1991

Preconscious Factors in Romantic Attraction

Jay T. King
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

King, Jay T., "Preconscious Factors in Romantic Attraction" (1991). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 988.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/988

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

57 482
K564
1991

PRECONSCIOUS FACTORS IN ROMANTIC ATTRACTION

BY

JAY T KING

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PSYCHOLOGY**

670188
UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1991

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to discover whether or not the character and or behavior of parents is a factor in the romantic attraction and mate selections made by adults. The study examined the correlation between the parent's temperament and the partners temperament under two different conditions. The first condition involved a comparison when the participants identified their parent as a nurturant parent. The second condition involved a comparison when the participants identified their parent as a person with whom they had a conflicted parent- adolescent relationship. Four predictions were tested based upon psychoanalytic and psychodynamic theory; 1) adults will be attracted to and select partners who are similar in temperament to the parent they identify as nurturant, 2) adults will be attracted to and select partners whose temperament is complementary to their own, 3) adults will be attracted to and select partners who are similar in temperament to the parent with whom they had a conflicted parent-adolescent relationship, and 4) adults will be attracted to and select partners who are unlike the parent with whom they had a conflicted parent- adolescent relationship.

The participants consisted of 95 adults between the ages 24 and 40. They were required to have been

cohabitants or married for at least three years. Sixty six women and 29 men participated in the study. The subjects were asked to describe their father, mother, partner and self on the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Scale and the LaForge, Interpersonal Check List. Then they were asked to describe their parent-adolescent relationship using the Bienvenue Parent Adolescent Communication Inventory, (PACI). The PACI was used to identify the two parent-adolescent conditions, nurturant, and conflictual.

The results support the first and the fourth hypothesis. They did not support the second and third hypothesis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the following people who played an important part in the development and completion of this project:

To the members of my committee: Dr. Joel Cohen whose sense of humor, personal perspective and personal interest helped to keep this project alive; Dr. Lawrence Grebstein whose long standing confidence and family perspective helped to keep me focused on the applicability of this research; Dr. James Prochaska whose early confidence and his courage to support my professional development has proven a source of encouragement in all of professional endeavors; and a special thanks to the Chairperson of my committee, Dr. Albert Lott for his marathon dedication to this project and to my personal and professional development.

I also want to thank the late Dr. Stan Berger who was responsible in part for my admission to URI and for organizing a program of study to facilitate my training.

Thanks to Dr. Alan Willoughby who has been an advocate for me and has provided a major contribution to my career and professional development, and to Dr. Fayneese Miller whose eleventh hour thorough review of this project, and adherence to the highest literary and statistical standards, along with humor and personality helped bring

this project through its final stage. Thanks to Dr. Nicholas Etcheverry for his long standing support, confidence, encouragement and friendship and to Marsha Getter and Fran Goldberg who have watched over this project like it was their own and have recruited many of the subjects who participated in this study. A special thanks to Dr. Craig Boatman, who provided manual, verbal, and inspirational labor and who periodically reminded me of the other projects awaiting our attention, and to Dr. Mitzy Klemperer who supported and believed in me during the most critical hours.

In addition I want to thank my family and friends whose support and patients allowed this project the time to be concluded. A special thanks to Sheila whose support has been comprehensive. Thanks to my mother who has provided extraordinary love and care for Nianna and Kaytia and allowed me to concentrate during the final months of this effort without reservation, and to my wife who is and has forever been the best mother and wife anyone could want.

Thanks to all who have supported and or contributed to my growth and development, and to the development of psychology as the place I can call my professional home.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	viii
Chapters	
I.	Introduction: 01
	Hypothesis/predictions 24
II.	Method 27
	Participants 27
	Instruments 28
	Taylor Johnson T Analysis 28
	Interpersonal Check List 33
	Parent-Adolescent Com Inv. 35
	Procedures 38
	Statistical Method 40
	Sample 41
III.	Results 45
	Table 1 & 1A 48
	Table 2 49
	Table 3 49
	Table 4 & 4A 50
	Table 5 51
	Table 6 51
	Table 7 55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Table 8	.	.	.	55
	Table 9	.	.	.	56
	Table 10	.	.	.	59
	Table 11	.	.	.	59
IV.	Discussion	.	.	.	62
V.	References	.	.	.	72
VI.	Appendix	.	.		
	Research Consent Form	.	.		83
	Instructions	.	.	.	84
	Background	.	.	.	85
	Father Form	.	.	.	86
	Mother Form	.	.	.	87
	Mate Form	.	.	.	88
	Self Form	.	.	.	89
VII.	Bibliography	.	.	.	90

TABLES

1. Subjects Who Identified a Nurturant Parent.
2. Comparison of Nurturant Mother/Partners & Non-Nurturant Mother/Partner Pairs.
3. Comparison of Nurturant Father/Partner & Non-Nurturant Father/Partner Pairs.
4. Subjects Who Identified a Conflictual Parent-Adolescent Relationship with a Parent.
5. Nurturant Mother/Partners & Conflict Mother/Partner Compared.
6. Nurturant Father/Partner & Conflict Father/Partner Compared.
7. Overall Correlation for Mother/Partner and Father/Partner Pairs.
8. Nurturant Mother/Partners & Nurturant Father/Partner Compared.
9. Self/Partners Correlations.
10. Conflictual Mother/Partners & Non-Conflictual Mother/Partners Compared.
11. Conflictual Father/Partners & Non-Conflictual Father/Partners Compared.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although most adults claim that they would like a partner who is attractive, intelligent, sensitive, financially secure and has a sense of humor, not all of the mates that are subsequently selected meet this description. Furthermore, when a potential partner does meet the description, there are often a dozen other prospective partners who would meet the same description. Psychologists do not fully understand how one qualified individual is chosen from a collection of equally qualified individuals. Most adults do not fall in love with everyone who meets their criteria.

Many of the scholars who have studied marriage and the process of selecting mates argue that interpersonal attraction can not be an exclusively conscious process. In other words, there are non-conscious, factors that contribute to how attractive adults find other adults.

Sociologists, social psychologists, psychoanalysts and others have attempted to understand, study and analyze romantic attraction, beginning at the beginning of the twentieth century. This process is also referred to as

object choice in the object relations and psychoanalytic literature. Efforts to develop a coherent theory about this process began with Freud's essays, Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality (1905), including "A Special Type of Object Choice Made by Men" (1910), "Observations on Transference Love" (1914), "On Narcissism" (1914), and "The Sex Lives of Humans" (1916).

Two decades later, empirical studies designed to address the questions raised by these theories followed, (Burgess and Cotrell 1939; Commins 1939; Dreikurs 1930; Kirkpatrick 1937; Mangus 1936; Strauss 1946. Each looked at a different aspect of mate selection/object choice theory. The success of these studies was limited by both the misapplication of the theory and by a methodological technology that was not adequate to the task of measuring the multivariate factors described in psychodynamic theory. A more current investigation is warranted because the technology for measuring personality and interpersonal styles has improved dramatically during the last 10 years. It is also warranted because our mobility, and consequently our romantic options, have increased dramatically.

In more recent years other studies have been designed to test the same or similar psychodynamic hypotheses. The earlier studies as well as the more recent ones generally conclude that psychoanalytic ideas about object choice are supportable (Arons, 1974; Balint, 1965; Bowlby, 1969; Dicks,

1967; Fairbairn, 1954; Goethals, 1973, 1976; Guntrip, 1961; Jedlicka, 1980; Kavin & Switzer, 1973; Kernberg, 1974; Murstein, 1971; Sullivan, 1953; Winch, 1955, 1958).

For example Arons (1974), Jedlicka (1980), Kirkpatrick (1937), and Strauss (1946), found support for some of the Freudian and neo-Freudian theories suggesting that mates would resemble the nurturant parent of the child. Guntrip (1961) and Murstein (1971), on the other hand, found support for one of Freud's later ideas which suggested that mates resemble a complement of the "self". The complement is characterized as someone with a different or apposite temperament and interpersonal style, in other words, someone like the "ideal" or "grandiose self".

Formulating definitive conclusions in this area of research is complicated by the fact that some of these theories appear to be inconsistent. For example, one model proposes that adults select a person resembling the parent with whom they had the most conflict during adolescence (Kubie, 1956), while another submits that humans select someone resembling the more nurturant parent (Freud, 1914). Although these assertions may appear contradictory, nurturant parents are often experienced as overprotective. This can be experienced as smothering and can generate conflict between the adolescent and his or her parents. In these cases the adolescent repeatedly struggles with the parent over liberties that he or she covets while the parent

believes that granting such liberties would be premature and possibly hazardous. The parent is both nurturant and a source of conflict for the adolescent.

What is needed currently is a more carefully designed and controlled study that would update the technology, methodology and the psychometric aspects of the previous research in this area.

Previous Investigations

Many of the earlier studies on object choice proposed that there is some resemblance between parents and mates. Mangus (1936), for example, designed an investigation of "Freudian Psychology" which asserted that the typical young woman forms a conception of an ideal husband which is more closely associated with her conception of her father than with any other "intimate male associate." Mangus compared ideal mates (not actual husbands) with fathers, another "intimate male relative", and another "unrelated intimate male companion". With a sample of 600 college females, he used "fundamental interest" and "personality traits" to identify the "male companions" and "fathers", and then to compare them to persons described as "ideal mates".

The "fundamental interest" included interest such as science, politics, religion, art, and business. Some of the "personality traits" included were dominant, cooperative, energetic, self-confident and tactful. The subjects were

asked to judge their father as they remembered him from their childhood and adolescent experience. They were also asked if their father was still living.

Mangus found with a "high degree of certainty" that there was significant similarity between the father and the "ideal mate" conceptions. However, he also found that the correlation between father and "ideal mate" was less than the correlation between "companion" and "ideal mate". Given that the Mangus study was designed specifically to compare "relative-ideal mate" and "companion-ideal mate" similarity to the "father-ideal mate" similarity, he considered his hypothesis unconfirmed.

Although Mangus made a theoretically infelicitous choice when he decided to focus on "ideal mates", instead of real mates, he did nonetheless demonstrate that similarities exist between fathers and "ideal mates", for women. A more careful reading of Freud's theory indicates that his thoughts were not about "ideal mates", but real mates. Since Freud was interested in unconscious drives and motivations, "ideal mates", to the extent that they are conscious, would fail to genuinely test the theory. "Ideal mates" may be both conscious, and unrealistically perfect. Furthermore, neo-Freudians like Kubie, Dicks, and M. Klein assert that the partners we actually commit ourselves to may in fact be distinctively unlike the mate we would describe as "ideal".

Another important methodological shortcoming in the Mangus investigation was created by his use of a design that does not appear to prevent subjects from combining and or confusing their "ideal mate" with their current lover or spouse. He ask subjects to describe their "intimate companion", and then to describe their ideal mate. In doing so he failed to consider that "intimate companions" are often idealized, especially during the first two years of the relationship. The problem with this design is that it encourages an artificial inflation of the "companion-mate", "ideal mate", correlation.

An additional weakness in the Mangus design involves his subject selection criterion. He used college aged women. As Erik Erikson explains in, Identity Youth and Crisis (1968), development during adolescence and young adulthood is a period marked by strivings for autonomy. Thus the idea of having a mate similar to ones parent during this developmental stage may be alien to the way most young adults like to see themselves. The young women in the Mangus study are likely to have artificially minimized the similarities between the "ideal mate" and their fathers. This oversight was also apparent in the Arons et. al. study of 1974.

A more discriminating design would have either used older subjects or somehow disguised the fact that mates and parents were being compared. In the present study both of

these problems were corrected. The developmental stage problem was corrected by using primarily but not exclusively older subjects, and the comparison problem was corrected by using instruments that were too long and involved for anyone to remember all of what they said about one family member while using the instrument to describe another. Also, a procedure was included that imposed a one week delay between the time when the subjects completed the questionnaires for mother and father and the time when the subjects completed the questionnaires for the partner and for themselves. That is, the research participants characterized their mother and father at one session and characterized their partner and themselves during another session one week later.

During the year following the Mangus study, C. Kirkpatrick (1937), conducted "A Statistical Investigation of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection." Kirkpatrick compared the physical characteristics of opposite sex parents and mates. He looked at eye color, height, weight, age, and general appearance. He concluded that the similarities were significant and that Freud's theories were confirmed. Once again a test of the more salient components of Freud's theory had not occurred. Freud's interest was primarily in the personalities, temperaments, and interpersonal styles of mates and not physical characteristics such as eye color and height. Furthermore, the Kirkpatrick study was weakened by the

absence of a control group and because at least one of his high correlations was an artifact of his use of the bivariate, eye color.

Another of the earlier tests of Freud's theory of object choice was conducted by Anselm Strauss (1946). His hypothesis was that, "a child's image of his or her parents plays a crucial role in the child's selection of a marriage partner . . . He learns to love, hate, desire, envy, avoid, and so forth through personal contact with people during the earliest years of his life." In this context, Strauss proposed that individuals choose as mates, people who resemble or are different from their parents in just those important physical or personality traits the adult liked or disliked in his parents when he or she was a child. More specifically, he proposed that satisfactory childhood relationships with the opposite sex parent will be repeated in that the subject will "fall in love with someone possessing temperament and personality characteristics similar to those of the loved parent . . ." They will select someone resembling in temperament and personality the parent with whom they had a satisfactory relationship. Concurrently he argued that unsatisfactory child-parent relationships would result in selections where the adult would choose a partner whose temperament and personality were unlike the parent with whom they had a conflict laden relationship. Strauss was also alert enough to correct the

theoretical misunderstanding of the previous researchers who assumed that the attraction would necessarily be to the parent of the opposite gender. He explicitly acknowledged that adults are as likely to be attracted to the characteristics of the same sex parent as they are to the opposite sex parent.

For the Strauss study, engaged and recently married participants were recruited, minimizing the problems related to the "ideal mates" employed by Mangus. He also incorporated males as well as females, nearly two hundred of each gender, all in their twenties.

The variables considered by Strauss in addition to temperament and personality were "Opinions", "Beliefs", and "Physical Characteristics". Strauss used a scale that he developed himself for the measurement of temperament and personality. The reliability and validity coefficients for his scale were not available and may never have been determined. He included 25 items as follows; Dominating; easily influenced by others; moody; angers easily; gets over it quickly; irritable; jealous; selfish; easily hurt; aggressive; easygoing, stubborn, sense of duty; sense of humor; makes friends easily; cares what people say and think; likes belonging to organizations; acts impulsively; easily depressed, easily excited, understanding of others, easy to confide in, feels inferior, self confident. He used a five point Likert Scale to determine the amount of

"irritability", for example. He then randomly reassigned mates to different subjects within his sample and determined that a correlation of .22 represented the resemblance between randomly assigned parents and mates. These randomly reassigned mates constituted his control group, i.e., the chance similarity between parent and mate. The average correlation between parent and actual mate in his study was .23, virtually the same as the control group.

He did not find significant similarities between parents and mates on all of these variables. However, he did find that significant similarities existed between males' mates and their mothers, and females' mates and their mothers, with respect to temperament and personality. The similarity between mates and mothers for men was greater than it was between mates and fathers for women, the latter case the correlation being statistically significant. In other words, it appears that males select mates who resemble their mothers. Females also select mates that resemble their mothers. When examining cross-gender selection, i.e., women choosing mates like their fathers, and men choosing mates like their mothers, the mates of women are less like their fathers than the mates of men are like their mothers.

Strauss also identified the personality and temperament characteristics that represented the strongest similarities between parents and mate. These were; 1) gets over anger easily, 2) self confident, 3) sense of duty. Strauss's

final conclusion was that the image subjects have of their parents influences the selection of mates but that the selection is not necessarily based on resemblance to the opposite gender parent. He found that the selection could be based upon resemblance to the same sex parent as well. Furthermore, he found interview support for his hypothesis that unsatisfactory parent-child relationships can result in choices that represent an attempt to find mates very much unlike the parent with whom they had a conflict laden relationship. It is important to highlight here that some personality characteristics appear more pertinent to the mate selection process than others. It follows then that if different characteristics are investigated, different findings will emerge. Although these results are consistent with other studies in this area of research, the scales employed to produce these results were not supported with reliability or validity coefficients for the scale items.

Contemporary Investigations

The institution of marriage has undergone some profound changes since the time of the studies by Mangus and Strauss. In Massachusetts alone the divorce rate increased nearly 25% during the 1970's (Census of Family Statistics, 1982). The U.S. Department of Commerce reported that both males and females were waiting longer before taking their first marital vows and that in the five years between 1978 and

1983, this trend has accelerated more rapidly than ever before in recorded history (Marital Status and Living Arrangements 3/1983). Clinical observations suggest that as the trend towards marrying later continues, so continues the escalating divorce rate. It appears that older partners have become more refined in their needs and predilections and simultaneously less willing to make the compromises and accommodations essential for lasting relationships. Furthermore, the rising emergence of the "reconstituted family", i.e., the previously married father with children marries a previously married mother with children, as a sociological and clinical phenomenon, further complicates the structure of the North American family. Social workers, family therapists, and marriage counselors are having to reconsider the nature of families. All of this is happening in the virtual absence of analytically oriented research about what non-conscious variables bring lovers together and bond them. Most of this research that did focus on the selection process was done before 1960.

These factors, i.e., the escalating divorce rate, dual career marriages, reconstituted families etc., have resulted in a resurgence of interest in the marriage phenomenon. Much of the research in this area has been focused on "marital satisfaction" (Gurman, 1973; Gurman, & Kniskern, 1978; Jacobson, 1978; Luckey, 1964; Nadelson, 1977; O'Leary & Arias, 1983; Olson, 1970; Royce, & Sager, 1976; Stuart,

1969; Weiss, 1975). These studies however, do not address the question of what it was that attracted these adults to each other initially.

There were fewer than a dozen studies conducted during the last three decades that specifically test analytic concepts about object choice and/or parent-mate similarity. The focus has been more on the conscious sociological and social psychological aspects of selecting mates such as socioeconomic background, education, and cultural preferences, (Berscheid & Walster, 1969; Jacobson, 1978; Lott & Lott, 1974; Murstein, 1961, 1967, 1971; Sager, 1976; Stuart, 1969; Winch, 1958;) There have been only a few studies (Arons, Ain, Anderson, Burd, Filman, McCallum, O'Reilly, Rose, Stichmann, Tamari, Wauro, Weinberg, & Wine-sauker, 1974; and Jedlicka, 1980; Urdy, 1963) however which were designed specifically to test analytic concepts.

Arons et al, (1974), investigated the Freudian notion that "the choice of love object in adulthood represents a shifting of libidinal energy from the first love objects the parents to the others." Arons et al, employed a variable that they labeled "the relationship" which they distinguished from temperament or personality traits. They defined relationship in this experiment with six items, 1) openness, 2) influence, 3) dominance, 4) responsiveness, 5) trust, and 6) playfulness. Each of these concepts consisted of two phrases. For example, Openness was defined

as, a) "we talk easily about any subject", and b) "she asked me about things I do not want to talk about", and Trust was composed of, a) "I feel my secrets are safe with my future wife" and, b) "my future wife makes promises she does not keep". A 1 (never) to 4 (almost always) scale was used for each of the phrases. Like Strauss, Arons found that based upon these variables, both male and female subjects selected mates like their mothers. Seventy seven percent of the female subjects selected mates like their mothers and 71% of the male subjects did the same.

The Arons et.al. study, although more thoughtfully designed than many of those previously mentioned, has several shortcomings. Like Strauss, the researchers selected subjects from a line of people waiting to receive marriage licenses. Arons failed to collect any information about the length of the courtship or the duration of the marriage. Although purchasing a marriage license may be a more reliable indication of "selection" than becoming engaged, many marriages do not survive the first two years. Some of these adults will have selected another mate within a year or two after participating in the Arons's investigation. In the present study we used only subjects who had been married or cohabitating romantically for at least three years.

Another limitation of the Arons study was that it excluded subjects who did not "live with both parents beyond the age of ten." Arons omitted his rationale for this

decision but many family oriented scholars postulate that the loss of a parent during these delicate years increases the likelihood of a "selection" designed to replace the lost parent (Bowen, 1978; Dicks, 1967; Klimek, 1979; Kubie 1956). As this is an empirical question, the current study will control for deceased parents. Another recent study conducted by Jedlicka (1980) used ethnicity to determine whether subjects selected mates similar to their opposite sex parent. His ethnic groups were; Caucasians, Hawaiians, Portuguese, Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, Japanese, and Blacks (including Puerto Ricans). He found that the ethnic identity of the opposite sex parent was the same as the ethnic identity of the mate. In other words, he found that women with Hawaiian fathers found Hawaiian mates and women with Japanese fathers usually married Japanese men. Although one could challenge his idea about what constitutes an ethnic group, what is important to this project is that ethnicity is not what Freud had in mind when he postulated resemblance between parents and mates. Thus it is not clear that Jedlicka's design provided a legitimate test of psychoanalytic theory.

The vast majority of the mate selection research published during the last decade, addressed the debate about whether adults select mates similar to themselves or mates who are complementary (Boyden, 1984; Buss, 1985; Buss, 1986; Maharabian, 1989; Mathes, 1985; Vinacke, 1988; and Wilson

1989). Without exception all of the authors found support for the self/mate similarity theory. Vinacke (1988), found support for both but concluded that complementarity plays a more significant role in the strength and maintenance of the relationship and that similarity plays a more meaningful role during the initial stages of the relationship. None of these studies consider the character or the behavior of the parents as a potential factor in interpersonal attraction or mate selection. However, in a related area of research, Gold (1985), while looking at mother daughter relationships, found that a close positive relationship between mother and daughter was associated with close positive friendships in the daughters adolescent and adult life.

The study that follows also found support for the similarity theory between self and mate but additionally demonstrates the possibility of a more salient variable, the personality and behavior of the parents.

Testing Psychoanalytic Theory

The need for a more precise investigation of the psychoanalytic theory of mate selection is apparent. Previous studies have either been casual in their selection of the salient variables, (Jedlicka, 1980; Kirkpatrick, 1937), careless in their consideration of developmental factors, inadequately discriminating in their selection of subjects, (Arons et.al., 1974; Mangus, 1936; Strauss,

1946;), or overly simplistic in their application of psychoanalytic theory (Arons, 1974; Jedlicka, 1980; Kirkpatrick, 1937; Mangus, 1936). Therefore the following paragraphs will clarify psychoanalytic concepts about mate selection as a step towards a new empirical test.

Although Freud was one of the original scholars to show interest in this process, his ideas and the ideas of his followers were neither simple nor singular. The investigation that follows is designed to simultaneously test four of the prevailing psychoanalytic hypothesis on this subject. Freud's idea about the anaclitic and narcissistic choices and two other ideas described by Strauss, the neurotic and healthy choices. The research format test of four separate models; 1) that a mate like the nurturant parent is selected, the "anaclitic choice", or 2), that a mate like the unconscious "ideal self" is selected, the "narcissistic choice" or 3), that people select someone resembling the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship, the "neurotic choice" or 4), that people select mates who are not like the parent with whom they had a conflictual relationship, the "healthy choice".

The first two hypotheses tested are based on the anaclitic/narcissistic choice prediction. In Freud's paper (1910) "A Special Type of Object Choice Made By Men", he proposed that, "object choices are based on anaclitic or narcissistic needs. The person who makes the anaclitic

choice is oriented primarily toward nurturance and sustenance and is focused on the gratification of dependency needs." According to Freud this anacletic choice is slightly more likely to be made by males while the female is slightly more likely to make the "narcissistic" choice. A narcissistic choice is made by a person who sees himself or herself as the object. In this case the person who is chosen represents the "ideal self" or the projected ego ideal (the personality or temperament complement). In other words, this is a selection which allows two halves to become one whole. "The selection of a mate is based upon unconscious signals by which the partners recognize in each other the possibility that they can jointly work through unresolved conflicts that exist intrapsychically in each of them." (Dicks, 1967).

Thirty years after his original thoughts on this subject Freud (1957) expanded his theory by adding that men are more prone toward the anacletic choice and women toward the narcissistic. This distinction was presumably based upon the child rearing practices that accustomed men to having someone waiting on and taking care of them and women being trained to believe that they were not complete until they possessed a man in their lives. Cattell and Nesselrode (1967) renamed this conceptualization the "Need Completion Principle". They referred to it as "a desire to possess characteristics (by sharing them in the possessed partner)

which are felt by the individual to be necessary to his or her self concept.", or to him or her becoming a whole person.

The third hypothesis being tested is one that emerges from the writings of Dicks (1967), Kubie (1956) and Strauss (1946). Kubie saw the process of selecting mates as a frequently neurotic one. He argued that these selections are often motivated by unconscious neurotic needs. He writes about a woman whose father died when she was young. "Over a number of years it was evident to all of her friends, but not to herself, that she was driven by an obvious need to find in marriage a substitute father and an ally against her mother." Another example is described of a patient whose mother was a vigorous, dominant, aggressive woman. "Her father was emotionally weak, insecure and colorless. This young woman felt compelled to choose someone in her father's image so that in her own marriage she also could be as dominant a figure as her mother had been. Quite unconsciously she had to duplicate in her own life everything she hated most in her mother's behavior towards her father."

Dicks (1967) similarly argued that marriage is not always a rational decision. Like Jung (1928), he proposed that "built in unconscious archetypes are based upon ambivalent relationships to earlier love objects, most often the person's parents, not necessarily the opposite gender

parent."

Dicks, like Mangus, also recognized that some adults would attempt rational choices. "A man married his wife because she did not resemble his possessive mother like all of his previous girl friends had." This idea of selecting someone unlike the parent who was the source of conflict, represents the essential ingredients of our fourth hypothesis. Incidentally, Dicks' was in complete agreement with Freud in his belief that adults select mates who possess the characteristics of the self that are considered missing, i.e., the "ideal self", a choice discussed in this paper as the "narcissistic" choice. These mates will be high on qualities that the subject believes he or she is low on and low on qualities that the "self" is high on.

Furthermore Dicks' describes the process of selecting a mate as an "obscure" one, meaning that "the person one decides to marry and not merely have an affair with, is largely based on unconscious signals or cues by which the partners recognize in a more or less ego-syntonic person, the other's fitness for joint working through or repeating of still unresolved splits or conflicts inside each other's personalities." In other words, Dicks is proposing that the choice is motivated by the wish to complete oneself and make the self whole through marriage. The unconscious belief here is that one becomes whole not only by finding the personality complement but also by finding a person who will

provide the "emotional supplies", encouragement, approval, attention etc., which were withheld by the original caretakers. Unfortunately these partners, like the original caretakers, are often equally unwilling or unable to provide such supplies. In this case the struggle persists and the person remains entangled in a futile but highly charged drudgery.

Dicks' theory is similar to the more recent work of Murstein (1971) who describes a similar matching process as selections based on "complementary needs", quoting Herbert Spencer (1926) who wrote, "the true sentiment of love between men and women arises from each serving as a representative of the other's ideal." For example, the man with the magnificent memory but foggy conceptual powers ought to marry a woman with superb conceptual powers but a weak memory. The same principle held for temperament and mental ability. Note the use of the rhetoric "ought to marry". This reflects the attitude of the era which was that "love" was secondary to the practical matter of creating perfect offspring and maintaining the purity of the race.

Although there is a great body of research on marriage in the social psychological and sociological literature, the focus in those studies is on variables that are actively conscious during the mate selection process. Factors such as ethnic origin, education and socioeconomic background,

religion and physical attractiveness, have been extensively investigated (Kirkpatrick, 1937; Burgess & Wallin, 1943; Winch, 1958; Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, & Rottman, 1966; Jedlicka, 1980). These studies have been useful in their capacity to identify meaningful variables. They have also clarified for psychologists the tangible variables that are salient factors in interpersonal attraction.

Psychoanalytically oriented scholars, on the other hand believe that human attraction is not based exclusively or even primarily on such tangible factors. They argue that the essence of such attractions is actually not conscious (Dicks, 1963; Dreikurs, 1930; Evans, 1964; Freud, 1914-1933; Jung, 1928; Kernberg, 1974; Kubie, 1956; Main, 1966; Spencer, 1926; Stein, 1956) It is also apparent that conscious factors reduce the pool of prospective mates to a smaller group. But, if we discontinue our investigation after identifying only the conscious variables we remain uninformed about how a person selects one from the myriad of persons who satisfy the conscious criteria. The remaining question is, after the conscious criteria have been met, can we learn any more about how the pool of prospective candidates is reduced to one? Can we identify what factors isolate a potential partner into the more exclusive arena of eligibility for a long term romantic commitment?

The measurement of preconscious factors is a more challenging enterprise. It requires that the subjects are

either unaware or ill-informed about the full purpose of their participation in the experiment. Otherwise they may edit, modify or bias their responses in ways that render them less authentic and more vulnerable to the "social desirability" influence. Secondly, and perhaps more intangible given our age of psychological enlightenment, it remains enormously difficult to know with any empirical certainty that what has been measured is truly preconscious or unconscious material.

For the purpose of this study we will use the more liberal of the two concepts, i.e., preconscious. A preconscious factor will be operationally defined as any relevant and measureable factor not actively thought about by the participant as part of the attraction of one person to another. For example, if a subject reports, "I was attracted to the way s/he reacted when I accomplished something.", and was simultaneously not thinking about the fact that his or her parent responded in the same way, this resemblance will constitute a preconscious factor.

In summary, the purpose of this study is to test several psychoanalytic ideas about romantic attraction and mate selection. There are several different hypotheses in the literature and therefore several being tested in this study. The study is designed to improve upon the previous research in this area by controlling the variables not adequately controlled for in earlier investigations and by employing

more recently developed and sophisticated personality scales. The methodology utilized eliminates the problem created by the use of the "ideal" mate by using real mates. The use of older subjects eliminates the developmental stage issue created by the exclusive use of young adults, and the length of the scale combined with the mandatory waiting period between completion of the scales, controls for the practice effect and for comparative response patterns. Finally this study improves upon the previous studies by more carefully selecting the most relevant variables.

Hypotheses:

The first hypothesis under investigation in this study was: a) Mates are selected preconsciously for the gratification of anaclitic needs, i.e., for their resemblance to the subject's nurturant parent, usually, but not necessarily the mother. A "Mate" is operationally defined as the person with whom the subject lives, and with whom the subject is romantically involved and has been for at least three years. This hypothesis will be tested by comparing the subject's description of his or her nurturant parent with the subject's description of his or her mate. When the subject's description of the mate is highly correlated with the subject's description of the nurturant parent, the prediction associated with the first hypothesis will be considered affirmed.

The second hypothesis was, b) Mates are selected pre-consciously for the gratification of narcissistic needs, i.e., for their personality, temperament, and interpersonal style complementarity to the "self". Data supporting this hypothesis will be represented by subjects' descriptions of mates that are not highly correlated with the subjects' descriptions of themselves. The third hypothesis was: c) Mates are neurotically selected, preconsciously, for their similarity to the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship during adolescence. Selections supporting this hypothesis will be represented by mates whose descriptions by the subjects are highly correlated with the subject's description of the parent with whom he or she had a conflicted relationship.

The fourth and final hypothesis was: d) Mates are selected for their dissimilarity to the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship. Selections supporting this hypothesis are represented by descriptions of mates who are not highly correlated with the descriptions of the parents with whom the subject had conflicted relationships during his or her adolescence. This analysis is essentially the reverse of the third hypothesis. More specifically, the predictions associated with these hypotheses are as follows; 1. Subjects who describe a parent as nurturant will select a mate who they describe as similar to the nurturant parent. The theory predicts that men will make this type of

selection slightly more frequently than women.

2. Subjects will select mates who are the complement of themselves, i.e., subjects will have chosen mates whose descriptions are not highly correlated with the subjects' description of themselves. The theory predicts that women will make this type of selection slightly more frequently than men.

3. Subjects who rate their relationships with a parent as conflicted during adolescence will have selected mates whose descriptions are highly correlated with the descriptions of this parent.

4. Subjects who rate their relationships with a parent as conflicted during adolescence, will select mates whose descriptions are not highly correlated with the description of the relevant parent.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

There were 95 participants in the study (N=95). There were 66 women and 29 men between the ages of twenty and forty with heterogeneous socioeconomic backgrounds. They all volunteered to participate. A ceiling age of 40 was included to limit the elapsed time between when the subjects were living with their parents and when they were filling out the questionnaires describing the interactions they had with them. The participants included teachers, bankers, lawyers, government employees, secretaries, community college students, homemakers, computer operators and programmers and others from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Washington D.C. and Maryland. The requirements for participation in this study were that subjects had to be between the ages of twenty and forty, that the subjects had selected a "mate" that fit the definition employed in this investigation, and that they be uninformed about the hypotheses being tested until they had completed filling out the questionnaires. A "mate" was defined in this study as "a person with whom you lived and are, or were, romantically involved for at least three years." In order to assure consistency with the subjects

who may have had more than one mate, they were instructed to utilize the instruments to describe their first mate.

Subjects were told that the purpose of the research was to understand more about the dynamics of intimate relationship. Adopted persons, persons from broken families, and persons raised by step parents were separated from the main analysis. Approximately 210 packets were distributed and approximately 90 were not returned or were returned incomplete. There were also more than a dozen subjects who, despite reassurances that all participants names would remain anonymous, replied that the requested information was "too personal" and declined to complete the questionnaires. In addition, several extra months were spent specifically trying to add males to the subject pool and very few were secured through these efforts.

Instruments:

The Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Scale (TJTA) was used to determine the temperament of the participants' parents, partner, and self. Then these descriptions were employed to determine the degree of similarity, the correlation, between mates and nurturant mothers; mates and nurturant fathers; mates and self; mates and difficult mothers; and mates and difficult fathers.

1. Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (TJTA)

The TJTA (1977) is a comprehensive revision of the Johnson Temperament Analysis developed in 1941 by R.H.

Johnson. "The revision consists of 180 items equally divided among nine traits designed to be of value for individual, premarital, and marital counseling." Towards this purpose the scale includes a "criss cross" test in which one person records his or her impressions of another person (usually a close relative or someone well known to the subject).

The participants in this study received a booklet that included a blank space for the name of the person they described in their responses, i.e., mother, father, mate, or self, and an answer sheets which listed three possible responses for each question. The responses were catagorized as +, mid, or -. A "+", response means "decidedly yes", or "mostly so". A "mid" response means "undecided", and a "-", response means "decidedly no" or "mostly not so". Each subject answered 120 questions with respect to the target relative by indicating that the statement is either "+", "mid", or "-". For example, "Does . . . take an active part in community affairs or group activities?" The subject then marks the appropriate slot under "+", "mid", or "-". There are twenty items in each of the nine categories listed below. The scoring stencil converts the "+", "mid", and "-", ratings into the quantitative ratings of 2,1, and 0, respectively. Thus in the first category, "nervous", the higher the score, the more nervous the target person is according to the subject. The scores for each of the nine

catagories range from 0 to 40 with 40 being the most "nervous" and 0 being the most composed. At the end of the 180 responses a raw score is calculated on each of the nine traits. Then the raw score is converted to a percentile and charted on the appropriate scoring sheet. There is a separate scoring stencil for each of the nine categories.

The nine trait dimensions are: nervous/composed, depressive/lighthearted, active-social/quiet, expressive-responsive/inhibited, sympathetic/indifferent, subjective/objective, dominant/submissive, hostile/tolerant, self-disciplined/impulsive. The norms on this instrument were constructed with 4,018 female subjects and 3,640 male subjects from the northeast, south and west.

For this study, only six of the nine traits were included to reduce the length of time the subjects would need to spend responding to the questions. The six selected were nervous, depressive, expressive, sympathetic, dominant, and hostile. These were selected because their focus is primarily interpersonal. For example, one of the items from the twenty that constitutes the "Hostile" category is #161, "Is . . . superior and overbearing in his attitude towards others?"

Reliability:

The TJTA was evaluated and reviewed by Donald L. Moser (1978) and Robert F. Stahmann (1981). The raw score one to

three week retest reliability correlations coefficients with N=81 were; nervous .88, depressed .90, active/ social .88, expressive/responsive .89, sympathetic .74, subjective .79, dominant .89, hostile .84, self-disciplined .87. A split-half reliability was also calculated separately for sex differences on N=1138, 477 males and 661 females. These results were as follows: for males; nervous,.85, depression,.90, active/social,.81 expressive/responsive,.77, sympathetic,.73, subjective,.71, dominant,.72, hostile,..82, self-disciplined,.82. For females the split-half reliabilities were; nervous,.87, depression,.79, active social,.74, expressive-responsive,.72, sympathetic,.65, subjective,.77, dominant,.76, hostile,.75, self-disciplined,.83. The correlation coefficients are included in the appendix.

Two additional forms of split-half reliability were calculated, the Spearman-Brown, and the "Guttman Estimated Minimum". The coefficients are presented in the appendix. The Spearman-Brown, split-half reliability coefficients were as follows; nervous,.80, depression,.86, active/social,.77, expressive/responsive,.74, sympathetic,.71, subjective,.75, dominant,.76, hostile,.79, self-disciplined,.82. The Guttman split-half reliability coefficients were exactly the same as the Spearman-Browns except that for "social/active" the Guttman was lower at .76 and for "hostile" the Guttman was lower at .78. In each case when the Guttman correlation

coefficient was lower the difference was .01. An additional estimate was made using the analysis of variance method and comparable results were found; nervous,.85, depression,.90, social/active,.79, expressive/responsive,.86, sympathetic,.77, subjective,.82, dominant,.76, hostile,.82, self-disciplined,.82. The analysis of variance results are presented in the appendix.

Validity:

" The empirical validity on the TJTA was estimated through the use of psychologists and self ratings. Psychologists were asked to rate clients who were under their care. They were asked only to select those individuals whose personality dynamics were thoroughly familiar to them. The TJTA was subsequently administered to these individuals and their scores were then compared with the psychologist's ratings. In most case the predictions were closely duplicated by the test results, in others there were only slight variations on a few traits.

The construct validity on the TJTA was estimated by correlating the TJTA with the MMPI and the 16PF scales. The results are presented in Table X and Table XI. The matrix of intercorrelations was factor analyzed using a principle components solution with a varimax rotation. The evaluators concluded that the TJTA concurs in a manner to be expected with the 16PF and the MMPI. They conclude from these

findings that the constructs underlying not only the individual TJTA scales but also the trait patterns, are substantiated." (Nash,1980) For details see appendix vii., Table X & XI.

The reviewers, Mosher and Stahmann add that the basic manual and the training material are very well written and can serve as a model for other tests. (Mosher & Stahmann, 1974).

2. Interpersonal Check List:

Interpersonal style, was measured by the Interpersonal Check List (ICL). This scale was used by the subjects to describe the interpersonal styles of the mother, father, partner, and "self".

The Interpersonal Check List (ICL) was developed by T. Leary, Rolfe LaForge, and Robert Suczek in 1955 and 1956 as part of the Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality. It has been employed as the primary source of measurement in more than 220 published research projects between 1955 and 1975. Furthermore it is an instrument designed specifically for research. It is designed to "measure a person's description of themselves and others, especially persons that the subjects know well like mother, father, siblings, spouse and self. The instrument allows the descriptions of various persons to be compared in terms of the resulting profiles and summary scores."

Sixteen interpersonal traits are represented in 128 items. 1.) Able to give orders - Dictatorial 2.) Self respecting - Conceited 3.) Able to take care of self - Cold and unfeeling 4.) Can be strict - Cruel and unkind 5.) Can be frank and honest - Hard hearted 6.) Can complain - Rebels against everything 7.) Able to doubt others - Distrust everyone 8.) Able to self criticize - Always ashamed of self 9.) Can be obedient - Spineless 10.) Grateful - Clinging vine 11.) Appreciative - Will believe anyone 12.) Cooperative - Agrees with everyone 13.) Friendly - Loves everyone 14.) Considerate - Tries to comfort everyone 15.) Helpful - Spoils people with kindness 16.) Well thought of - Expects everyone to admire him. These sixteen traits comprised the revised list of traits by LaForge and Suczek (1975). The instrument has also been modified to control for social desirability and average endorsement frequency, (Bentler 1977, Test & Review).

Cross validation, concurrent validity, construct validity, and reliability studies have all been conducted and support the validity of the instrument.

The general dependency factor on the ICL was correlated with peer report (PR), self report (SR), a true - false questionnaire (Q), the forced choice E.P.P.S. (1954), the sentence completion (SC) test by Rohde's (1957), the T.A.T. and the Rorschach Test. The SR, PR, EPPS, and the Q, all correlated positively with the ICL. Less direct measures

such as the Rorschach and the T.A.T. were not significantly correlated. The Armstrong, test - retest reliability correlations coefficient was $r = .78$ for octant reliability. The internal consistency ranged from $r = .953$ to $.976$ when calculated with the Kuder-Richardson. Zuckerman (1961) found correlations ranging from $.94$ to $.96$ for peer ratings and the ICL. Zuckerman (1961) and Klopfer (1961) both found validity with respect to direct measures of the ICL traits but found poor correlations with the more indirect projective measures such as the SC, the T.A.T. and the Rorschach.

3. Parent - Adolescent Communication Inventory:

The third instrument being utilized in this study is the "Parent - Adolescent Communication Inventory" developed by M.J. Bienvenu in 1969. This inventory was designed to help counselors, educators and researchers in their assessment of parent - adolescent relationships. It is a 40 item inventory that can be administered to a single subject or to a group of subjects. An example of some questions that represented conflict are listed below; "Does your father lecture and preach to you too much?" ; "Does your mother criticize you too much?" ; "Do you find your mother's tone of voice irritating?" When subjects responses to these kind of items are affirmative, they receive a score of zero and consequently a lower overall score. It is designed such

that there are three possible responses, "usually", "sometimes", and "seldom". The scoring range is from zero to three with the higher score going to the more favorable response. The questions are structured so as to control against response set. They vary in their structure such that on some occasions the "usually" response is scored zero and for another question it is scored three. It should be noted that a "sometimes" response, when indicative of a favorable attitude or answer is given a score of "2" whereas when suggesting an unfavorable attitude is given a score of "1". Approximately half of the items are reverse keyed.

The possible range of scores to be earned on the inventory is zero to 120. The higher the total score the more open and positive the level of parent-adolescent communication. For this investigation, when a subject rated his or her parent with a score of ten or more out of a possible 18 on the six questions measuring nurturance, the parent receiving the ten or more score was cataloged as a nurturant parent. Thereby the subject became a subject with a nurturant mother or father. When the subjects rating of their communication with their parent was 8 or less out of 18 on the six questions that measured conflict, the parent receiving the low score was cataloged as a difficult parent i.e., a parent with whom the subject had a conflicted relationship.

Three reliability studies have been conducted on the 40

item inventory. A split-half correlation coefficient, computed on scores of 74 teenage subjects on the odd and even numbered statements, revealed a coefficient of .86 after correction. This correlation coefficient of .86 was calculated with the Spearman-Brown test. Using the Spearman-Rho, a test-retest study of 84 boys and girls within a three week period revealed a .78 coefficient of reliability for this inventory. In the second test retest reliability study of 63 additional subjects within a two week period a reliability coefficient of .88 was obtained.

To establish the face validity of the PACI, the original 36 item version was submitted to a clinical team consisting of a psychiatrist, psychologist, and psychiatric social worker whose consensus was that all of the items are relevant to intra-family communications. With 376 high school youths, 31 of the thirty six items were found to discriminate significantly between the upper and lower quartiles. Significance was calculated with the chi-square test at the .01 confidence level. For cross-validation the mean scores of three major sub-groups (three different high schools) within the sample were compared. The same mean was found for two of the schools while the third school was one point higher. Based on an item analysis the inventory underwent a major revision. The subsequent 40 item inventory discriminated significantly between the upper and lower quartiles at the .01 level using the same chi-square test.

In 1969 another test of 59 delinquent and non-delinquent youth revealed significant differences using the "t" test.

Procedure:

It was intended that the administration of the TJTA, PACI, and the ICL be conducted primarily in group format. By the end of the study, less than 15% of the useable subjects completed the forms in the group format. Twelve of the 95 completed the questionnaires in groups. The majority of the participants completed the questionnaires at home or at work. For the 12 who began responding to the forms in the group format, they completed the first two, mother and father during the initial sitting. About half of the twelve chose to complete the other two, the partner and the self, at home and the other six chose to return to the classroom 7 days after the first sitting and completed the second set of questionnaires on their partner and on themselves.

Participants were first asked to read and sign the consent form. After the consent forms had been signed, the TJTA and the ICL forms were distributed. Participants were told to follow the instructions on the outside cover of the booklet, and to answer each question as it applies to their father. When this exercise was completed with respect to the fathers, the same forms were filled out with respect to their mothers. Participants used both the TJTA and the ICL to describe their mother and father. Participants were

allowed as much time as necessary but were told that filling out the questionnaires on all four characters generally requires approximately 3 hours to complete. Subjects were then reminded about the necessity of a second sitting which would occur on the same day of the following week. Special arrangements were offered for those unable to attend the second group sitting but most of the participants chose to complete the remaining two forms on their own time at home.

During the second sitting they were instructed to fill out the Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory. They were instructed to answer the questions the way they would have when they were approximately 15 years of age. We recognized that the accuracy of these memories may be variable, but we are interested in the memory itself and not an objective truth. When they had completed the PACI, they were handed the next TJTA form and told to respond to the questions with respect to their "mate" and then with respect to themselves, "self". The same was done with the ICL.

The delay between these two administrations was included in an effort to control against any effort by subjects to inflate differences between their parent and partner. A debriefing session date was arranged with each of the participants at which time they were provided with a more complete explanation of the questions being addressed by the research. At this point, after the subjects had

completed all the questionnaires, they were told that the researchers were investigating whether the experience participants had with their parents when they were young played any part in their selection of a long term romantic partner.

The participants who chose to complete the questionnaires at home or elsewhere received a detailed set of instructions with their packet of research materials. They were all asked to provide phone numbers so that a debriefing could take place by phone. All of these materials are included in the appendix.

Statistical Method:

The participants used the TJTA to provide descriptions for each of the four target personalities, mother, father, partner, and self. These descriptions produced six separate scores for each of the personalities described. The first score represented "nervous", the second score "depressive", the third score "expressive", the fourth "sympathetic", the fifth "dominant" and the sixth, "hostile". The scores ranged from 0 to 40. The higher the score the more present the related characteristic. A model of the scoring profile for each subject is presented below.

Pilot Sample

F=father M=mother P=partner S=self

TJTA raw scores

pilot subject		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>S</u>
nervous	A	18	02	16	12
depressive	B	03	02	18	24
expressive	C	08	10	16	10
sympathetic	D	04	16	28	24
dominant	E	38	22	12	08
hostile	F	38	16	06	06

subject #1 TJTA
correlation matrix

	<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>S</u>
F	1.0			
M	.96	1.0		
P	.17	.23	1.0	
S	.24	.34	.97	1.0

Hypothesis 1:

Subjects who described one or both of their parents as nurturant on the ICL and the PACI qualified for inclusion in the test of hypothesis #1. A nurturant parent was operationally defined by their score on the PACI. Each participant rated their parent-child relationship and when

the score for that relationship, met the criteria, the parent qualified as nurturant. Any subjects who did not describe either of their parents as nurturant were not included in this analysis.

For all of the subjects who did describe one or both of their parents as nurturant, a Pearson R comparison was conducted to determine the correlation between the subject's description of their nurturant parent and the subject's description of their partner. Then we calculated the mean of these correlations for all the subjects who described one or both of their parents as nurturant and the mean of the same correlations from the subjects who did not describe that parent as nurturant. Then we conducted a t-test to determine whether the two groups were different. The theory predicted that the mean correlation for the subjects who identified one of their parents as nurturant would be significantly higher than the mean correlation of the subjects who did not identify one of their parents as nurturant.

Hypothesis 2

For this analysis we used the six TJTA scores. Each subject provided a description of their partner and a description of themselves. A Pearson R was used to determine the degree to which the two sets of scores were correlated.

The theory predicted that the mean of these correlations would be significantly lower than the random

correlation between relatives in the general population. If these correlations were as predicted we would reject the null hypothesis.

Hypotheses 3 and 4

For this analysis we first had to determine which of the subjects described one or both of their parents as difficult i.e., the subject described their relationship with that parent as a conflicted one. The PACI was used to determine whether or not the subjects had a conflicted relationship with a parent. A conflictual relationship was operationally defined as a relationship whose description achieved a score of 8 or less on the relevant items of the PACI. If the rating of this relationship qualified as conflictual, the subject was included in the test of hypothesis 3 and 4. After determining which participants were qualified for inclusion in these test, the six TJTA scores were used to calculate the r between the difficult parents and the partner.

The mean of these correlations was compared to the mean correlation of the subjects who did not identify themselves as having had a conflicted relationship with a parent. A t-test was conducted to determine whether the two groups were different. Hypothesis 3 predicted that the two groups would not be different or that the mean correlations for the group with conflicted relationships would be significantly higher

than the mean correlation for the subjects who did not report having had a conflicted relationship with a parent. Hypothesis 4 predicted the reverse of hypothesis #3.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The data analysis is presented in four sections. The analyses from each of the four major hypotheses are presented separately. Under the heading of Hypothesis 1 there is a description of the sample and of the quantitative criteria by which a subgroup of the sample qualified for inclusion in the test of the first hypothesis. This is followed by a description of each of the comparison groups and the criteria for inclusion in each of the three comparison groups. The analysis of each comparison is presented in a corresponding table. The quantitative analyses consists of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, means, standard deviations and t-tests to determine whether there were differences between the variables.

For hypothesis 2 there were no separate qualifying criteria for subject inclusion; all of the subjects were included. The theory predicts that adults select mates who are complementary in temperament and interpersonal style. Complementary is operationally defined as a person whose description is not positively correlated with the description of himself or herself. Both the description of the mate and the description of the self were generated by the same participant. The theory also proposed that women

would adhere to this pattern more than men. . The mean correlations from the three comparison groups was used to determine whether the self/mates correlations were significantly different in the predicted, lower, direction. The design of the data analysis for hypotheses 3 and 4 is the same as the design of the data analysis of hypothesis 1, with the relevant variable being "conflicted" instead of "nurturant". A conflicted relationship was operationally defined as one where the subject's rating of his or her relationship with his or her parent achieves the appropriate score on the relevant questions from the PACI. In this case the participant qualified for inclusion in this analysis. For example, a yes on a question like, "Does your mother criticize you to much?", or a no on a question like "Does your father respect your opinion?" would produce the lower score necessary for the relationship to qualify as a conflicted one.

HYPOTHESIS #1

To review, the first hypothesis (the "anaclytic" choice) predicts that adults select mates who are similar to their "nurturant" parent. To qualify as a nurturant parent the subject's description of the parent on the PACI was scored, and parents who received qualifying scores were included in this analysis. The nurturant parent was operationally defined as the mother or father who recieved a

score of 12 or higher on the relevant questions from the PACI. For example, a yes on a question like "Does your mother pay compliments or say nice things to you?", or a yes on "Does your father have confidence in your abilities?" would produce the high score necessary to qualify the relationship as a nurturant one.

The six trait scores from the TJTA of the nurturant parent were then compared to the the six trait scores for the mate. These scores were derived from the subject's descriptions of parent and mate. A Pearson product-moment correlation was used to make the comparison. The mean of these correlations, for all of the subjects who had a nurturant parent, was compared to the means of the three comparison groups described below. A t-test was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the groups. Below is a description of the subjects in the sample and then a description of the three comparison groups:

Ninety five (95) adults provided the data for these analyses. Eighty three (87%) of them identified at least one of their parents as nurturant. Fifty two (54%) identified mother as a nurturant parent and 31 (32%) identified father. Of the subjects who identified mother as the nurturant parent, 12 were males and 40 were females. Of those who identified father as the nurturant parent, 6 were males and 25 were females. These data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Participants Who Identified One or Both Parents as Nurturant. N=83 (87.4% of Total N=95)

	males		females		total	
Nurturant	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes-Mother	12	41	40	60	52	54
Yes-Father	06	21	25	38	31	33
Yes-Total	18	62	65	98	83	87
No--Total	11	38	01	02	12	13
All Total	29	100	66	100	95	100

Table 1A

Only Participants Who Identified a Parent as Nurturant N=83

	males		females		totals	
Nurturance	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes-Mothers	12	67	40	62	52	63
Yes-Fathers	06	33	25	38	31	37
Yes-Total	18	100	65	100	83	100

Again using the mean correlation between the subjects descriptions of their nurturant parent and their descriptions of their mates, we compared these mean correlations to the three mean correlations described below.

Comparison Group 1

The first comparison was as follows. The mean r of the mother/partner combinations for those mothers who were

identified as nurturant was compared to the mean r of the mother/partner combinations for those mothers who were not identified as nurturant. See Table 2.

This was followed by a comparison of the mean r of the father/partner combinations for those fathers identified as nurturant and the mean r of the father/partner combinations for those fathers not identified as nurturant. See Table 3.

Table 2t Test Comparison of the Nurturant^t Mother/Partner Correlations and the Non-Nurturant Mother/Partner Correlations.

Nurturant	N	mean r	sd	t
Yes M/P	52	.4069	.5050	
No M/P	43	.0613	.6071	
Difference				2.9960*

* $p < .01$

Table 3t Test Comparison of the Nurturant Father/Partner Correlations and the Non-Nurturant Father/Partner Correlations.

Nurturant	N	mean	sd	t
Yes F/P	31	.5125	.5508	
No F/P	64	.0474	.5960	
Difference				3.5680*

* $p < .001$

Comparison Group 2

The second set of comparisons was between the mean r 's of the nurturant parent/partner combinations and the mean r 's

of the parent/partner combinations for those subjects who identified at least one of their parents as the source of a conflicted relationship. The subjects who identified themselves as having had a conflicted relationship with at least one parent are presented below in Table 4.

Table 4 Participants Who Identified One or Both of Their Parents as The Source of Conflict. N=66 or 69% of Total N=95.

	males		females		total	
Conflictual	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes-Mother	04	14	21	32	25	26
Yes-Father	12	41	29	44	41	43
Yes-Total	16	55	50	76	66	69
No-Mother & Father Total	13	45	16	24	29	31
All-Total	29	100	66	100	95	100

Table 4A The Conflictual Parent Subgroup N=66 or 69% of Total N=95

Yes-Mother	04	25	21	42	25	38
Yes-Father	12	75	29	58	41	62
Yes-Total	16	100	50	100	66	100

The first of these comparisons was between the mean r of the mother/partner combinations for those mothers identified as nurturant and the mean r of the mother/partner combinations for those mothers identified as having had a conflicted relationship with the participant. (For simplicity these mothers will be referred to as the difficult mothers.) That is the nurturant mother/partner pairs were

compared to the difficult mother/partner pairs. See Table 5.

Table 5t Test Comparison of the Nurturant Mother/Partner Correlations and the Conflictual Mother/Partner Correlations.

catagory		N	mean r	sd	t
Nurturant	M/P	52	.4069	.5050	
Conflictual	M/P	25	-.0824	.5767	
Difference					3.8005*

* $p < .001$

This comparison is followed by the comparison of the mean r of the father/partner pairs of those participants who identified their fathers as nurturant, and the mean r of those father/partner pairs of the participants who identified their father as a parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship, i.e., the difficult fathers. See Table 6.

Table 6

t Test Comparison of the Nurturant Father/Partner Correlations and the Conflictual Father/Partner Correlations.

Category	N	mean	sd	t
Nurturant F/P	31	.5125	.5508	
Conflictual F/P	41	-.0286	.6342	
Difference				3.7340*

* $p < .001$

Comparison Group 3

The third comparison correlation coefficient was derived from Strauss (1946), who determined that the population mean correlation for similar investigations was .22. (This was virtually the same as the overall mean correlation between partners and parents in this study, .23.) In this case an actual comparison was estimated. The t-test results were approximated based upon data from other tests because the raw data from the population were not available.

The mean mother/partner and father/partner correlations for the subjects with nurturant parents was determined to be significantly higher than the mean correlations for all three of these comparison groups. This was interpreted as support for the prediction associated with hypothesis 1. The results of these test are presented in Tables 2,3,5, and 6.

For the 52 subjects who identified their mothers as the nurturant parent, the mean M/P r was .4069, as is presented in Table 2. The mean r for all of the M/P combinations was .2570. The nurturant parent/partner mean r is noticeably higher than the mean r for the full group of mother/partner combinations.

In Table 2 the mean mother/partner correlation for the 43 non-nurturant mothers was .0613. The t-test was used to determine whether the mean nurturant M/P correlation was different from the mean r for the non-nurturant mother/partner combinations. The t score of 2.996 revealed

the difference to be statistically significant in the predicted direction, higher, $p < .01$.

The mean mother/partner correlation for the 25 subjects who identified their relationship with their mother as a source of conflict was $-.0823$. The t-test was used to determine whether the nurturant M/P correlations were different from the conflict M/P correlations. In Table 5 the t score of 3.8 shows the difference to be statistically significant in the predicted direction, $p < .001$. We also saw that the mean mother/partner correlation for subjects with nurturant mothers was $.4069$. We suspect that this would be significantly higher than the population mean correlation of $.22$. These results suggest that we reject the null hypothesis with respect to nurturant mothers, i.e., when subjects identify their mother as "nurturant" they are significantly more likely to select a partner who is described as similar to the nurturant mother than they are to select a partner like a mother who is not identified as nurturant.

For the 31 subjects who identified themselves as having had a nurturant father, the mean father/partner correlation was $.5125$. The sample F/P correlation with $N = 95$, was $.2042$. The nurturant father/partner correlation is noticeably higher.

The mean father/partner correlation for the 64 subjects who did not identify themselves as having had a nurturant

father was .0474. In Table 3 the t-test revealed that the mean father/partner correlation for subjects with nurturant fathers was significantly different from the mean r for the non-nurturant father/partner combinations, $p < .001$.

In Table 6, the mean father/partner correlation for the 41 subjects who reported that their relationship with their father was a conflicted one was $-.0286$. The t-test shows that the mean father/partner correlation of $.5125$, for the subjects with nurturant fathers was significantly different from the mean correlation for the F/P combinations for the subjects who reported having had a conflicted relationship with father, $t = 3.734$, $p < .001$.

We suspect that the difference between the mean father/partner correlations for those with a nurturant father, and the mean parent/partners r for the population of $.22$, is significant. This assumption is based upon a visual inspection of the data.

Note that in Table 7 the overall mother/partner correlation of $.2570$ was slightly higher than the overall father/partner correlation of $.2042$, but when the father was "nurturant", this factor had a greater impact on the selection pattern of these subjects, $.5125$, than the presence of a "nurturant" mother had on the selection patterns of the subjects who reported having had a nurturant mothers, $.4069$. See Table 8. The difference between the nurturant father/partners and the nurturant mothers/partners

groups was not significant.

Table 7 The Overall Sample Mother/Partner r and the Sample Father/Partner r.

	N	mean r	sd
Mother/Partners	95	.2571	.5737
Father/Partner	95	.2042	.6189

Table 8 t Test Comparison of the Nurturant Mother/Partner Correlations and the Nurturant Father/Partner Correlations.

category	N	mean	sd	t
Nurturant M	52	.4069	.5050	
Nurturant F	31	.5125	.5508	
Difference				.8827*

* $p = .190$

HYPOTHESIS #2

Hypothesis #2 predicts that subjects (women more than men) will select mates who are described as the "complement" to the description of themselves. In other words, subjects will choose mates who will provide the missing personality characteristics and who are nearly the opposite of themselves (the narcissistic choice). To test this hypothesis a determination had to be made about whether the descriptions of the mates were different from the descriptions of the "self". In other words, the mean partner/self correlation should be lower than the mean

parent/partner or random self/partner correlation. The mean correlations are presented in Table 9. For the overall partner/self (P/S) combinations, the mean correlation was .4856. For this data to have supported the prediction associated with hypothesis 2, the mean r would need to have been significantly lower than no correlation, .00, or significantly lower than the random pair r of .22.

Table 9 The Mean Correlations for the Partner/Self Combinations.

category	females	males	overall
	N=66	N=29	N=95
Partner/Self	.4937	.4662	.4856

The mean partner/self correlation of .4856 is also higher than the sample mean mother/partner correlation of .2570 and the sample mean father/partner correlation of .2042 from Table 7. These results are all contrary to the predicted finding.

Finally, Freud's theory that women would be more likely than men to make this narcissistic selection was analyzed. For this to be confirmed, the correlations for women would need to be lower than those for men. Instead, as can be seen in Table 9, it was the men who made the slightly more complementary selections where the mean was .4662 for men and .4936 for females. The difference was not significant.

Note that the results presented in Table 9 support the

body of research that concludes that adults select mates who are "similar" in personality characteristics to themselves, (Jedlicka 1980, Buss 1985, Buss 1986, Meharabian 1989, Wilson 1989, Boyden 1984, Vinacke 1988, Mathes 1985). The other results in this study appear to indicate that "similarity" between mate and self may not be the salient variable. In other words, while it is true that there is an overall mean high positive correlation between mate and self, it may be the personality characteristics of the parents that allow us to differentiate between and to understand why some subjects fall below the mean and others fall above.

HYPOTHESIS #3

The third hypothesis predicts that subjects will select mates like the parent with whom they had a "conflicted" relationship, the so called "neurotic choice". Recall the theory is that the subject's attraction is based in the preconscious perception that this selection represents an opportunity to resolve the conflict with the surrogate parent, the mate.

Referring back to Table 4, 66 (69%) of the participants in this sample indicated that they had a conflicted relationship with at least one parent. It was found that 41 (43%) of the subjects indicated that their conflicted relationship was with their father and 25 (26%) of the

subjects indicated that their conflicted relationship was with their mother. See Table 4 and 4A. Note that a higher percentage of the females (76% N=50) reported having had conflict with a parent than males (55% N=16). Also note that both men and women reported conflict more often with father than with mother. Three times more often for men, N=12 to N=4, and for female participants, conflict with father N=29, conflict with mother, N=21, 58% to 42% for women. Of only those who reported conflict with a parent, 62% of the participants reported that the conflict was with father while 38% reported that it was with mother. See Table 4 and 4A.

Of the subjects (N=25) who reported that the conflict was with mother, 21 (84%) of those were female subjects and 4 (16%) were male subjects. (See Table 4, row 1, column 1,3, and 5.) Of the subjects who reported that the conflict was with father (N=41), 29 or 71% were female subjects and 12 or 29% were male subjects. (See Table 4, row 2, column 1,3, and 5.) These statistics indicate that female subjects were nearly three times more likely than men, to report conflict with one or both of their parents.

The test of hypothesis 3 began with a comparison of the group of subjects who reported having had a conflicted relationship with a parent and those subjects who reported that they did not have a conflicted relationship with a parent. The mean r for the conflict M/P combinations was

-.0824. The mean r for the No-Conflict group was .3780. The t score of 3.67 for the M/P combinations determined that the two groups were different (i.e., no-conflict higher) in the predicted direction, $p < .001$. This data is presented in Table 10.

The mean r for the father/partner combinations of the participants who reported conflict with father was -.0286. The mean correlation for the no-conflict F/P combinations was .4252. The t score of 3.68 for the conflict - no conflict F/P comparison revealed that the difference between these two groups was statistically significant, $p < .001$. See Table 11.

Table 10

t Test Comparison of the Non-Conflictual Mother/Partner Correlations and the Conflictual Mother/Partner Correlations.

Conflict	N	mean r	sd	t
No -M/P	70	.3780	.5205	
Yes-M/P	25	-.0824	.5767	
Difference				3.6732*

* $p < .001$

Table 11t Test Comparison of the Non-Conflictual Father/Partner Correlations and the Conflictual Father/Partner Correlations.

Conflict	N	mean r	sd	t
No- F/P	54	.4253	.5166	
Yes F/P	41	-.0286	.6342	
Difference				3.6785*

* $p < .001$

The next comparison test for hypothesis #3 involved comparing the conflict groups with the nurturant groups. For this test we compared the conflict father/partner correlations with the nurturant F/P correlations. This was also done for hypothesis #1. The t test determined that the two groups were different, $t = 3.73$ and $p < .001$. See Table 6. Then we compared the conflict mother/partner group with the nurturant M/P group. The t score of 3.80 found in Table 5 indicated that the two groups were different and that the selections made by those reporting a conflicted relationship with either parent were for partners unlike the parent with whom they had the conflicted relationship.

The mean mother/partner correlation for the participants who reported a conflicted relationship with mother was $-.0824$. See Table 10. Table 11 includes the mean father/partner correlation for the subjects who reported having had a conflicted relationship with father, $-.0286$. When the subject reported having had a conflicted relationship with a parent, both the M/P and the F/P mean correlations were negative and both were well below the sample M/P and F/P mean correlations of $.2570$ and $.2042$ respectively.

The mean conflict mother/partner correlation and the mean conflict father/partner correlation were both far below the population standard sample mean correlation of $.22$. Without having tested the actual data, it appears that this

difference would be statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

The theoretical prediction was that the correlation between the conflicted parent and the selected partner would be relatively high. Because it was neither relatively high nor positive, we accept the null hypothesis with respect to hypothesis #3, i.e., we conclude that the subjects in this study did not select partners like the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship.

HYPOTHESIS #4:

Hypothesis 4 predicts that subjects will select mates/partners who are not like the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship, the "healthy choice". We began by determining how many of our subjects reported having a conflicted relationship with a parent. See Table 4 and 4A.

As noted earlier, this hypothesis is the inverse of hypothesis 3, the data clearly require that we accept the null hypothesis with respect to hypothesis 3 and therefore must reject the null hypothesis with respect to hypothesis 4. In other words, the prediction associated with hypothesis 4, adults will select a mate unlike the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship, is supported by the results in this investigation.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results indicate that when adults select a long-term romantic partner, their selection is affected by the character of their previous parent-child relationship. This was found to be true for both male and female participants. The relationships studied were divided into two classifications: nurturant and conflicted. If the earlier relationship between a participant and his or her parent was perceived to be nurturant, the participant selected a long-term romantic partner who was like their parent. On the other hand, if the earlier relationship was perceived to be conflicted, the participants selected a long-term romantic partner who was not like their parent. This effect was found when the relevant parent-child relationship was with the father and when it was with the mother, in both the nurturant and the conflicted condition.

In every analysis, the relationships were defined in terms of the participant's perception. The descriptions of both the parents and the selected long-term partners were based upon the perceptions of the participants. It was not assumed that these perceptions were objectively accurate, only that the perceptions were the relevant variable in this

investigation.

The results also support the proposition that preconscious factors are essential to any understanding of romantic attraction. The operational definition of a preconscious factor was any factor not actively thought about and reported during the initial stages of one person's attraction to another. Previous studies have established that the conscious factors in romantic attraction are physical appearance, intellectual, political, and recreational interest, education, material resources, and certain positive personality characteristics, (Berscheid & Walster, 1969; Jacobson, 1978; Lott & Lott, 1974; Murstein, 1971; Nevid, J. 1984; Sager, 1976; Stuart, 1969; Winch, 1958;). The factors examined in this study were not among those listed as conscious factors in other studies.

The first hypothesis predicted that participants would select a partner who was like their nurturant parent. Most of the subjects in the study, identified themselves as having had at least one nurturant parent. Of the male participants 62% , indicated that at least one of their parents was nurturant. Of those nurturant parents, 66% were the mothers and 33% were the fathers. Of the female participants, 98.5% indicated that at least one of their parents was nurturant. Of those nurturant parents, 61.5% were mothers and 38.5% were fathers. Note that the female participants were more likely to have reported and or

experienced nurturance in their homes than were the male participants. There are several potential explanations for this. One may be that parents actually treat male and female offspring differently. Another may be that males are less sensitive to the emotional ecology of family environments.

These participants, both males and females, were significantly more likely to choose a partner like their nurturant parent than were participants who did not identify a parent as nurturant. This was true whether the parent identified as nurturant was the mother or the father. We also found that the participants who identified themselves as having had a nurturant parent selected partners significantly more like that parent than the participants who identified themselves as having had a conflictual relationship with a parent.

The second hypothesis predicted that adults would select partners who were unlike themselves. The theory was that adults are attracted to persons who complement themselves in personality and interpersonal style. The two halves create the whole. The data from this hypothesis did not support this prediction. Neither the male nor the female participants selected mates unlike themselves on the characteristics considered in this study. The mean correlation between the participants and their partners was positive and relatively high. For women it was .49 and for men it was .47 and overall .486. Although the difference

between the men and women was not significant, the hypothesis suggested that women would be slightly more likely to make this complementary selection. These results contradict that expectation and show the men are at least as likely to make the complementary choice. For a selection to have qualified as a complementary choice, the correlation between the partner and self would need to have been either negative or significantly lower than the correlations of the other selection correlations in the study.

The third hypothesis predicted that participants who reported having had a conflicted relationship with at least one or both of their parents would select a partner like the parent with whom they had the conflicted relationship. Sixty nine percent of the participants identified themselves as having had a conflicted relationship with at least one parent.

Of the female participants, (N=66), 75.8% identified themselves as having had a conflicted relationship with at least one parent. Of those difficult relationships, 42% were with mother and 58% were with father. Of the male participants, (N=29), 55.2% identified themselves as having had a least one parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship. Of these difficult relationships, 25% were with mother and 75% were with father. Note again that more female participants identified themselves as having had a conflictual relationship with a parent than did males.

These participants, both the females and the males, were significantly more likely to select a partner unlike the parent with whom they had the conflicted relationship than those participants who did not identify themselves as having had a conflicted relationship. This was true whether the parent identified as the source of the conflict was the mother or the father. Again the difference between the selection patterns of those with a conflicted relationships and those who identified one of their parents as nurturant, was statistically significant.

In both of the above conditions, i.e., the nurturant parent, and the conflictual relationship, the mean correlations between the parents and the selected partners were compared to the random mean r of the population. Based upon the t -test for differences between groups, it was estimated that the difference between the nurturant group and the random group was significant at at least the $p < .05$. The estimated difference between the conflictual relationship group and the random population was also significant at the $p < .05$ level. The results from the third test also address the prediction proposed in the fourth hypothesis. The prediction associated with the fourth hypothesis was that adults would select partners unlike the parent with whom they had a conflicted relationship. These results indicate that in contrast to the prediction associated with hypothesis 3,

adults select partners unlike the parent with whom they had the conflicted relationship.

The subjects analyzed in this investigation, represented a small northeastern geographical range but a relatively broad socioeconomic range. School teachers, bankers, lawyers, government employees, secretaries, community college students, homemakers, and persons using the laundromat were included. The subjects lived in or worked in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Washington D.C.. The generalizability of our findings is unknown but would appear to be broader than most of the studies done in the mate selection area. However, it would not be appropriate to conclude that our findings represent the population of persons consuming or likely to consume marital counseling services. Less than 10% of our participants indicated that they had had any involvement with professional counseling services. It may be that had there been more of these subjects, these groups would show a stronger representation in the two hypothesis not supported in our study, hypothesis 2, the narcissistic and hypothesis 3, the neurotic choices. While the participation of several homosexuals has been reported, it would not be valid to assume that these results have implications for homosexual couples.

Although the external validity is relatively high, it is limited by those limitations characteristic of voluntary

participants.

The participants in this study were persons with diverse backgrounds, interests, and lifestyles. They were not college sophomores who spend much of their time filling out research questionnaires. Only two of the participants in this study reported that they had been previously involved in human-subjects research. There were also very few mental health professionals participating in the study, which reduces the risk that the participants may have been familiar with the concepts being studied.

There are, nonetheless, some important limitations warranted with respect to the conclusions drawn from this investigation. The first involves the selection of personality, temperament and interpersonal variables. The original authors of these theories did not have personality, temperament, and interpersonal styles subdivided and factoranalyzed the way they are in 1991. Results in this type of study may differ significantly when different personality traits are chosen. Another limitation is that it is virtually impossible to exact control over participants who are not paid and or are not students and who have responsibilities that make total compliance with the instructions in this study relatively unlikely. The participants in this study were given detailed, specific instructions about how and when the instruments were to be completed. Nonetheless they completed the instruments on

their own time wherever and whenever they were able. The researcher was not able to observe and can not testify to total compliance on the part of the participants. If the participants completed the forms all in the same day or in a different sequence than was mandated by the instructions, the results may be less valid. In any case, replication is warranted.

Finally, although a second and third effort was made to recruit more male participants, there is an unfortunate inequity in the number of males to females who elected to participate in this study. Although there is nothing in the results that suggests that the males who participated were atypical, females were more than twice the number of males participating. A more balanced distribution would be preferable.

Further Research

The 1980's and probably 1990's represent difficult times for the North American family. Marital and family therapist are seeing large numbers of broken and blended families that present new challenges to research and clinical psychologists. The Juvenile Courts are seeing custody disputes, neglect and abuse. As a culture our interpersonal skill appear to lag further behind our ability to manufacture smart bombs and intelligent computers. Parents appear to have less time for parenting and children

have less opportunity to see and learn about healthy relationships. The number of children growing up feeling betrayed and consequently distrustful of relationships does not appear to be on the decline. Of all the topics studied by psychologists, interpersonal relationships are among the most complex.

The study described above is part of an effort to expand our understanding of family relationships and how the behavior of one generation of parents influences the behavior and choices of following generations.

This study suggests that nurturant parenting increases the likelihood that the children of these parents will be attracted to and select partners like their parents. Further research could address whether the subsequent partnerships are enduring and healthy. Are they more successful than the relationships produced from the adults who survived conflicted relationships and selected partners who were not like their parent or parents? Will these children become adults who are nurturant and who provide a stable, trustworthy environment for their children?

Further research could also address more precisely the construct validity of both nurturance and conflicted relationships. How do we operationally define a nurturant relationship, or is this a concept that is best defined subjectively? Is nurturance something that parents can learn to become by participating in family therapy?

Finally, the question remains, is the preconscious beyond the scope of empirical research? With reasonably specific operational definitions of the conscious behavioral correlates, preconsciously motivated behavior may in some cases, be operationally defined. The results of this study appear to indicate that the character and behavior of parents may influence the romantic attraction and mate-selection behavior of adults. If it can be determined that adults are "not actively thinking about" the character and behavior of their parents when they become attracted to another adult, and if "not actively thinking about" is an acceptable definition of the preconscious, the conclusion that preconscious factors are involved in romantic attraction would become plausible. In addition to the implications discussed above, these results suggest that until when relationships are fully understood, parents who wish to see their children enter healthy adult relationships need to spend some time and effort providing nurturant models.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, N. (1958). The Pyschodynamics of Family Life. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books Inc..
- American Psychological Association. (1983). Publication Manual Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Araoz, D.L. (1974). Marital Transference. Journal of Family Counseling, 2, 55-63.
- Armstrong, R.G. (1958). The Leary Interpersonal Check List: A Reliability Study, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 14, 393-394.
- Arons, A., Ain, R., Anderson, J. Burd, H., Filman, G., McCallum, R., O'Reilly, E., Rose, A., Stichmann, L., Tamari, Z., Wawro, J., Weinberg, L., & Winesauker, J. (1974). Relationships with Opposite Sexed Parent and Mate Choice. Human Relations, 27, #1, 17-24.
- Balint, M. (1965). Primary Love and Psychoanalytic Technique. New York: Liveright.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E.H. (1969) Interpersonal Attraction. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I. & Spark, G. (1973). Invisible Loyalties. New York: Harper & Row.

- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowen, M. (1978). Family Therapy in Clinical Practice
New York: Jason Aronson.
- Boyden, T., Carroll, J.S., & Maier, R.A. (1984).
Similarity and Attraction in Homosexual Males: The
Effects of Age and Masculinity and Femininity. Sex
Roles, 10, 939-947.
- Burgess, E.W. & Cotrell, L. (1939). Predicting Success or
Failure in Marriage. N.Y.: Prentice Hall.
- Burgess, E.W., & Wallin, P. (1943). Homogamy in Social
Characteristics. American Journal of Sociology, 49,
109-124.
- Buros, O.K. (1970). The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook,
Vol I. New Jersey.: Gryphon Press. 266, (127).
- Buros, O.K. (1974). The Seventh Mental Measurement
Yearbook, Vol I. New Jersey.: Gryphon Press. 959, (572).
- Buros, O.K. (1978). The Eighth Mental Measurement Yearbook,
Vol I. New Jersey.: Gryphon Press. 1111, (692).
- Buss, D.M. & Barnes, M. (1985). Human Mate Selection.
American Scientist, 73 (1), 47-51.
- Buss, D.M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in Human
Mate Selection. Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 50, (3), 559-570

- Cattell, R.B., and Nesselrode, J.R. (1967) Likeness and completeness theories examined by 16 personality factor measures on stable and unstable married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 7: 351-361.
- Commins, W.D.(1932). The Marriage Age of the Oldest Sons. Journal of Social Psychology III, 487-490.
- Dicks, H.V. (1967). Marital Tension. New York: Basic Books.
- Dicks, H.V. (1953). Experiences with marital tension in a psychological clinic. British Journal of Medical Psychology. 26, 181.
- Dicks,H.V.(1963). Object Relations Theory and Marital Studies. British Journal of Medical Psychology,39, 125.
- Dreikurs, R. (1930). The Choice of a Mate. The International Journal of Individual Psychology,I,4, 103.
- Eisenstein, V.W.(ed.) (1956). Neurotic Interactions in Marriage. London: Tavistock.
- Erikson,E.(1950).Childhood and Society. New York: Norton.
- Erikson,E.(1968). Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.

- Evans, R. (1964). Conversations with Carl Jung. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Foa, U.G. (1961). Convergence in the Analysis of the Structure of Interpersonal Behavior. Psychological Review, 68, (5), 341-353.
- Freud, S. (1910). Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality: III. In. Strachey (ed.). The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 7. A Special Type of Object Choice Made by Men. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1914). On Narcissism. In E. Jones (ed.), The Collected Papers of Sigmund Freud. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.
- Freud, S. (1912). The most prevalent form of degradation in erotic life. In, Standard Edition, 1953, 11, 177-195.
- Freud, S. (1916). Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis: Lecture XX. The sexual life of human beings. In. Standard Edition, 1963, 16, 237-243.
- Fairbairn, W.R.D. (1954). An Objects Relations Theory of Personality. New York, Basic Books.
- Forehand, R. & Smith, K. (1986) Parent Adolescent Conflict Comparison and Predictions of Mothers, Fathers, and Daughters. Journal of Early Adolescence, 6(4), 353-367.

- Goethals, G.W.(1973). Symbiosis and the Life Cycle, British Journal of Medical Psychology, 44, 91-96.
- Goethals, G.W.(1976). The Evolution of Sexual and Genital Intimacy: A comparison of the Views of Erik Erikson and Harry S. Sullivan, Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 4, (4), 529-544.
- Gold, M. & Yanoff, D.S. (1985). Mothers, Daughters, and Girlfriends. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49,(3), 654-659.
- Gurman, A.S.(1973). The Effects and Effectiveness of Marital Therapy: A review of outcome research. Family Process, 12, 145-170.
- Gurman,A.S. & Kniskern,D.P.(1978). Research in Marital and Family Therapy: Progress Perspective and Prospect. In: S.L.Garfield & A.E. Bergin (Eds.) Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change (Revised Edition). New York: Wiley.
- Guntrip, H.(1961). Personality Structure and Human Interactions. International Library of Psychoanalysis, London: Hogarth.
- Howard, J., Blumstein, P. & Schwartz, P. (1987). Social or Evolutionary Theories? Some Observations on Human Mate Selection.Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,(1), 194-200.

- Jacobson, N.S. (1977). Problem solving and contingency contracting in the treatment of marital discord. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 92-100.
- Jacobson, N.S. (1978). Specific and non-specific factors in the effectiveness of a behavioral approach to marital discord. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 46, 442-452.
- Jedlicka, D. (1980). A Test of The Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection. The Journal of Social Psychology, 112. 295-299.
- Jung, C.G. (1928). Contributions to analytic psychology. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1974). Barriers to Falling and Remaining in Love, Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Assoc. 22 486-511.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1974). Mature Love: Prerequisites and Characteristics, Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 22, 743-768.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research, (2nd.ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc..
- Kirkpatrick, C. (1937). A Statistical Investigation of The Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 32, 427-430.

- Klimek, D. (1979) Beneath Mate Selection and Marriage: The unconscious motives in human pairing. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Klopfer, W.G. (1961). A Cross-Validation of Leary's "Public" Communication Level. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 17, 318-322.
- Ktsanes, T. (1955). Mate Selection on the Basis of Personality Type: A study utilizing an empirical typology of personality. American Sociological Review, 20, 547-551.
- Kubie, L.S. (1975). Practical and Theoretical Aspects of Psycho-analysis (rev.ed.), New York: International Univ. Press, Inc.
- Kubie, L. S. (1956). Psychoanalysis and Marriage: Practical and theoretical issues. In V. E. Einstein (ed.), Neurotic Interactions in Marriage. New York: Basic Books, 10-43.
- Lott, A.J. & Lott, B.E. (1974). The Role of Reward in the Formation of Positive Interpersonal Attitudes. In: T.L. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.
- Luckey, E.B. (1964). Marital Satisfaction and Personality Correlates of Spouse. Journal of Marriage and the Family, May, 217-220.

- Luckey, E.B. (1965). Marital Satisfaction and Parent Concepts. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 34, 3, 95-204.
- Main, T.F. (1966). Mutual Projection in a Marriage. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 7, 432-439.
- Mangus A.H. (1936). Relationships between young women's conceptions of intimate male associates and their ideal husbands. Journal of Social Psychology, 7, 403-420.
- Mathes, E. W., & Moore, C. L. (1985) Reik's Complementarity Theory of Romantic Love. The Journal of Social Psychology, 125, (3), 321-325.
- Meharabian, A. (1989). Marital Choice and Compatibility as a Function of Trait Similarity-Dissimilarity. Psychological Reports, 65, (3, pt2), 1202.
- Murstein B.I. (1961). The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 194-197.
- Murstein, B.I. (1967). Empirical test of role, complementary needs and homogamy theories of marital choice. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 689-696.
- Murstein, B.I. (1967). The relationship of mental health to marital choice and courtship progress. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 447-451.

- Murstein, B.I. (1971). Self ideal-self discrepancy and the choice of marital partner. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 37, 47-52.
- Nash, L. (ed.) (1980 Revision). Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Manual Los Angeles: Psychological Publications Inc.
- O'Leary, K.D. & Arias, L. (1983). The Influence of Marital Therapy on Sexual Satisfaction. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 9, 3, 171-181.
- Olson, D.H. (1976). Treating Relationships, Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphics.
- Royce, W.S. & Weiss, R.L. (1975). Behavioral cues in the judgement of marital satisfaction: A linear regression analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 816-824.
- Sager, C.J. (1967). Transference in the conjoint therapy of married couples. Archives of General Psychiatry, 16, 185-193.
- Sager, C.J. (1976). Marriage Contracts and Couple Therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Sager, C.J., Kaplan, H.S., Gundlach, R.H., Kremer, M., Lenz, R. & Royce, J.R. (1971). The Marriage Contract. Family Process, 10, 311-326.
- Spencer, H. (1926). An autobiography. London: Watts & Co.

- Stein, M. (1956). The unconscious meaning of the marital bond. In: V. Eisenstein (Ed.), Neurotic Interactions in Marriage. New York: Basic Books.
- Strauss, A. (1946). The Influence of The Parent-Image Upon Marital Choice, American Sociological Review II, 554-559.
- Stuart, R.B. (1969). Operant Interpersonal Treatment of Marital Discord. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 675-682.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: W.W.Norton.
- Taylor, R.M. & Morrison, W.L. (1980). Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Handbook. Los Angeles: Psychological Publications Inc.
- Udry, J.R. (1965). The influence of the ideal mate image on mate selection and mate perception. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, 477-482.
- Udry, J.R., & Bauman, K.E. (1968). Skin color, status, and mate selection. Revision of paper presented at the American Sociological Association Convention, Boston.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of Census (1983) Marital Status and Living Arrangments: Current Population Reports. Series P-20, no. 389.

- Vinacke, W.E., Shannon, K., Pallazzo, V., Balsavage, L., & Cooney, P. (1988). Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs. 114,(1), 51-76.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. (1966). The importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 4, 508-516.
- Willoughby, R.R. (1936). Neuroticism in marriage. IV. homogamy: V summary and conclusions. Journal of Social Psychology, 7, 19-31.
- Wilson, W. (1989). Resolution of the Issue of Similarity Versus Complementarity in Mate Selection Using Height Preference as a Model. Psychological Reports, 65,(2), 387-393.
- Winch, R.F. (1955). The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: Final Results on the Test of General Hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 20, 552-555.
- Winch, R.F. (1958). Mate Selection: A Study of Complementary Needs. New York: Harper.
- Winer, B.J. (1971). Statistical Principles in Experimental Design (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw Hill.
- Zuckerman, M., Levitt, E. E., & Lubin, B. (1961). Concurrent and Construct Validity of Direct and Indirect Measures of Dependency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25(2) 316-323.

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

I have been informed that the purpose of this study is to understand more about the nature of romantic relationships. I am aware that I will be asked to fill out a number of written questionnaires and answer some general and specific questions about my parents, my mate and myself. The first half of the questionnaires will require approximately 1.5 hours to complete and the second half will require approximately the same time. When these questionnaires are completed, either the project investigator will pick them up or I will return them by mail.

I understand that by completing these questionnaires I become eligible to win a prize of \$150.00 that will be awarded to one of the participants in July of 1989.

I have been assured that the information I provide will be kept anonymous and confidential providing that the chief investigator has enough information to contact me if there is a problem with how I completed my forms.

My questions have been answered to my satisfaction and I am aware that I may withdraw from this study at any time. If I have any further questions I can call Jay King at 617-696-0150.

With this understanding I volunteer to participate in this study.

Signed _____

Date _____

Instructions

Enclosed you will find a test booklet for the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (TJTA), the Interpersonal Check List (ICL), and the Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory (PACI). You will also find four answer sheets for the TJTA and four IBM answer sheets for the ICL. The PACI responses can be made directly onto the booklet.

First fill out the "Background" sheet. Second fill out the "Father Form" then fill out the first TJTA marked "Father". Then fill out the first ICL marked "Father". When you have completed those three, do the same for your mother. First the "Mother Form", the TJTA marked "Mother" and the ICL marked "Mother".

Two days after you have completed the above forms, fill out the PACI. Then fill out the "Mate Form", the TJTA, and the ICL on your "Partner". When you have completed those, do the same with respect to yourself. First the "Self Form", the TJTA, and then the ICL. The answer sheets are labeled with the title of the target relative. All forms should be filled out in pencil.

The Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis has 180 items. You only need to respond to 120 of them. The ones you can skip are marked on the booklet.

When responding to the Interpersonal Check List statements, mark the IBM form in column #1 only if the statement is true about the relative named on that answer sheet. If the statement is not true, leave the space blank and go on to the next statement. You can ignore columns 2 through 5 .

The Parent Adolescent Communication Inventory has 40 items plus a list of fill in statements. Only the first 40 items are required.

It is important that you fill these instruments out in the order presented above. It is also important that you do not discuss your responses with any of the target relatives before you have completed all of the forms.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Background

Please answer the following background questions. It is important that you answer them as accurately as you can.

1. Code number: your telephone number and your initials.
_____.
2. Age: _____
3. Gender: _____

PARENTS

1. Are both of your biological parents living?
Yes ____ No ____

I don't know ____

If No, please give the month and year of mother's death: _____ and/or month and year of father's death: _____

How old were you when this death occurred? mother's death: ____ father's death: ____

2. Are both of your biological parents living together today?

Yes ____ No ____ . If No, when did they separate? (Year and month): ____ . How old were you when they separated? ____ .

Father Form

Please use the enclosed forms to describe your father the way you remember him when you were an adolescent, between 10 and 15 years of age. If your father was not the male primarily available to you when you were an adolescent, indicate below and use this form to describe the person who played the role of father for you.

- A. Stepfather
- B. Grandfather
- C. Uncle
- D. Brother
- E. Other _____ (specify)

If you became separated from your father because of a separation, divorce, or death and he did not return before you were 15, indicate your age when you and he became separated. ____ Not applicable ____.

If there were no adult males involved in your upbringing put a check here ____ and proceed to the next form.

Mother Form

Use the enclosed forms to describe your mother the way you remember feeling about her when you were an adolescent, between 10 and 15 years of age. If your mother was not the person primarily available to you when you were growing up, indicate below and use this form to describe the person who played the role of mother for you.

A. Stepmother

B. Grandmother

C. Aunt

D. Sister

E. Other _____ (specify)

If you became separated from your mother because of separation, divorce, or death and she did not return before you were 15, indicate your age when you and she became separated. _____ Not applicable ____

If there were no adult females involved in your upbringing check here ____ and proceed to the next form.

Mate Form

Please use the enclosed forms to describe your first mate. A "mate" is someone with whom you have or had a romantic relationship and lived with for a minimum of three years. The following questions should be applied to your first mate. If none of your relationships qualify, circle "No" below and use this form to describe the person with whom you have had the most enduring romantic relationship.

Circle the applicable responses.

Mate A. Yes (3 yrs) B. No (involved less than 3 yrs)

Married C. Yes D. No

1. Is your first mate living? Yes ____ No _____. If no, how long ago did they die? (month, year) _____

2. Are you and your first mate living together today? Yes ____ No _____. If no, when did you separate? (month & year) _____

3. Rate the degree of tension/conflict between you and your first mate:

1) very low 2) low 3) moderate 4) high 5) very high

4. Rate the degree of satisfaction you experience or experienced with your first mate:

1) very low 2) low 3) moderate 4) high 5) very high

5. Your age _____, and the age of your mate _____ when you first moved in together.

Are you and your mate of the same gender?

A. Yes B. No

If you became separated from your mate during the last six months, indicate how recently and the reason. _____ wks ago.

A. Separation B. Divorce C. Other

Now fill out the TJTA and the ICL on your "mate".

Self Form

1. How many "mates" have you had? _____

2. Rate your experience, if any, with individual or group counseling:

a) negative b) neutral c) positive d) not applicable

Date ended: _____

3. Rate your experience, if any, with marital or family counseling:

a) negative b) neutral c) positive d) not applicable

Date ended: _____

Now fill out the TJTA and the ICL on yourself, "self".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, N. (1958). The Pyschodynamics of Family Life.
New York, N.Y.: Basic Books Inc..

American Psychological Association. (1983). Publication
Manual Washington D.C.: American Psychological
Association.

Araoz, D.L. (1974). Marital Transference. Journal of Family
Counseling, 2, 55-63.

Armstrong, R.G. (1958). The Leary Interpersonal Check
List: A Reliability Study, Journal of Clinical
Psychology, 14, 393-394.

Arons, A., Ain, R., Anderson, J. Burd, H., Filman, G.,
McCallum, R., O'Reilly, E., Rose, A., Stichmann, L.,
Tamari, Z., Wawro, J., Weinberg, L., & Winesauker, J.
(1974). Relationships with Opposite Sexed Parent and
Mate Choice. Human Relations, 27, #1, 17-24.

Balint, M. (1965). Primary Love and Psychoanalytic
Technique. New York: Liveright.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E.H. (1969) Interpersonal
Attraction. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Boszormenyi-Nagy, I. & Spark, G. (1973). Invisible
Loyalties. New York: Harper & Row.

- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowen, M. (1978). Family Therapy in Clinical Practice
New York: Jason Aronson.
- Boyden, T., Carroll, J.S., & Maier, R.A. (1984).
Similarity and Attraction in Homosexual Males: The
Effects of Age and Masculinity and Femininity. Sex
Roles, 10, 939-947.
- Burgess, E.W. & Cotrell, L. (1939). Predicting Success or
Failure in Marriage. N.Y.: Prentice Hall.
- Burgess, E.W., & Wallin, P. (1943). Homogamy in Social
Characteristics. American Journal of Sociology, 49,
109-124.
- Buros, O.K. (1970). The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook,
Vol I. New Jersey.: Gryphon Press. 266, (127).
- Buros, O.K. (1974). The Seventh Mental Measurement
Yearbook, Vol I. New Jersey.: Gryphon Press. 959, (572).
- Buros, O.K. (1978). The Eighth Mental Measurement Yearbook,
Vol I. New Jersey.: Gryphon Press. 1111, (692).
- Buss, D.M. & Barnes, M. (1985). Human Mate Selection.
American Scientist, 73 (1), 47-51.
- Buss, D.M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in Human
Mate Selection. Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 50, (3), 559-570

- Cattell, R.B., and Nesselrode, J.R. (1967) Likeness and completeness theories examined by 16 personality factor measures on stable and unstable married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 7: 351-361.
- Commins, W.D.(1932). The Marriage Age of the Oldest Sons. Journal of Social Psychology III, 487-490.
- Dicks, H.V. (1967). Marital Tension. New York: Basic Books.
- Dicks, H.V. (1953). Experiences with marital tension in a psychological clinic. British Journal of Medical Psychology. 26, 181.
- Dicks,H.V.(1963). Object Relations Theory and Marital Studies. British Journal of Medical Psychology,39, 125.
- Dreikurs, R. (1930). The Choice of a Mate. The International Journal of Individual Psychology,I,4, 103.
- Eisenstein, V.W.(ed.) (1956). Neurotic Interactions in Marriage. London: Tavistock.
- Erikson,E.(1950).Childhood and Society. New York: Norton.
- Erikson,E.(1968). Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.

- Evans, R. (1964). Conversations with Carl Jung. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Foa, U.G. (1961). Convergence in the Analysis of the Structure of Interpersonal Behavior. Psychological Review, 68, (5), 341-353.
- Freud, S. (1910). Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality: III. In. Strachey (ed.). The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 7. A Special Type of Object Choice Made by Men. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1914). On Narcissism. In E. Jones (ed.), The Collected Papers of Sigmund Freud. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.
- Freud, S. (1912). The most prevalent form of degradation in erotic life. In, Standard Edition, 1953, 11, 177-195.
- Freud, S. (1916). Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis: Lecture XX. The sexual life of human beings. In. Standard Edition, 1963, 16, 237-243.
- Fairbairn, W.R.D. (1954). An Objects Relations Theory of Personality. New York, Basic Books.
- Forehand, R. & Smith, K. (1986) Parent Adolescent Conflict Comparison and Predictions of Mothers, Fathers, and Daughters. Journal of Early Adolescence, 6(4), 353-367.

- Goethals, G.W.(1973). Symbiosis and the Life Cycle, British Journal of Medical Psychology, 44, 91-96.
- Goethals, G.W.(1976). The Evolution of Sexual and Genital Intimacy: A comparison of the Views of Erik Erikson and Harry S. Sullivan, Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 4, (4), 529-544.
- Gold, M. & Yanoff, D.S. (1985). Mothers, Daughters, and Girlfriends. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49,(3), 654-659.
- Gurman, A.S.(1973). The Effects and Effectiveness of Marital Therapy: A review of outcome research. Family Process, 12, 145-170.
- Gurman,A.S. & Kniskern,D.P.(1978). Research in Marital and Family Therapy: Progress Perspective and Prospect. In: S.L.Garfield & A.E. Bergin (Eds.) Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change (Revised Edition). New York: Wiley.
- Guntrip, H.(1961). Personality Structure and Human Interactions. International Library of Psychoanalysis, London: Hogarth.
- Howard, J., Blumstein, P. & Schwartz, P. (1987). Social or Evolutionary Theories? Some Observations on Human Mate Selection.Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,(1), 194-200.

- Jacobson, N.S. (1977). Problem solving and contingency contracting in the treatment of marital discord. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 92-100.
- Jacobson, N.S. (1978). Specific and non-specific factors in the effectiveness of a behavioral approach to marital discord. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 46, 442-452.
- Jedlicka, D. (1980). A Test of The Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection. The Journal of Social Psychology, 112. 295-299.
- Jung, C.G. (1928). Contributions to analytic psychology. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1974). Barriers to Falling and Remaining in Love, Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Assoc. 22 486-511.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1974). Mature Love: Prerequisites and Characteristics, Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 22, 743-768.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research, (2nd.ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc..
- Kirkpatrick, C. (1937). A Statistical Investigation of The Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 32, 427-430.

- Klimek, D. (1979) Beneath Mate Selection and Marriage: The unconscious motives in human pairing. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Klopfer, W.G. (1961). A Cross-Validation of Leary's "Public" Communication Level. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 17, 318-322.
- Ktsanes, T. (1955). Mate Selection on the Basis of Personality Type: A study utilizing an empirical typology of personality. American Sociological Review, 20, 547-551.
- Kubie, L.S. (1975). Practical and Theoretical Aspects of Psycho-analysis (rev.ed.), New York: International Univ. Press, Inc.
- Kubie, L. S. (1956). Psychoanalysis and Marriage: Practical and theoretical issues. In V. E. Einstein (ed.), Neurotic Interactions in Marriage. New York: Basic Books, 10-43.
- Lott, A.J. & Lott, B.E. (1974). The Role of Reward in the Formation of Positive Interpersonal Attitudes. In: T.L. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.
- Luckey, E.B. (1964). Marital Satisfaction and Personality Correlates of Spouse. Journal of Marriage and the Family, May, 217-220.

- Luckey, E.B. (1965). Marital Satisfaction and Parent Concepts. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 34, 3, 95-204.
- Main, T.F. (1966). Mutual Projection in a Marriage. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 7, 432-439.
- Mangus A.H. (1936). Relationships between young women's conceptions of intimate male associates and their ideal husbands. Journal of Social Psychology, 7, 403-420.
- Mathes, E. W., & Moore, C. L. (1985) Reik's Complementarity Theory of Romantic Love. The Journal of Socail Psychology, 125, (3), 321-325.
- Meharabian, A. (1989). Marital Choice and Compatibility as a Function of Trait Similarity-Dissimilarity. Psychological Reports, 65, (3,pt2), 1202.
- Murstein B.I. (1961). The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 194-197.
- Murstein, B.I. (1967). Empirical test of role, complementary needs and homogamy theories of marital choice. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 689-696.
- Murstein, B.I. (1967). The relationship of mental health to marital choice and courtship progress. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 447-451.

- Murstein, B.I. (1971). Self ideal-self discrepancy and the choice of marital partner. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 37, 47-52.
- Nash, L. (ed.) (1980 Revision). Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Manual Los Angeles: Psychological Publications Inc.
- O'Leary, K.D. & Arias, L. (1983). The Influence of Marital Therapy on Sexual Satisfaction. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 9, 3, 171-181.
- Olson, D.H. (1976). Treating Relationships, Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphics.
- Royce, W.S. & Weiss, R.L. (1975). Behavioral cues in the judgement of marital satisfaction: A linear regression analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 816-824.
- Sager, C.J. (1967). Transference in the conjoint therapy of married couples. Archives of General Psychiatry, 16, 185-193.
- Sager, C.J. (1976). Marriage Contracts and Couple Therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Sager, C.J., Kaplan, H.S., Gundlach, R.H., Kremer, M., Lenz, R. & Royce, J.R. (1971). The Marriage Contract. Family Process, 10, 311-326.
- Spencer, H. (1926). An autobiography. London: Watts & Co.

- Stein, M. (1956). The unconscious meaning of the marital bond. In: V. Eisenstein (Ed.), Neurotic Interactions in Marriage. New York: Basic Books.
- Strauss, A. (1946). The Influence of The Parent-Image Upon Marital Choice, American Sociological Review II, 554-559.
- Stuart, R.B. (1969). Operant Interpersonal Treatment of Marital Discord. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 675-682.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: W.W.Norton.
- Taylor, R.M. & Morrison, W.L. (1980). Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Handbook. Los Angeles: Psychological Publications Inc.
- Udry, J.R. (1965). The influence of the ideal mate image on mate selection and mate perception. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, 477-482.
- Udry, J.R., & Bauman, K.E. (1968). Skin color, status, and mate selection. Revision of paper presented at the American Sociological Association Convention, Boston.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of Census (1983) Marital Status and Living Arrangments: Current Population Reports. Series P-20, no. 389.

- Vinacke, W.E., Shannon, K., Pallazzo, V., Balsavage, L., & Cooney, P. (1988). Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs. 114,(1), 51-76.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. (1966). The importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 4, 508-516.
- Willoughby, R.R. (1936). Neuroticism in marriage. IV. homogamy: V summary and conclusions. Journal of Social Psychology, 7, 19-31.
- Wilson, W. (1989). Resolution of the Issue of Similarity Versus Complementarity in Mate Selection Using Height Preference as a Model. Psychological Reports, 65,(2), 387-393.
- Winch, R.F. (1955). The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: Final Results on the Test of General Hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 20, 552-555.
- Winch, R.F. (1958). Mate Selection: A Study of Complementary Needs. New York: Harper.
- Winer, B.J. (1971). Statistical Principles in Experimental Design (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw Hill.
- Zuckerman, M., Levitt, E. E., & Lubin, B. (1961). Concurrent and Construct Validity of Direct and Indirect Measures of Dependency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25(2) 316-323.