy vs. self perception, and
3) intra-individual perception. The total discrepancy scores were significantly different between the two groups. In commenting on this difference Taylor suggests that marital adjustment is provided for by similar patterns and similar intensities in the perception of selves, which in turn are really a function of communication and a reciprocal taking of roles.

Another attack on the empathy problem was made by Farber (1962). He looked into the elements constituting competence in marital relationships. Factor analysis revealed five categories for husband and wife: perceived empathy, autonomy, resourcefulness, cooperativeness, and tested empathy. The first four factors are self-explanatory. The fifth, tested empathy, was composed of a number of elements divided into three increasingly complex levels, all revolving around prediction by one mate with regard to the other (the husband is used here as the case in point although the process was equally true for wives). The first level involved the ability of the husband to predict the wife's perception of her own behavior and attitudes toward her husband. Level two involved the ability of the husband to predict the wife's perception of the husband's conformity to her expectations. Level three was the ability of the husband to predict the wife's perception of the husband's perception of the wife's conformity to his expectations. In discussing how these levels of empathy are involved in the
marital relationship, Farber states,

If low marital adjustment is regarded as a failure to meet expectations, the actors' empathy at the second or third levels are probably low, even though empathy at the simplest level may be very high. Hence, although individually the husband and wife may be highly sensitive to the intentions, attitudes, and gestures of the spouse, in interaction (in which interchange of expectations is necessary) the couple may not communicate expectations to each other. Conversely, the couple may be inept at simple, first-level empathy, but may adequately verbalize information necessary for second and third levels of empathy (p. 45).

Farber also notes as a side issue, that the dimensions of personality needs suggested by the factor loadings at the second empathy level are similar to those applied by Winch in his development of a typology of complementarity.

Hobart (1955) found results completely contradictory to those of Farber. Psychological empathy, i.e., insight into how the mate rates himself as a person, was found to be more closely related than marital role empathy or insight into the marital roles which mates expect self and spouse to play. No relationship was found between role disagreement and marital adjustment for either husband or wife. His data further indicated that barriers to communication, (e.g., taboo topics, one mate sulking, withdrawing, etc.) were more highly related to marital adjustment than either role agreement or empathic communication.

The above studies were, in effect, addressed to the question of which concept or concepts within role theory
have the most predictive power for marital adjustment. Another study (Murstein, 1967) pitted role theory itself against two aspects of need theory, viz., complementarity and homogamy, with regard to mate selection. He employed the interperception scores (the disparity between self concept of one partner and the ideal spouse desired by the other) and intraperception scores (disparity between the concept of one's ideal spouse and one's perception of one's fiancee). He found that couples chose each other on the basis of role compatibility as seen by the respective members of the couples (interperception) and as viewed by one member alone (intraperception). Role theory accounted more cogently for marital choice than either complementary or homogamous need theory for intraperception scores but not for interperception scores.

The final article reviewed in this section also deals with an examination of role theory and need theory. It is a recent article by Winch (1967) who is currently willing to speak of roles, in addition to complementary needs, as useful concepts. He points out that complementary need theory was designed only to predict mate selection, not marital happiness or marital stability. Roles or needs may be more important, according to Winch, depending on the type of family being studied. "Where the family is highly functional... the less importance will the family (or the culture) give to the idiosyncratic needs of the individual.
In middle class America, where extended families tend to be non-functional, needs assume more importance for selection, happiness and stability" (p. 761).

**Areas of Marital Conflict**

This section contains only three studies, but they seem to be sufficiently *sui generis* to require separate treatment. Mathews and Mihanovich (1963) gave happy and unhappy couples a check list of problems and asked them to indicate which occurred in their marriages. The problems occurring in the unhappy marriages differed from the happy ones in number and kind. Of 364 problems, there was a statistically significant difference on 334 problems between the two groups. The two most important areas of disturbance in unhappy marriages were fulfillment of basic needs and interaction (decision making). The most discriminating item between the two groups was "Don't think alike on many things (endorsed by fifty percent of the unhappy groups compared with eleven percent of the happy group). Of 190 problems tested on a "length of marriage" dimension, 150 were as likely to occur at any period of married life. These data, the investigators suggest, indicate that problems do not disappear and are not solved; people learn to live with them.

Defining a "problem area" in a much broader sense, Mitchell (Mitchell, Bullard, and Mudd, 1962) found no substantial differences between happy and unhappy groups in
how they ranked their areas of conflict. Economic problems ranked highest; religious and educational problems ranked lowest. The only difference found was that the unhappy group listed greater frequency of problems. In addition to finances, other most frequently mentioned problem areas were household management, sharing household tasks, and children.

Carson (1962), in comparing happy and unhappy marital couples on agreement in certain areas, found that compatibility was a function of spousal agreement in the areas of dealing with in-laws, finances, and friends. Compatibility was also a function of agreement regarding the importance of these areas. Areas that did not discriminate between groups were intimate relations, demonstration of affection, and philosophy of life.
SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

To summarize this literature is to overgeneralize and give evaluative weightings to data that do not begin to be complete enough to legitimately allow the evaluative process. With these major limitations well in mind, the attempt is made.

Marital Choice

People marry people who are like themselves in demographic, physical and personality characteristics. Marriage at colleges distant from spouses' parental homes tends to reduce demographic homogamy.

Personality Traits

Happily married spouses are emotionally stable, unanxious, considerate of one another, and emotionally dependent on each other.

Interests

Happily married spouses have similar interests, but are conservative in indicating mutuality. They do not show mutuality on superficial interests.

Values and Attitudes

Couples grow more alike in values throughout their married life. Happily married couples perceive themselves
as having similar values, while this may not really be so.
Marital satisfaction that comes from agreement between spouses
in one value or attitude area is a poor predictor of marital
satisfaction in another value or attitude area.

Self Acceptance

Happily married spouses feel adequate, confident
and are well adjusted. Happily married spouses are similar
in their adjustment.

Ideal Mate

Men and women want the same personality character-
istics in a mate. Once engagement and marriage take place,
the ideal mate concept becomes unimportant. Nevertheless,
the real mates of happily married spouses are perceived to
more closely resemble the spouses' ideal mate.

Parental Identification

Happily married husbands are like their fathers;
happily married wives have husbands like their (the wives')
fathers.

Needs

Happily married spouses have their needs satisfied.
Different needs come into prominence at different marital
stages.
Complementarity

Happily married couples are neither complementary within the same need nor complementary on need pairs. There may be a few exceptions but at present it is not possible to tell what they are.

Roles

Happily married couples agree about role expectations and enactments for themselves and each other. Their self expectations and self enactments are closely related. Conventional marital roles play a part of the happy marriage, though not particularly with respect to husbands as instrumental, wives as expressive. Taking the role of the other is important. Role expectations and role enactments are not identical for husbands and wives, in addition to even the usually thought of sex role differences.

Perception

Happily married couples have greater

1) Self perception congruence
   (I see me vs. you see you)

2) Self spouse congruence
   (I see me vs. you see me)

3) Greater assumed similarity
   (I see me vs. I see you)

4) Greater empathy
   (I see how you see you vs. you see you)
Areas of Conflict

Happily married couples have different kinds of problems and lesser amounts of the same problems than do unhappy married couples.

In happy marriages the wife does more adjusting, but the happiness of the marriages is more dependent upon her happiness than the husband's.
HYPOTHESES

The problem this study addressed itself to was to account for the variance in marital happiness and, secondarily, to account for the variance in need satisfaction. It was hypothesized that marital happiness is a function of (1) homogamy among certain needs, (2) complementarity among certain other needs, (3) agreement between spouses regarding need level and need reduction, (4) self perception congruence, (5) empathy with regard to needs and (6) empathy with regard to role expectations. It was hypothesized that need satisfaction is a function of homogamy among certain needs and complementarity among certain other needs.

The hypotheses tested were designed with three objectives in mind: (1) to inclusively incorporate all meaningful concepts that had emerged from the literature, i.e., to draw upon interpersonal perception, needs, roles, and empathy; (2) to amalgamate homogamy and complementarity by indicating where each would occur within a marriage; (3) to synthesize need theory and role theory (in effect, attempting to validate a small portion of Parsonian theory which is presented in the discussion section).

Hypotheses I and II deal with the homogamy-complementarity issue. Intraneed complementarity is used in reference to one need. With the need for achievement,
for example, there is intraneed complementarity when one spouse is high on the need and the other is low. *Interneed complementarity* is used in reference to a pair of needs. With the pair of needs dominance and deference, for example, interneed complementarity exists when one spouse is high on need dominance and the other high on need deference. There is also interneed complementarity if both spouses score low or moderately on their respective needs.

*Homogamy*, unlike complementarity, is used only in reference to one need, and is the reciprocal of intraneed complementarity. When both spouses score high, low, or moderately on a given need, homogamy is present.

**Hypothesis IA)** When marital partners have similar amounts of needs that are met homogamously, their marital happiness as related to these need areas is greater than when they differ in degree of need.

**Hypothesis IB)** When marital partners have dissimilar amounts of needs that are met by intraneed complementarity, their marital happiness as related to these need areas is greater than when they are alike in degree of complementary need.

**Hypothesis IC)** When marital partners have similar amounts of complementary needs which are met by
interneed complementarity, their marital happiness as related to these need areas is greater than when they have dissimilar amounts of these needs.

Hypothesis II is a more parsimonious version of Hypothesis I. If, in fact, homogamy and complementarity provide marital happiness, the very least we would expect of them is to provide need satisfaction within the need being examined.

Hypothesis IIA) When marital partners have similar amounts of needs that are met homogamously, their satisfactions within those need areas are greater than when they differ in degree of need.

Hypothesis IIB) When marital partners have dissimilar amounts of needs that are met by intraneed complementarity, their satisfactions within those need areas are greater than when they are similar in degree of complementary needs.

Hypothesis IIC) When marital partners have similar amounts of complementary needs which are met by interneed complementarity, their satisfactions within those need areas is greater than when they have dissimilar amounts of those needs.
Hypothesis III compares the predictive power of self-spouse need congruence, self-spouse need reduction congruence, and, combining needs and roles, role expectation congruence with respect to need satisfaction.

Hypothesis IIIA) Marital happiness is a function of self-spouse agreement re: perception of the self.

Hypothesis IIIB) Marital happiness is a function of self-spouse agreement re: need reduction.

Hypothesis IIIC) Marital happiness is a function of self-spouse agreement re: marital expectations.

Hypothesis IV attempts to demonstrate the importance of self perception congruence for marital happiness.

Hypothesis IV) Marital happiness is a function of similarity of spouses' self perceptions.

Hypothesis V examines marital happiness in relation to receiving empathy as well as marital happiness in relation to giving empathy. In other words, this hypothesis covers the possibility that the mate who provides empathy for his partner may be as happy or happier than the partner who receives it.

Hypothesis VA) Marital happiness of one spouse is a function of the amount of empathy he receives from his mate.

Hypothesis VB) Marital happiness of one spouse is a function of the amount of empathy he extends to his mate.
METHOD

Subjects

Marital couples were selected from two sources: (1) Twelve couples in treatment in a social work agency in the Southwestern United States; (2) Twenty-one couples in New York City, with at least one spouse of each marital pair in a professional occupation. While this latter group was not considered to be the same as a "happily married" group, it clearly provided the overall sample with a broad range, thereby increasing the chances for a stronger correlation between marital happiness and the variables being studied. Sixteen couples were Jewish, seventeen were gentile. Length of time married ranged from six months to thirty years.

Test Battery

Three tests were administered: (1) Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, (2) Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (short form), (3) marriage questionnaire. The EPPS was selected because the greatest number of relevant and significant findings found in the literature employed this measure. The Locke-Wallace short form marital adjustment test has been found to have better validity and reliability than any other test currently in usage (see Locke and Wallace, 1959, Borello, 1966, pp. 158-160). The marriage
questionnaire was designed by the investigator and is as follows: The same fifteen needs as are found in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were used. Each need in the questionnaire was defined by brief simple descriptions as are used in the EPPS manual (Edwards, 1959, p. 11). Each spouse was asked to rate A) himself, B) his mate, C) his prediction of his mate's self perception. For self perception and mate perception, the spouses were asked for three kinds of judgments for each of the fifteen needs: (1) perception of need level, (2) perception of reduction of need by spouse, and (3) perception of desired need satisfaction of need by spouse. This third category allowed for a spouse to indicate that his mate was meeting a need either (a) too little, (b) too much, or (c) enough just as it was being met. When these desired satisfaction ratings were made by the spouse in rating his mate's desired satisfactions and compared with those of the mate, this comparison provided, in effect, a measure of the spouse's knowledge of his mate's expectations for him with respect to the satisfying of the mate's needs.

Procedure
Case workers at the social work agency administered the three paper and pencil tests to their twelve couples, and returned the data to the investigator so that the twelve couples remained anonymous. The investigator supplied the
other twenty-one couples, who were all volunteers, with the tests, which they filled out at home and mailed back to the investigator, also without identifying themselves.

**Scoring and Statistical Analyses**

To test hypotheses IA and IB: Homogamy and intra-need complementarity were measured at the same time because they were defined as the reciprocals of each other, i.e., when need scores were the same homogamy existed and when they were different complementarity existed. The EPPS raw scores of each spouse were converted into percentiles, using college population norms. The percentiles, in turn, were converted into quintiles (a percentile of 1 through 20 assigned a quintile score of 1, a percentile of 21 through 40 assigned a score of 2, etc.). For each couple, the spouses' scores were compared and subtracted for all fifteen needs. The smaller the difference score between the spouses the more homogamy, the larger the difference the more complementarity. Defining and measuring complementarity as a difference in need level is consistent with the definition and measurement of this concept as found in the literature. Difference scores were then correlated with marital happiness scores for each sex.

To test hypothesis IC: Difference scores were obtained in the same way as for IA and IB for the following pairs of complementarities (H=Husband, W=Wife):
H-nurturance/W-succorance, H-succorance/W-nurturance; H-dominance/W-deference, H-deference/W-Dominance; H-aggression/W-abasement, H-abasement/W-aggression; H-exhibition/W-affiliation, H-affiliation/W-exhibition. With these pairs, the larger the difference score the less complementarity, the smaller the difference score the more complementarity (e.g., H-nurturance score=5, W-succorance score=5, difference score=0=high complementarity).

To test hypothesis IIA, IIB, and IIC: The same procedure was followed as for IA, IB, and IC, except that difference scores were correlated with need satisfaction scores. "Need satisfaction" was judged to be the response to the question, "How much more or less would you like your spouse to help satisfy this need?" rather than to the question, "How much does your spouse help to satisfy this need?" because in the framework being employed in this investigation, a need can be "oversatisfied." Many spouses, for example, indicated that their partners met their need for abasement "considerably" but also indicated that they would like their partners to meet the need "much less." Satisfaction scores were determined by assigning the category "enough just as is" a score of zero, the categories "less" and "more" a score of 1, and the categories "much less" and "much more" a score of 2. Hence, the lower the score the more satisfaction.
To test hypothesis IIIA: Difference scores between spouse's rating of self and partner's rating of spouse were computed and then correlated with marital happiness scores for each sex. The same analysis was done for IIIB with need satisfaction scores of the spouse and the partner's rating of his spouse's satisfaction. The same analysis was carried out for IIIC, using desired satisfaction scores.

To test hypothesis IV: Difference scores for spouses' self perceptions were summed and correlated with marital happiness scores.

To test hypothesis V: To rate "received empathy" the spouse's perception of self was compared with the partner's prediction of the spouse's self perception. These difference scores were correlated with the original spouses' marital happiness scores. To correlate marital happiness with "extended empathy" these same scores were correlated with the marital happiness scores of the spouses making the predictions.
RESULTS

No significant correlations (Table I) were found between marital happiness and homogamy or complementarity within the same need (with the exception of need order which, owing to the relatively low magnitude of the correlation and its occurrence with 29 other correlations, is most economically interpreted as not being different from chance). Therefore, hypotheses IA and IB were not supported.

Interneed complementarity was also shown to have no relationship to marital happiness (Table II). It was found, in fact, that for the need pair husband-succorance/wife-nurturance a lack of complementarity was correlated with wives' marital happiness. Hypothesis IC was not supported.

With the exception of need exhibition in which complementarity led to husband's need satisfaction, homogamy or complementarity within the same need did not lead to satisfaction (Table III). For all practical purposes, hypotheses IIA and IIB were not supported. Table IV provides interesting data on interneed complementarity and need satisfaction. Need satisfaction was measured so that the lower scores indicated more satisfaction. Signs were reversed so that a positive relationship between need satisfaction
TABLE I

Correlations between Marital Happiness and Intraneed Homogamy or Complementarity

(Negative correlations indicate homogamy; positive correlations indicate complementarity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>-005</td>
<td>075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>-130</td>
<td>-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>-118</td>
<td>-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>-016</td>
<td>-046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>-078</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>-036</td>
<td>-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>-133</td>
<td>-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>-163</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HET</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>-229</td>
<td>-012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II
Correlations between Marital Happiness and Interneed Complementarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need pair</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF-DOM</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM-DEF</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH-AFF</td>
<td>046</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF-EXH</td>
<td>-103</td>
<td>-233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC-NUR</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>321*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR-SUC</td>
<td>-015</td>
<td>-079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA-AGG</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG-ABA</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
TABLE III

Correlations between Need Satisfactions and Intraneed Homogamy or Complementarity

(Negative correlations indicate complementarity; positive correlations indicate homogamy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>-391*</td>
<td>-090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>-190</td>
<td>-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>070</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>-051</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>035</td>
<td>-217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>-016</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>-058</td>
<td>-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HET</td>
<td>-090</td>
<td>-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>-179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .025
### TABLE IV

Correlations between Need Satisfactions and Interneed Complementarities

(For each need pair, the need on top is the husband's, the one on bottom the wife's. Positive correlations indicate a positive relationship between satisfaction and complementarity. Negative correlations indicate a positive relationship between satisfaction and lack of complementarity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interneed pair</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF-</td>
<td>-552****</td>
<td>-217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>-235</td>
<td>-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM-</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>376**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH-</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>463***</td>
<td>-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF-</td>
<td>-351**</td>
<td>467***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>-172</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC-</td>
<td>-136</td>
<td>-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>-364**</td>
<td>-046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR-</td>
<td>-193</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>-144</td>
<td>-302*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA-</td>
<td>-296*</td>
<td>-030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>-144</td>
<td>-253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG-</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p< .05  
** p< .025  
*** p< .005  
**** p< .0005
and complementarity would be represented by a positive correlation coefficient. It will be noted that there are two correlation coefficients for each sex although there is only one complementary pair involved. The second correlation (the top one of each pair is the husband's, the bottom is the wife's) is a measure of the satisfaction of the need which is not the one that is involved in the complementary pair. This arrangement becomes less confusing if we examine an actual pair. Looking at husband-exhibition/wife-affiliation in Table IV, it can be seen that when this complementarity does exist for husband and wife, the husband does not get his need for exhibition satisfied ($r.022$), but strangely, he does get his need affiliation satisfied ($r.463$), the very need that his wife possesses in such a degree that she is complementary to him on his need for exhibition. This same occurrence takes place with husband's need nurturance satisfaction on the complementarity husband-succorance/wife-nurturance and also with wife's need affiliation satisfaction on the complementarity husband-affiliation/wife-exhibition.

Other significant correlations are as follows: For the need pair husband-dominance/wife-deference, the wife's need deference is satisfied when complementarity exists. With husband-deference/wife-dominance, however, only when there is a lack of complementarity is the husband's need deference satisfied. When there is a lack of complementarity
on husband succorance/wife nurturance, the wife's need succorance is satisfied. When a lack of complementarity exists for husband abasement/wife aggression, the husband's need abasement is satisfied. Hence, hypothesis IIC is partially supported.

Correlations between marital happiness and agreement between spouses regarding the need level of one spouse existed only when husbands and wives agreed about the wives' need level (Table V). There was no correlation between marital happiness and agreement about need reduction (Table V). With respect to agreement about role expectations and marital happiness, there were strong correlations for both spouses. Therefore, hypothesis IIIA is partially supported, IIIB is refuted, and IIIC is totally supported.

There was no significant correlation found for congruent self perceptions and marital happiness (Table VI). Hypothesis IV is not confirmed.

Table VII indicates that marital happiness is not a function of having one's self perception predicted by his mate or predicting his mate's self perception. Hence, hypothesis V is not supported.

The use of a computer in calculating correlations also yielded data which, while not directly related to the above five hypotheses, is equally interesting:

1. When husband dominance/wife deference complementarity exists, the wife achieves satisfaction in needs deference,
### TABLE V

**Correlations between Marital Happiness and Agreement between Spouses Regarding Needs, Need Satisfactions, and Role Expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Area</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>354*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Satisfactions</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectations</td>
<td>645****</td>
<td>629****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p<.025
**** p<.0005

### TABLE VI

**Correlations between Marital Happiness and Congruent Self Perceptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Congruent Perceptions</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII

Correlations between Marital Happiness and Giving or Receiving Empathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
order, autonomy, abasement, nurturance, and heterosexuality (Table VIII).

2. When complementarity does not exist on the following five pairs of needs, the husband achieves need satisfaction on a variety of needs: (in all cases the husband's need is on the left, the wife's on the right) deference-dominance, abasement-aggression, succorance-nurturance, affiliation-exhibition, and nurturance-succorance. For abasement-aggression and succorance-nurturance, a lack of complementarity also correlated with overall need satisfaction (Table IX).

3. Diminished complementarity in one pair of needs is associated with diminution in another pair of needs for husbands and wives for the following four complementary pairs: succorance-nurturance, nurturance-succorance, abasement-aggression, aggression-abasement (Tables X and XI).

4. Satisfactions among needs were considerably more interrelated for women than men (Table XII).

5. Marital happiness was associated with need satisfaction for three out of fifteen needs for husbands, for thirteen out of fifteen needs for women. Total need satisfaction was much more related to marital happiness for women than men (Table XIII).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Satisfaction</th>
<th>Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>376**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>397**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>430***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>401**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HET</td>
<td>391**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .025
*** p < .01
### Selected Correlations Between Lack of Interneed Complementarity and Husband's Need Satisfactions

(The husband's need is to the left, the wife's to the right on the four need pairs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Satisfaction</th>
<th>DEF-DOM</th>
<th>ABA-AGG</th>
<th>SUC-NUR</th>
<th>AFF-EXH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>-552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td></td>
<td>-364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>-452</td>
<td></td>
<td>-363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>-364</td>
<td>-386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Need</td>
<td>-411</td>
<td>-455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE X

Correlations among Four Need Pairs Lacking in Complementarity (Husbands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Pairs</th>
<th>SUC NUR</th>
<th>NUR SUC</th>
<th>ABA AGG</th>
<th>AGG ABA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUC NUR</td>
<td>324*</td>
<td></td>
<td>422*</td>
<td>068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR SUC</td>
<td>324*</td>
<td></td>
<td>296*</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA AGG</td>
<td>422**</td>
<td>296*</td>
<td></td>
<td>061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG ABA</td>
<td>068</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p< .05
** ** p< .01

### TABLE XI

Correlations among Four Need Pairs Lacking in Complementarity (Wives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Pairs</th>
<th>SUC NUR</th>
<th>NUR SUC</th>
<th>ABA AGG</th>
<th>AGG ABA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUC NUR</td>
<td>324*</td>
<td></td>
<td>399*</td>
<td>309*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR SUC</td>
<td>324*</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>351**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA AGG</td>
<td>399*</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG ABA</td>
<td>309*</td>
<td>351**</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p< .05
** ** p< .025
TABLE XII

The Number of Significant Intercorrelations Among Fifteen Need Satisfactions for Husbands and Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercorrelations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII
Correlations between Marital Happiness and Need Satisfactions for Husbands and Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Satisfactions</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>083</td>
<td>687****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>546****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>-028</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>522***</td>
<td>466***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>650****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>604****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>382*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>413*</td>
<td>471***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>437**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>590****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>452***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>-137</td>
<td>532***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HET</td>
<td>421**</td>
<td>608****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>366*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Needs</td>
<td>408**</td>
<td>760****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .025  
** p < .01  
*** p < .005  
**** p < .0005
DISCUSSION

By far the most significant and important finding of this investigation is the strong correlation (.645 for husbands, .629 for wives, p<.0005) between agreement with respect to desired need satisfactions and marital happiness. This correlation signifies that when the spouse has a knowledge of his mate's expectations of him regarding the satisfaction of her needs, she is happy in the marriage (and vice versa for the husband's happiness). That these role expectations are generated by needs, and, in turn, produce need satisfactions provides empirical support for a small segment of Parsonian theory in which Parsons (Parsons and Bales, 1955) amalgamates role theory and need theory. His amalgamation is worth examining. In discussing the organization of personality as a system of action states, he theorizes, "The essence of a system of action is that it consists of motivation, or need disposition units. . . . Action in a role is motivated by a plurality of need disposition components" (p. 157). Parsons then discusses the developmental process, indicating that in the process, need dispositions, object relations and identifications are "inextricably related so that although needs may certainly be considered as relatively enduring, as an individual finds himself engaged in a given social interaction, or assuming a given social role, this
situation organizes the enduring need units" (p. 157). For this reason, as Tharp (1964) and Levinger (1964a) have also pointed out, it is vital to speak of marriage specific needs and roles, which is precisely what this investigation did.

There is one point made by Parsons that is contradicted by the data in this study. He states that a role does not produce an opportunity for the "acting out" of one need disposition, but a "way in which a subsystem of need dispositions operates in an organized way" (p. 157). This study shows that individual needs do have specific role expectations surrounding them, and if the role expectation for a given need is not known by the spouse's mate, the marital happiness of the spouse will be lessened.

The strong correlations indicated above are also significant for other reasons. The theoretical framework in which this investigation was conducted very deliberately sought to blend together at one juncture the three areas which had proven fruitful in marital research, namely, interpersonal perception, needs, and roles. Knowledge of role expectations regarding need satisfactions provided this blend. Should a combining of meaningful elements not have yielded meaningful results, something would clearly have been amiss in our theory or methodology.

Finally, this knowledge of spousal expectations is, in effect, a complex kind of empathy; and, most importantly, an empathy that carries with it a "prescription" for action.
The data in Table XIV substantiate this position. It shows the relationship between empathy, as it is defined in this investigation, and need satisfaction. Let us first look at these variables for wives. Between empathy and wives' total need satisfaction is a .758 correlation (p < .0005). While it naturally is not legitimate to assume causality from correlation coefficients, it would seem to be a fairly well-founded speculation that the empathic knowledge of the husband does, in fact, allow him to act upon this knowledge in satisfying his wife. It is interesting to note that only two out of fifteen need satisfactions, namely, order and intraception, do not significantly correlate with empathy. One explanation of these two nonsignificant correlations relates to our culture. Most husbands know their wives' expectations for them with respect to meeting the wives' need for order. There is, however, practically a cultural sanctioning of husbands being lax in this area. For need intraception somewhat the same explanation holds true. Husbands are aware that their wives would like them to be more gossipy, to talk about people and their motives. With the possible exception of social scientists, husbands are often limited in either their desire or ability to indulge their wives in this area. For both needs, wives are resigned to not having these needs met; consequently, their happiness is not diminished.

In examining the relationship between empathy and marital happiness for husbands, the important variables
TABLE XIV

Correlations between Need Satisfactions and Empathy For Husbands and Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Satisfaction</th>
<th>Empathy Husbands</th>
<th>Empathy Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>373*</td>
<td>580****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>452***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>089</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>603****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>-007</td>
<td>411**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>540***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>565****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>040</td>
<td>688****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>623****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>436**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>463***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>075</td>
<td>438**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HET</td>
<td>527***</td>
<td>507***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>464***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Need</td>
<td>419**</td>
<td>758****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.025  
** p<.01  
*** p<.005  
**** p<.0005
become diminished in number and, inversely, more significant. While the correlation between empathy and marital happiness for men is essentially the same size (.645) as for women (.629), the correlation between marital happiness and total need satisfaction is practically half (wives: .760, husbands: .408). Further examination of Table XIII indicates only three specific need satisfactions for husbands correlate with happiness, namely, exhibition, succorance and heterosexuality. That there are only a few significant correlations explains the lower total need satisfaction correlation with marital happiness; it also serves to stress the importance of these need satisfactions.

The differing number of need satisfactions for husbands and wives as they relate to marital happiness also helps to explain the difference in the number of intercorrelations among need satisfactions for each sex. The data in Table XII reflects this difference. Intercorrelations for women are fifty in number and only ten for men. In other words, need satisfactions for wives have a diffuse quality, and if needs are met in one area they are likely to be met in another. For husbands, need satisfactions are, with a few exceptions, independent of each other.

The need satisfactions that correlate with marital happiness for men are not the same as those need satisfactions that correlate with empathy, as is true in the case of women. Only one need satisfaction, viz., heterosexuality,
correlated with both. Other need satisfactions correlating with empathy are achievement and intraception. The difference is best explained by examining more closely the concept of need satisfaction. As used in this study, the concept does not reflect the perceived strength of the need, the perceived importance of satisfying the need, or the perceived importance of the specificity of the satisfying agent. In this context, let us look again at the two need satisfactions that correlated with empathy but not with happiness, viz., achievement and intraception. It would seem that the husband perceives his need for achievement as strong, but does not have a particular investment in his wife meeting the need, although he may well have this investment in his boss. With need intraception he may well perceive his need as low, the satisfaction of the need as not very crucial, and be somewhat indiscriminate about the agent of satisfaction; whether it is his wife or not does not matter very much. The husbands' need satisfactions that correlate with marital happiness, namely, heterosexuality, exhibition and succorance, are perceived as strong needs that do need satisfying from their wives in particular. Among the few need satisfactions for men that correlate with one another are exhibition and succorance (.529) indicating that husbands who are getting sympathy, affection and help from their wives also get attention, applause, and encouragement to be witty and clever.
The variables that constitute the kind of empathy defined and employed by this investigation and its relationship to marital happiness help to explain the negative findings with regard to some of the other hypotheses. The relatively low correlation between marital happiness and agreement about need level, and then only for wives, as well as the lack of correlation between happiness and agreement with regard to need reduction (hypotheses IIA and B) demonstrates how essential knowledge is of how to go about meeting a need. It is believed that the lack of knowledge of role expectations also serves to explain the lack of correlation between perceptual empathy (hypotheses VA and VB) and happiness as has been found in the literature. In addition, empathy as employed by other investigators has only called for a spousal prediction on a dichotomized dimension (e.g., Dymond's (1954) study in which spouses had to predict mates' answers to MMPI items). This investigation used a five point scale.

Before turning to other positive findings, it is perhaps appropriate to discuss the remainder of the negative results. In keeping with the latest American Psychological Association fiat that "research resulting in negative findings should not end with long discussion of possible reasons for the outcome" (APA, 1967, p. 13), this section will be concise.

No correlation was found between congruent self perceptions and marital happiness (Table VI). Similar to
negative findings with respect to perceptual empathy, self-perceptive congruence provides no information about expectation congruence (which might well have been a meaningful measurement) and the measurement required a much higher level discrimination, with a five point scale, than did studies in the literature with positive results.

Other negative findings involved intraneed complementarity. The fact that this concept provided no significant correlations with need satisfaction or marital happiness leads the investigator to believe that as currently being conceptualized and measured, intraneed homogamy or intraneed complementarity (which Winch referred to as Type II complementarity) is not a meaningful entity.

Such is not the case with interneed complementarity. For the most part this concept was meaningful in its correlation with a lack of need satisfaction. Stated in a positive way, a lack of complementarity made for greater need satisfaction, especially with regard to the husband's need satisfactions. An examination of the complementarities and need satisfactions indicates that it is chiefly in non-wife-dominant marriages that the majority of need satisfactions occur. For the need pairs (H)deference/(W)dominance, (H)abasement/(W)aggression, (H)affiliation/(W)exhibition, and (H)succorance/(W)nurturance a lack of complementarity correlated with twelve need satisfactions for men (Table IX).
In each case the lack of complementarity was in the direction of the wife not being in the role of the dominant mother and the husband not playing the role of the dominated son. On the other hand, in husband-dominant marriages, although this domination extended no further than (H)dominance/(W)deference complementarity, the wife had six separate needs satisfied.

These findings are similar to results achieved by Blazer (1963) who found a lack of (H)deference/(W)aggressiveness to correlate with marital happiness (.52). His results suggest that as the husband becomes more deferent, the wife becomes less aggressive.

Finally, couples who have an equalitarian (non-complementary) relationship in one aspect of their marriage, tend to have it in other aspects as well (Table X and XI). Collating this data with the other findings dealing with complementarity, it seems clear that in traditional husband-dominant marriages, the wife has many of her needs satisfied. In wife-dominant marriages, the husband has few of his needs satisfied. Wife dominant marriages refer to those in which as the wife becomes increasingly dominant, aggressive, exhibitionistic, and nurturant, the husband becomes increasingly deferent, abasing, affiliative and succorant.
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Questions arising from the results of this investigation are of many varieties: Why is the kind of empathy measured here so crucial for marital happiness? Why is this empathy so highly related to need satisfaction for women and not for men? Why are women's need satisfactions so interrelated while men's are not? Why do non-wife-dominant marriages provide so many satisfactions for husbands? Is it because, as Luckey (1960 a) suggests, that wives can remain little girls, but husbands cannot remain little boys? And if so, how is it that husbands' succorance needs are better satisfied when there is a lack of husband-succorance/wife-nurturance? Do these facts, coupled with the finding that women's need satisfactions increase in husband-dominant/wife-deferent marriages, help to reestablish the importance of traditional marital sex roles? Has the recent emphasis on roles specific to marriage overemphasized the importance of specific roles for specific marriages, as if to say that as long as any given couple is in agreement about who should play what role they will find happiness?

If need satisfaction took into account spouses' perceived need strength and perceived importance of their needs being satisfied by only their marriage partners would
need satisfaction account for more of the variances in marital happiness? Would it become an even better measure of marital happiness than marital happiness tests currently in use? Are certain role dimensions and need dimensions more critical for marital happiness than others? And if so, would it not be useful to begin talking about marital happiness life space to contrast it with just marital life space? And what is the correlation between marital happiness and other kinds of happiness in a spouse's life?

Implications for further research come also from investigators addressing themselves to very global aspects of marital functioning.

Wallen and Hill (1951) pointed out several years ago clusters of factors untested in marital research that still await exploration: (1) the history of success and failure in past intimate pair relations of each member of the marriage pair, (2) the capacity to give and accept love in intimate relationships, (3) the presence of expectations of success, determination to succeed, or some expression of the unwillingness to solve the problems of marriage by separation or divorce, and (4) some measure of the problem-diagnosing and the problem-solving ability of the pair. Their third factor is stated somewhat differently by Schutz (1966) who states, "We must focus on whether the couples have resources for handling their aggressions, or what happens after the fight?"
Bermann (1966) would direct research attention not only to compatibility or the internal pull holding spouses together, but also to barrier, the external forces pushing or holding couples together. Romano (1960) sees the need to study mutual failures in consensual validation, i.e., how the husband and wife fail to agree on the interpersonal intent of their own and their spouses' marital behavior.

Still another area for research is the translation of poetic hunches by gifted clinicians into verifiable hypotheses. One such example is Reik: "Our love is the unconscious advertisement of how we wish to be loved. It is a demonstration by proxy" (1944, p. 181).

And speaking of love, just what does it have to do with marital happiness? Sufficient but not necessary? Necessary but not sufficient?
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