



1984

## The Intimacy Motive and Its Relationship to Interpersonal Perception in the Dating Couple

Rogelio Rodriguez  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Rodriguez, Rogelio, "The Intimacy Motive and Its Relationship to Interpersonal Perception in the Dating Couple" (1984). *Master's Theses*. 3399.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/3399](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3399)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1984 Rogelio Rodriguez

THE INTIMACY MOTIVE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP  
TO INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION IN THE DATING COUPLE

by

ROGELIO RODRIGUEZ

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate  
School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

December, 1984

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to several people who were of much assistance to me in the completion of this project.

I would first like to thank Dr. Dan McAdams, the director of this theses, for all his constant support, help, and general availability throughout every stage of this research project. I am also indebted to Dr. James Johnson for his generous and continuous assistance throughout this project.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to those friends and family who gave me much support and understanding during the entire course of this thesis.

## VITA

The author, Rogelio Rodriguez, is the son of Mauro and Maria Rodriguez. He was born on October 16, 1958, in San Antonio, Texas.

His elementary education was completed at Jose Francisco Ruiz elementary school in San Antonio, Texas. His secondary education was obtained at Edgar Allen Poe junior high school and Highlands High School in San Antonio, Texas.

Mr. Rodriguez entered St. Mary's University in September, 1977, in San Antonio, Texas. He received the degree of Bachelor of Science in psychology in December, 1980.

In September, 1981, Mr. Rodriguez entered the clinical psychology program at Loyola University of Chicago. He received a teaching assistantship for 1981-82 and 1982-83. A clerkship was completed at Cook County Hospital in 1982 and at West Side VA Hospital in 1983. He received an assistantship at the Charles I. Doyle Guidance Center for 1983-84 and 1984-85.

## DEDICATION

To my parents Mauro and Maria Rodriguez, with respect, love, and appreciation.

Para mis padres Mauro y Maria Rodriguez, con respeto, agradecimiento, y mucho carino.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
VITA . . . . .	iii
DEDICATION . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES . . . . .	xi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	3
Motives and motive measurement . . . . .	3
Intimacy motivation . . . . .	4
Interpersonal perception in couples . . . . .	9
Satisfaction of needs in couples . . . . .	14
Rubin's Loving and Liking scales . . . . .	16
Formulation of hypothesis . . . . .	16
III. METHOD . . . . .	21
Subjects . . . . .	21
Measures . . . . .	21
Procedure . . . . .	29
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	32
Independent measures . . . . .	32
Dependent measures . . . . .	32
Agreement A Questionnaire . . . . .	32
Agreement B Questionnaire . . . . .	42
Needs/Needs Fulfillment Questionnaire . . . . .	51
Length of relationship . . . . .	71
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	80
APPENDIX A . . . . .	85

	Page
APPENDIX B . . . . .	89
APPENDIX C . . . . .	95
APPENDIX D . . . . .	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Ranges, Means, Standard Deviations for Intimacy, Loving, and Liking Scores . . . . .	33
2. Mean Score on Agreement A by Intimacy Level of Male and Intimacy Level of Female . . . . .	35
3. A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement A as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	36
4. Mean Score on Agreement A by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female . . . . .	38
5. A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement A as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	39
6. Mean Score on Agreement A by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female . . . . .	40
7. A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement A as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	41
8. Mean Score on Agreement B by Intimacy Level of Male and Intimacy Level of Female . . . . .	43
9. A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement B as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	44
10. Mean Score on Agreement B by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female . . . . .	46
11. A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement B as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	47
12. Mean Score on Agreement B by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female . . . . .	49



Table	Page
13. A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement B as the Dependent Viriable . . . . .	50
14. Mean Correlation Scores on Need Importance by Intimacy Level of Male and Intimacy Level of Female and Perception of Partners . . . . .	53
15. A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Importance as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	54
16. Mean Correlation Scores on Need Importance by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female and Perception of Partners . . . . .	57
17. A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Importance as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	58
18. Mean Correlation Scores on Need Importance by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female and Perception of Partners . . . . .	59
19. A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Importance as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	60
20. Mean Correlation Scores on Need Fulfillment by Intimacy Level of Male and Intimacy Level of Female and Perception of Partners . . . . .	63
21. A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Fulfillment as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	64
22. Mean Correlation Scores on Need Fulfillment by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female and Perception of Partners . . . . .	66

23. A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Fulfillment as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	67
24. Mean Correlation Scores on Need Fulfillment by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female and Perception of Partners . . . . .	69
25. A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Fulfillment as the Dependent Variable . . . . .	70

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A    The Intimacy Motivation Scoring System . . . . .	86
APPENDIX B    Needs/Needs Fulfillment Questionnaire . . . . .	90
APPENDIX C    Agreement A Questionnaire . . . . .	96
APPENDIX D    Agreement B Questionnaire . . . . .	99

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A    The Intimacy Motivation Scoring System . . . . .	86
APPENDIX B    Needs/Needs Fulfillment Questionnaire . . . . .	90
APPENDIX C    Agreement A Questionnaire . . . . .	96
APPENDIX D    Agreement B Questionnaire . . . . .	99

- interpersonal  
- communication  
- self-esteem  
- happiness

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

One of the few ideas that most people agree with is the importance of interpersonal relationships in our lives. Interpersonal relationships can be the source of much enjoyment, and at another time, can cause much emotional pain. Throughout history, poets and philosophers have attempted to understand what makes for a good relationship. More recently, scientific researchers have attempted to empirically investigate what contributes to a good interpersonal relationship. However, this area of research is filled with subjective definitions and evaluations. For example, if love is required for a good relationship, what is love? There is no one definition of love that is universally agreed upon. Hence, problems with operational definitions abound in this type of research.

Although different types of relationships have been studied, marital relationships have been of particular interest. These have been investigated in different ways. For example, one method of studying married couples has been to examine the individual personality characteristics of the spouses and possible complementarity of their personality characteristics. The complementarity of spouses's needs has also been studied. How spouses perceive each other has been another area of study. Most research has examined dyadic relationships to gain more

insight into interpersonal relationships, usually using married couples.

Another area of investigation in social relationships has been the study of social motives as defined by David McClelland (1971). Although this line of research is relatively new, research is under way to study the impact of an individual's social motives, such as the affiliation or the power motive, on his/her interpersonal relationships.

*QWC* (This study will investigate the relationship between the interpersonal perception of the partners in a romantic couple and intimacy motivation. In this study, interpersonal perception refers to how each partner perceives the relationship. Interpersonal perception will be assessed in this study by three measures which will be explained later in the text: The Agreement A questionnaire consisting of a set of open-ended questions concerning the relationship; the Agreement B questionnaire consisting of several Likert-type questions also about the relationship; and the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire consisting of questions addressing the importance and fulfillment of certain needs within the relationship. Three primary objectives of this investigation are a) to better understand the intimacy motive and its effect on interpersonal relationships; b) to examine the expectations and satisfactions, especially in regards to needs individuals derive from relationships; and c) to offer alternative methods for research in social motivation and interpersonal relationships.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Motives and motive measurement

David McClelland has been a dominant figure in the study of motives and in their measurement. McClelland (1971) defines a motive as a recurrent preference for a particular goal state that energizes, directs, and selects behavior in certain situations. Three assumptions about motives are that 1) they are antecedent to behavior; 2) they cause or force behavior; and 3) motives themselves can serve as sensations (deCharms, 1982). Motives guide behavior toward the final goal of the motive. They keep subjects pushing toward the goal, enabling them to persist regardless of difficulties. Also, motives produce emotional responses in anticipation of the goal and again after achieving it (Winter, 1982).

The thematic measurement of human social motives was first begun by McClelland and his associates in their work with the achievement motive. Scoring consists of highly objective coding of narrative thought samples written or verbalized in response to ambiguous picture cues (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, 1952). McClelland used the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT, Morgan & Murray, 1935) to measure social motives. In the TAT, the subject is given a a vague picture stimulus and is told to write or tell a story about what is going on in the picture (e.g., what happened before, what is happening now, what

will happen, and how the characters in the picture relate to each other in some manner). The subject typically does not know exactly what the experimenter is trying to measure. Through this procedure, the TAT obtains a sample of a person's thoughts in a standardized situation. It is assumed that the content of the story response is a reflection of a dominant theme in an individual's everyday thought. The more dominant a theme is, the higher an individual is said to be in the particular motivation disposition (McClelland, 1971).

A frequent criticism of this scoring style has been the low test-retest reliability of the TAT (Entwistle, 1972). However, Winter and Stewart (1977) have argued that reliability of the TAT can be obtained with the proper instructions. More importantly, they assert that the traditional evaluations of reliability using objective tests such as self-reports may be inappropriate for the operant measuring of the TAT. McClelland states that operant thought measures, such as the TAT, have proven to have high validity in predicting operant behaviors over long periods of time, as well as other types of behavior in theoretically appropriate contexts, making them more useful than traditional objective measures such as self-report questionnaires and adjective checklists.

#### Intimacy motivation

The Affiliation motive (Heys, Veroff, & Atkinson, 1958) has generally been used in the study of interpersonal relationships. However, reviews of the need for Affiliation literature have recently concluded that the evidence for its construct validity is lacking (Boyatzis, 1973; McAdams, 1979). The difficulty with the Affiliation scoring system



appears to center on its emphasis on the active striving of a story character to obtain, maintain, or restore interpersonal relationships.

McAdams (1979,1980) has recently developed a new scoring system for what is termed the intimacy motive. The intimacy motive is defined as a recurrent conscious and/or unconscious preference for a particular quality of interpersonal experience of warm, close, and communicative exchange with another or with others (McAdams & Powers, 1981). The goal state of intimacy motivation is an interpersonal, noninstrumental encounter and experienced as a "good" in and of itself (McAdams, 1980). The emphasis is on being instead of actively striving for something. There is a loosening of ego boundaries, a surrender of control in interpersonal relations (McAdams, 1980). The theoretical orientation of the Intimacy motive stems from a number of sources such as Maslow's "Being-love" (1968), Bakan's communal mode of human experience (1966), Sullivan's concept of the need for interpersonal intimacy (1953), and Buber's I-Thou relation (1965,1970). McAdams (1980) characterized the most desirous interpersonal experiences of individuals scoring high on the intimacy motive by seven themes: 1) joy and mutual delight (Maslow); 2) reciprocal dialogue (Buber, Sullivan); 3) oneness, contact, union, and receptivity (Bakan,Maslow); 4) perceived harmony (Buber, Sullivan); 5) concern for the well-being of the other (Sullivan); 6) surrender of manipulative control and the desire to master in relating to the other (Bakan, Buber, & Maslow); and 7) being in an encounter which is perceived as an end in itself rather than doing or striving to attain a relationship or some extrinsic reward (Bakan, Buber, Maslow, Sulli-

van).

The intimacy motivation scoring system is designed to measure an individual's preference for interpersonal experiences of closeness, warmth, and communication. Using the TAT, intimacy motivation is measured through analysis of the quality of the interpersonal relationship manifested by characters in imaginative stories written by the individual. The stories are coded for the presence of ten thematic categories such as "relationship produces positive affect," or "dialogue," or "psychological growth and coping." (For a detailed outline of the intimacy scoring system (see Appendix A).

McAdams has conducted several studies to validate his intimacy motive system. McAdams (1980) found that subjects high in intimacy motivation were rated more often by friends as "natural," "warm," "sincere," "appreciative," and "loving" and seen as less "dominant," "outspoken," and "self-centered." Individuals scoring high on the intimacy motive have reported themes of intimacy in personal experiences that were significant to their own religious development (McAdams, Booth, & Selvik, 1982). In another study (McAdams & Constantian, 1983), subjects carried pagers for a week and when paged, reported their present thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. Intimacy motivation was highly correlated with percentage of interpersonal thoughts. Intimacy also correlated highly with conversation and letter writing behaviors. High intimacy scores correlated negatively with the number of expressed wishes to be alone or not interacting when in an interactional situation.

In another study examining intimacy motivation, McAdams and Powers

(1981) found that high intimacy individuals structured behavioral scenarios so that they were in close physical proximity to others, and they also attempted to promote a communal spirit. Individuals high in intimacy spent less time organizing activity, made fewer explicit commands, and relinquished power leaving room for spontaneity. McAdams (1982) conducted a study whereby subjects were asked to write about autobiographical memories of peak experiences and satisfying experiences. High intimacy individuals described autobiographical memories of peak experiences and to a lesser extent, satisfying experiences, that concerned love and friendship, reciprocal communication and sharing, helping others and being helped, and tender interpersonal touching. In another study, when high intimacy individuals described friendship episodes, intimacy motivation was associated with listening, self-disclosure, and trust or concern (McAdams, Krause, & Healy, in press)

McAdams and Vaillant (1982) examined longitudinal data of 57 middle-aged men from the Grant Study of Adult Development. Data were analyzed in terms of nine psychosocial adjustment indicators and four social motives: achievement, power, affiliation, and intimacy motivation. It was hypothesized that intimacy motivation measured at age 30 would be positively associated with subsequent psychosocial adjustment in middle age. In the 1960's, these 57 subjects had all consented to be interviewed on the issue of psychological health. This information was examined in conjunction with sets of TAT stories written by these 57 men in 1950-52 and total adult adjustment data obtained from them in the late 1960's. The TAT protocols were coded for achievement, power,

affiliation, and intimacy motivation. In regards to adult adjustment, nine objective indicators of adjustment were derived from interview and questionnaire data collected from the subjects. The nine indices were 1) 1967 income; 2) steady promotion; 3) games (i.e., pastimes or activities with non-family members; 4) vacations (use of vacation time); 5) enjoyment of job; 6) psychiatric visits; 7) drug or alcohol misuse; 8) days sick leave; and 9) marital enjoyment.

Results showed that the only significant difference in mean adjustment ratings for high vs. low motive score was for the intimacy motive. The subjects who scored high in intimacy motivation (as assessed by the TAT in 1950-52) exhibited better psychosocial adjustment in 1967 than subjects who had scored low in intimacy motivation. Of the nine psychosocial indicators of adjustment, enjoyment of job and marital enjoyment correlated the most strongly with intimacy motivation. In summary, of the four social motives examined, intimacy motivation was found to be the best predictor of psychosocial adjustment seventeen years later.

In conclusion, individuals with high intimacy motivation demonstrate an interpersonal style of openness, receptivity, sensitivity, and closeness, a style which would be expected to have an important effect on those individuals' romantic relationships.

Interpersonal perception in couples

Much research has been done on marital and premarital relationships. Most of these studies deal with personal and behavioral characteristics of the individual partners themselves or a comparison of these. For example, the effects of attitude similarity within the couple has received much attention (Center, 1975; Hill, Rubin & Peplau, 1976; Levinger, 1974; Levinger, Senn & Jorgenson, 1970). The relationship between self-disclosure and marriage satisfaction has also been examined (Hendrick, 1981). In this study by Hendrick, the results substantiated self-disclosure as a significant predictor of marital satisfaction and also demonstrated that attitude similarity has a strong positive relationship to marital satisfaction.

Nonverbal behavior in couples has also been examined for its relationship to marital satisfaction. For example, Sabatelli, Brick, and Denver (1982) examined 48 recently married couples. Nonverbal communication abilities were examined as mediators of marital complaints. The results suggested that nonverbal decoding abilities do not covary with relationship length. Also found was that nonverbal sensitivity to one's spouse does not covary with marital complaints. Noller (1980) also studied the communication of married couples. In this study consisting of 48 couples, each member sent a standard set of ambiguous messages to his or her spouse and decoded a similar set received by the spouse. The ambiguous messages were designed so that the verbal content could have a positive, neutral, or negative meaning depending on the nonverbal communication that accompanied it. Results indicated that couples with high

marital adjustment were able to communicate more effectively. In a later study using the same couples (Noller, 1981) the couples were shown a videotape of strangers of both sexes sending similar messages. Unlike the earlier study in which low-marital adjusted subjects had received lower scores when decoding their spouses than had other subjects; such differences were not found when when these subjects decoded opposite sex strangers. The findings suggested the possibility that problems in communication in low-marital adjusted couples are a consequence of the unhappy relationship rather than the cause of it.

In addition to non-verbal behaviors and communication styles, the relationship of interpersonal perception between spouses and marriage satisfaction has also been examined. For example, Luckey (1960), using a sample of 224 married couples who were administered the Marital Adjustment scale and the Interpersonal Checklist, found marital happiness related to the wife's perception of the husband being congruent with his self-perception. In comparison, no significant relationship was found between marital adjustment and the congruence of the husband's perception of his wife with her self perception. More support for these findings is found in a review of studies on interpersonal perception of married couples wherein Tharp (1963) concluded that marital happiness is related to the wife's perception of the husband being congruent with his own self-perception. Numerous other studies have also found some type of positive relationship between the degree of marital satisfaction and/or adjustment on the one hand, and the amount of agreement in how each spouse perceives him/herself, ideal self, and each other on the other

Conflict

hand (Barton & Cattell, 1972; Dymond, 1953; Ferguson & Allen; Luckey, 1960, 1964; Lundgren, Jergens & Gibson, 1980; Murstein, 1972; Murstein & Beck, 1972; Taylor, 1952). However, other studies did not find support for the hypothesis that mates who more accurately perceive each other tend to have longer or more satisfying relationships (Bentler & Newcomb, 1978; Udry, 1967).

In another study on spouses' perception, Epstein and Santa-Barbara (1975) studied 180 married couples that were in family therapy. Of interest were the couples' interactions in a mixed motive game that served as a conflict situation. The couples were divided into four groups depending on how they handled conflict. It was found that the couples who resolved their conflict cooperatively tended to perceive each other as cooperative. Those who resolved the conflict situation in a mutually destructive manner tended to to perceive each other as competitive. Knudson, Sommers, and Golding (1980) examined a married couple's videotaped conflict simulated interaction that, according to the couple, had previously occurred. In this study, 38 couples were rated according to the Leary Interpersonal system. During a subsequent replaying of the videotape, husbands' and wives' verbal descriptions of perceptions of self and spouse were elicited at three different stages of the conflict, using a method for eliciting perceptions derived from Laing, Phillipson, and Lee's multiperspective interpersonal perception technique (1966). The interpersonal perceptions of couples who resolved the conflict by engaging the issue at hand were contrasted with those of couples who resolved conflict avoidance. Findings indicated statisti-

cally significant differences between the groups. The authors said these findings suggested that engaging the issue was associated with an increase in spouses' access to one another's interpersonal perceptions, whereas avoidance was associated with decreases in valid perceptions. Hence, the two above mentioned studies also found a relationship between marital interaction and the spouses' perception of self and each other. However, they arrived at this conclusion via behavioral measures (i.e., videotaped and the mixed motive game) unlike the previously mentioned studies that, although arriving at the same conclusion, used only pencil and paper measurements.

A more elaborate and theoretically based measurement regarding marital adjustment and satisfaction and the perception of self and spouse was the Interpersonal Perception Method formulated by Laing, Phillipson, and Lee (1966). This design entailed twelve questions dealing with sixty dyadic issues which were grouped into categories such as interdependence and autonomy, warm concern and support, disparagement and disappointment, fight/flight contention, contradiction and confusion, and extreme denial of autonomy. The method centered on three perspectives: the direct perspective, how the partner saw oneself and his/her spouse; a meta-perspective, such as the wife's view of her husband's view of an issue; and a meta-meta-perspective, such as a wife's view of her husband's view of her view of an issue. Laing et al. used this method to identify disturbed marriages and the sources of disturbances. They administered the Interpersonal Perception Method to 12 disturbed couples and 10 non-disturbed couples. The authors found that



their method differentiated, at a statistically significant level, between disturbed and non-disturbed couples.

Drewery (1969) devised the Interpersonal Perception Technique also to examine spouses' perception of each other. He used the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) for this purpose. In this technique, each spouse took the Edwards with the following orientations: 1) How one perceives oneself; 2) how one perceives one's spouse; 3) how one thinks one's spouse perceives him/her; and 4) how one's spouse thinks one perceives him/her. Drewery calculated the extent of agreement between the spouses on each respective perception ( the four listed above) to identify issues of confusion and conflict in alcoholic marriages. Rae and Drewery (1972) administered this Interpersonal Perception Technique (IPT) to 33 married couples in which the husband was an alcoholic and to 51 non-psychiatric couples. They found that in comparison to the non-psychiatric couples, male alcoholics were much more confused about their marital socio-sexual role, as was the wife who seemed more masculine. The alcoholic was also more confused about his dependence-independence needs within the marriage. Other studies have also examined the spouses' perceptions of each other in alcoholic marriages. They have also found significant differences and discrepancy on how each spouse perceives him/herself and each other (Kogan & Jackson, 1963; Mitchell, 1959; Orford, 1976).

Most of the past research on interpersonal research in relationships has focused on personality characteristics and to a much lesser extent on how the partners perceive each other's perception of each

other. Findings indicate that there does seem to be some kind of relationship between how accurately spouses perceive each other and how satisfied they find their relationship. The present study hopes to examine more closely the partners' perception of the relationship as a unit itself, instead of more individual personality characteristics of each spouse. Of interest is the effect of the intimacy motive ( as measured by the TAT) on how each partner perceives the relationship (i.e., the extent of satisfaction and fulfillment derived from the relationship).

#### Satisfaction of needs in couples

Henry Murray defined a need as "...a construct which stands for a force, a force that organizes perception, apperception, intellection, connotation, and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing, satisfying situation," (1938, pp. 123-124). Murray postulated that the existence of a need could be inferred on the basis of the expression of satisfaction when a particular effect is achieved or disappointment when the effect is not achieved. By the intense study of a small number of subjects, he arrived at a list of twenty needs.

Borrowing from Murray's list of 20 needs, Winch (1958) devised a theory of need complementarity in married couples. Winch suggested that two types of complementarity were of importance in mate selection: the mutual gratification of single needs (Type 1), as when one partner is high and the other is low in the need to be dominant; and the mutual gratification of a combination of needs (Type 2), as when one partner is high in nurturance and the other is high in succorance. Kerchoff and

Davis (1962) reported evidence supporting Winch's theory of the complementarity of needs. However, other studies have not found supporting evidence for this theory. Schellenberg and Bee (1960) and Heiss and Gordon (1961) also failed to replicate Winch's findings of complementary needs. Katz, Gluchsberg and Krauss (1960) had 56 couples fill out a shortened version of the EPPS using eleven personality variables. Each spouse answered the questionnaire under three sets: 1) self; 2) extent his/her needs are satisfied by the spouse; and 3) a prediction of the spouses' responses. The results obtained contradicted the need complementarity hypothesis. Also found was that the degree of total satisfaction of wives was not consistently related to interspousal need complementarity. However, total satisfaction of the husband's needs was positively associated with interspousal complementarity in four need pairings.

Winch (1967) reexamined his theory by examining 25 recently married couples via two interviews and a projective technique to test the need complementarity theory. His data did provide some support for his theory. However, Bentler and Newcomb (1978) tested the need complementarity hypothesis on 77 couples, 52 married and 24 separated or divorced. They found little evidence supporting the complementarity of needs in these couples.

In summary, there seems to be some evidence that the fulfillment of needs, specifically those formulated by Henry Murray, is related to satisfaction and adjustment in interpersonal relationships, especially among married couples.

*Murray's list of 20 needs*  
*but also Rubin's scales*

The present study will also utilize Murray's list of 20 needs and determine their importance and fulfillment within romantically involved couples. Specifically, the effect of the partner's intimacy motivation (as assessed by the TAT) on the satisfaction of needs within the relationship will be examined.

#### Rubin's Loving and Liking scales

Also of interest in this study are Rubin's Liking and Loving scales. Rubin (1973) developed the Loving and Liking scales to assess romantic love. The Loving scale, according to Rubin, had components of attachment, caring, and intimacy. The Liking scale was related to aspects such as maturity and good judgement. Rubin administered these scales to college dating couples and found the Loving scale was a good predictor of a couple's progress six months later. These scales will also be used in this study. Of interest is whether a relationship exists between level of scores (high or low) on these scales and the partners' agreement on how they perceive their relationship, as assessed by different measures.

#### Formulation of hypothesis

This study examined the relationship between intimacy motivation and its effect on a couple's interpersonal perception of their relationship. Four groups of romantic couples were examined. One group was comprised of the male scoring high in intimacy motivation and the female scoring low in the intimacy motive. In another group, the female scored high on intimacy motivation while the male scored low on it. In another group,

both partners scored high on the intimacy motive. In the final group, both scored low on intimacy motivation. In addition all couples also took Rubin's Loving and Liking scales. Hence, the independent variables were how each of the partners in a couple scored on the intimacy motive and how they scored on the Loving and Liking scales. The dependent variables were a number of questionnaires which explored different aspects of the couple's relationship. It is emphasized that these questionnaires tried to measure how each partner perceives the the relationship and not the partners' personality traits or other individual characteristics. One questionnaire asked the subject to state the importance of certain needs (Murray's list of 20 needs), but this was intended to examine to what extent the partners agreed regarding the importance of these needs for each other, and how fulfilled these need are for each other within the relationship. Hence, the the dependent variables examined to what extent the partners have similar perceptions and views about their relationship.

Having differentiated couples via the partners' scores on the intimacy motive and Rubin's Loving and Liking scales, and then measuring how the partners perceived their relationship, the following hypothesis were formulated:

1. Based on the premise of the intimacy motive, the couples in which both partners have high intimacy scores (as assessed by the TAT) have the most agreement between them in various key perceptions of the relationship. According to the definition

GWC

of the intimacy motive, an individual scoring high on the intimacy motive has a recurrent preference for a warm, close, and communicative exchange with another or with others (McAdams & Powers, 1981).

*ind. w/ high  
self-esteem has  
good comm. & c.*

Consequently, in the author's opinion, if two individuals scoring high on the intimacy motive are involved with each other in a romantic relationship, one expects an elevated amount of communication and closeness within the relationship. This would result in the partners having a high degree of agreement in various important perceptions of the relationship.

2. Couples which are comprised of one high intimacy scoring partners and one low scoring partner (again, as assessed by the TAT) have the least agreement between them in various key perceptions of the relationship. This hypothesis is roughly the inverse of hypothesis 1. Given the definition of the intimacy motive, on an intuitive basis one could hypothesize that individuals scoring low on the intimacy motive do not have a recurrent preference for a warm, close, and communicative exchange with another or with others, at least when contrasted with individuals scoring high on the intimacy motive. Consequently, in the author's opinion, when one individual scoring high on the

intimacy motive and an individual scoring low on the intimacy motive become involved with each other in a romantic relationship, one would expect these two individuals to have quite different investments and expectations about the relationship. The high intimacy individual would work on having a warm, close, and communicative relationship and would expect reasonably the same from his/her partner. The low intimacy individual would not have such a recurrent preference for a warm, close, and communicative relationship. This would result in the partners having a lowered degree of agreement in various important perceptions of the relationship.

3. Couples in which both partners score high on Rubin's Loving scale and Liking scale have the highest agreement between in certain perceptions of the relationship. According to Rubin, persons scoring high on the Loving scale have a high degree of attachment and caring capacities. Those scoring high on the Liking scale have a high degree of maturity and good judgement. Consequently, when two individuals scoring high on the Loving and Liking scales are involved with each other in a romantic relationship, one would expect, according to the author, an elevated amount of caring, attachment, and good judgement within the relationship.

*Substantive*

This would result in the partners having a high degree of agreement in various important perceptions of the relationship.



## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### Subjects

Volunteers for the study were solicited from upper level psychology classes. Each volunteer was told that to qualify for the experiment, he/she would have to bring him/herself and his/her boyfriend/girlfriend to the study. One person could not participate individually; both partners of the couple were required for participation in the study. Both partners did not have to be currently enrolled in upper level psychology classes, or even enrolled at Loyola University; only one of them was required to be currently enrolled in an upper level psychology class. The average age of the subjects was 20 years old with a range from 17 to 28. The average length of the couples' relationship was 16 months with a range from 3 to 72 months.

#### Measures

All the questionnaires used can be found in Appendix B. A questionnaire was devised by the author to measure interpersonal perception of the relationship. In this study, interpersonal <sup>relationships</sup> perception in the relationship refers to the extent of agreement, between two partners in a romantic relationship, on the perception (as assessed by different measures) of their relationship. Hence, the relationship is the unit of interest. The partners involved in the <sup>a</sup> relationship are asked questions

whose responses are intended to elicit information on some area of their relationship. Agreement of the partners' perceptions may consist of both partners giving the identical response or both partners giving responses that are scored as belonging to the same category ( the scoring of responses and the different categories they could belong to will be described later in the text) or the similarity of their scaled point ratings on certain areas related to their relationship.

In devising the questionnaires used to measure the partners' perception of their relationship, the author first reviewed the literature on interpersonal relationships, especially that focusing on romantic couples and married couples (i.e., Drewery, 1969; Laing, Phillipson & Lee, 1966; Luckey, 1964). Of interest were the measures they used in their studies. After surveying the literature, the author came up with thirteen questions which, in his best opinion, tapped the interpersonal perception of the relationship. The first eight questions were open-ended questions and intended to elicit information about the relationship. Some examples of the questions are "Some aspects of the relationship are:," "Five negative things about our relationship are:" and "Areas in the relationship which need improvement are:". In the last five questions, subjects were asked to mark the appropriate answer in a seven point scale. For example, one question was "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your relationship with \_\_\_?" For this question, the possible responses ranged from "not satisfied at all" (scale point 1) to "extremely satisfied" (scale point 7). Another example was "How serious (i.e. devotion to relationship, extent of emo-

from the  
questions  
used.

tional involvement) would you consider your present relationship. Possible responses ranged from "not serious at all" (scale point 1) to "extremely serious (scale point 7). The author then conducted a pilot study and administered these questions to an upper level psychology class of 46 students, 24 female and 22 male. Using ten of these questionnaires ( five from each sex) obtained from the pilot study, the author devised categories for the responses for each of the first eight questions. Question 2 will be used as an example to explain the development of these categories. Question 2 asked "Some aspects of the relationship which I derive much satisfaction from are:" Responses obtained in the pilot study included "sex," "communication," and "her supportiveness." After going through the responses (from the ten questionnaires selected randomly from the pilot study) categories were developed with the intention of being able to fit as many different responses into as few categories as possible. For question 2, the following categories were devised: Category 1: Companionship, being or doing things together, being identified as a couple. Emphasis is on togetherness which is more important than the activity being done. Included here are adventures, trying out new things, and special times spent together. Category 2: Physical and/or sexual aspects. Category 3: Ability to communicate; talking with each other, confiding in each other, having an honest, flexible, and trustworthy relationship; feeling understood; lack of problems or ability to resolve them. Category 4: Positive feelings felt toward each other or felt individually because of the relationship. Category 5: Shared or compatible goals or interests.

Category 6: Taking care of each other, being concerned and responsible for each other, security for each other, being needed; giving/receiving advice. Given these categories, "sex" would fall in category 2, "communication" would fall in category 3, and "her supportiveness" would belong in category 6.

This process was done for the first eight questions. Each question had its own set of categories. The number of categories ranged from four (questions 1, 4, 6, 7, & 8) to six (questions 2 & 3). Using these categories, the rest of the questionnaires from the pilot study were scored by the author and an advanced psychology student to establish inter-scorer reliability in the scoring of the questionnaire. Interscorer reliability ranged from .79 (questions 2, 7, & 8) to .82 (for questions 1, 4, & 6).

The last five questions given in the pilot study (recall there were thirteen in all) did not require inter-scorer reliability as the subjects were required to mark their appropriate answer from a seven point rating scale. At this point, the author decided to break up this questionnaire into two questionnaires, the first eight questions comprising one questionnaire (which were open-ended questions and whose responses were score via which category they belonged to), and the last five questions comprising the second questionnaire (questions answered marking the appropriate response from seven possible scaled points ranging from, for example, not satisfied at all to extremely satisfied). The first questionnaire (comprised of the first eight questions) was labeled Agreement A and the second questionnaire was called Agreement B.

These labels (Agreement A and Agreement B) were given arbitrarily and were not intended to signify any particular meaning. Both were designed to measure the interpersonal perception of the relationship. According to the author, Agreement A tapped much more specifically how the partners perceived the relationship (e.g., "Five positive things about our relationship are:" and "Areas in the relationship which need improvement are:") since these were open ended questions. Agreement B assessed more the perceived satisfaction and commitment of the partners ( e.g., "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your relationship with \_\_\_?" or "How close does your present relationship compare to your idea of an 'ideal' relationship?") in more general terms since the subjects merely had to mark the appropriate response among those already provided for them. Scoring for Agreement A consisted of several steps. First, the partners' questionnaires were compared. Each question was compared individually. If each of the partners gave a response that belonged to the same category, they were given one credit. Hence, if each partner gave five responses but only two of each of their responses fell in the same category or categories, they would be given two credits. For example, suppose for question 2, the male responded with the following answers "sex, doing things together, and support for each other." The female partner responded to question 2 with "companionship, being concerned for each other, and talk to each other, and the love we feel." Companionship and doing things together would belong to the same category, category 1. Being concerned for each other and support for each other would also belong to the same category, category 6. Hence, for

question 2, the couple would receive two credits. The number of credits would be totaled for all questions and this total would represent the score for Agreement A questionnaire. For Agreement A questionnaire, the higher the score, the more agreement in responses between the partners in the responses they gave.

For Agreement B questionnaire, again the questionnaires of the partners were compared. Again, each question is compared individually. Credits for the questions consist of comparing which answers the partners marked and counting how many scaled units apart the partners' answers were from each other, if any. The first question of this questionnaire will be used as an example to illustrate this scoring system. This question asks "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your relationship with \_\_\_\_?" Suppose the female partner marks "not very satisfied," which is scale point 2. The male partner marks "pretty satisfied," which is scale point 6. The credit score is the difference between the two points, which in this case is four ( $6-2=4$ ). Hence, for the first question, this couple is given a credit of 4. The credits for the five questions are totaled to obtain a total score for Agreement B questionnaire. In Agreement B questionnaire, unlike Agreement A questionnaire, the higher the score, the less agreement between the responses the partners gave.

A questionnaire designed to assess how the partners perceive the importance of certain needs for each other and the fulfillment of these needs within the relationship was also developed. The needs examined were Murray's list of 20 needs (1938). The questionnaire consisted of a

\* use this - purpose of questionnaire

list of these twenty needs and their definitions. The subjects were asked to refer to the list in answering four questions: 1) how important is this need to you in the relationship; 2) how much is this need fulfilled for you in the relationship; 3) how important is this need for your partner; and 4) how much is this need fulfilled for your partner in the relationship. The subjects responded using a seven-point scale ranging from not important/fulfilled (scale point 1) to extremely important/ fulfilled (scale point 7). Scoring for this questionnaire consisted of several steps to arrive at four different scores for each couple. These four scores are correlations obtained representing the following: 1) the amount of agreement between the partners' perceptions on the importance of certain of the male partner's needs (Murray's 20 needs) within the relationship; 2) the amount of agreement between the partners' perceptions of the fulfillment of these needs of the male partner within the relationship; 3) the amount of agreement between the partners' perceptions on the importance of certain of the female partner's within the relationship; and 4) the amount of agreement between the partners' perceptions on the fulfillment of the female partner's needs within the relationship. To obtain these four scores, the partners' questionnaires were first examined together. The male's response to question 1 was compared to the female's response on question 3. Note that for the male, question 1 asked to mark the importance of a certain need for himself within the relationship. For the female partner, question 3 asked for her to respond how important she thought a certain need was for her male partner. Hence, both these questions referred to

the importance of certain needs for the male partner of the couple. By calculating the correlation between these responses ( question 1 for the male and question 3 for the female) across the 20 needs, a correlation representing the agreement between the partners' perception on the importance of certain needs within the relationship for the male partner was obtained. To obtain the agreement score on the fulfillment of these needs for the male partner, question 2 of the male's questionnaire ("For each need, please reply to what extent this need is being fulfilled for you in your present relationship.") was compared to the responses in question 4 of the female's questionnaire ("For each need, please reply to what extent you think each need is being fulfilled for your boyfriend in the present relationship."). A correlation was similarly calculated across needs to obtain a score representing the agreement between the partners' perception on the fulfillment of certain needs for the male partner. To obtain the agreement on the importance of these needs for the female partner, the male's responses to question 3 on his questionnaire ("For each need, please reply how important you think each need is to your girlfriend.") were compared to question 1 of the female partner's questionnaire ("For each need please reply how important each need is to you using the following as possible answers."), and a correlation calculated across needs. The agreement on the female's fulfillment of needs was obtained similarly, comparing the male's responses to question 4 on his questionnaire to the female's responses on question 2 of her questionnaire.

To measure intimacy motivation, a set of five TAT cards was admin-



possible  
istered and scored for intimacy motivation with McAdam's (1980) coding system. Rubin's Loving and Liking scales were also administered to assess their relationship with partners' agreement on aspects of their relationship. In searching for a way to measure romantic love, Rubin (1973) devised the Loving and Liking scales. Rubin tested his scales on dating couples and found that the students reported loving partners much more than their friends, while the gap between liking for partners and liking for friends was narrower. According to Rubin, the Loving scale was related to components of attachment, caring, and intimacy. Liking focused on aspects such as maturity, intelligence, and good judgement. Rubin found that the partners' scores on the Loving scale was a better predictor than the Liking scale score for the couple's progress six months later.

#### Procedure

Subjects were seated so that partners of a romantic couple did not sit close to each other; most often they filled out the questionnaires in separate rooms. They were told that the purpose of the research was to study romantic relationships. Subjects were told that their responses would remain confidential and that their partner would never see their responses so as to encourage true responses. Subjects were then administered the TAT. The set of five TAT cards was administered by the author according to the standard group administration procedure (Atkinson, 1958). Subjects were given five minutes to write an imaginative story in response to each picture. The five pictures in sequence showed (a) two people sitting on a bench, (b) two trapeze artists in midair,

(c) a man sitting at a desk upon which sits a photograph of a family, (d) a ship captain conversing with another man, and (e) a man and a woman walking a horse through a field. The subjects stories were scored for intimacy motivation by the author whose agreement with material pre-coded by experts achieved a rank order correlation of  $=.94$ , with category agreement for the two intimacy imagery categories at 93%.

After this administration, the questionnaires on interpersonal perception of the relationship ( Questionnaire A and Questionnaire B) were given out. Subjects were asked to answer the questions as truthfully and comprehensively as possible. After allowing for completion of these questionnaires, Rubin's Loving and Liking scales were passed out and subjects were asked to answer as accurately as possible. The questionnaire on needs were then passed out. Subjects were told to read the instructions carefully before beginning the task.

The median scores on the intimacy motive (as assessed by the TAT), and the Loving and Liking scales were used to form high and low intimacy groups. For both males and females, the median intimacy motive score was 2. Subjects scoring 2 and below were rated as scoring low on the intimacy motive while subjects scoring 3 and above were rated as high intimacy. For the Loving scale, the median score was 38. Those scoring higher than 38 were rated as scoring high on the Loving scale. For the Liking scale, the median score was 39 and anyone who scored higher than 39 was rated as scoring high on the Liking scale. The couples were then divided into four groups: a) both partners scored high on intimacy/Loving scale/ Liking scale referred to as the HH groups; male scored

high on intimacy/Loving scale/Liking scale and female scores low, the HL group; c) male scores low on intimacy/Loving scale/Liking scale and female scores high, the LH group; and d) both partners score low on these measures, the LL group. The size of groups ranged from 9 to 18. For example, for the groups divided by their scores on intimacy motivation, the groups were comprised of the HH group, n=10, the HL group, n=10, the LH group, n=14, and the LL group, n=18.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Independent measures

The proceeding table, Table 1, provides ranges, means, and standard deviations for the intimacy motivation score (as assessed by the TAT), Loving scale score, and Liking scale score according to sex and taken together.

T-tests were conducted to examine any possible differences between the sexes on the intimacy motive scores, Loving scale scores, and the Liking scale scores. No significant differences were obtained between the sexes on any of these t-test calculations.

#### Dependent measures

##### Agreement A questionnaire

Three separate 2x2 ANOVA's using Agreement A questionnaire as a dependent measure were calculated. For the first 2x2 ANOVA, the two factors were 1) the level (high vs. low) of the intimacy motive (as assessed by the TAT) of the male, and 2) the level of intimacy motive of the female (also either high or low as assessed by the TAT). The reader is reminded that the median score, which was 2 for both sexes, was used to differentiate between high and low levels of intimacy motivation. A score of 2 or below was considered low, a score of 3 or above belonged in the high level. The agreement of the partners' perception

Table 1

Ranges, Means, Standard Deviations for Intimacy, Loving, and Liking Scores

	Range	M	SD
<b>Males</b>			
Intimacy	0-9	2.42	2.16
Loving	20-40	37.17	7.24
Liking	24-45	34.48	5.54
<b>Females</b>			
Intimacy	0-9	2.62	2.27
Loving	21-45	37.46	4.90
Liking	24-45	37.28	5.88
<b>Both sexes</b>			
Intimacy	0-9	2.51	2.22
Loving	20-45	37.37	6.19
Liking	24-45	36.88	5.71



on their relationship was assessed by Agreement A questionnaire, the dependent measure. Recall that Agreement A questionnaire consisted of eight open ended questions about different aspects of the relationship ("Some aspects of the relationship which I derive much satisfaction from are:," Areas in the relationship which need improvement are:"). The following table, Table 2, provides the mean scores on Agreement A questionnaire for couples by the intimacy motive level of the partners. The reader is reminded that in Agreement A questionnaire, the higher the score, the more agreement between the partners' responses. Table 3, provides the 2x2 ANOVA table using Agreement A questionnaire as the dependent variable. Agreement A questionnaire (AgreA) as the dependent variable.

The preceding results address themselves to hypothesis 1 (Based on the premise of the intimacy motive, the couples in which both partners have high intimacy scores, as assessed by the TAT, would have the most agreement in perceiving their relationship, as assessed by the Agreement A questionnaire) and to hypothesis 2 (Couples which are comprised of one high intimacy scoring partner and one low scoring partner, as assessed by the TAT, would have the least agreement in the perception of their relationship, as assessed by Agreement A questionnaire). As shown in Table 3, no significant results were found to support these two hypotheses.

Another 2x2 Anova was calculated with the two factors being 1) the Loving scale score of the male (either high or low) and 2) the Loving scale score of the female (high or low). Agreement A questionnaire

Table 2

Mean Score on Agreement A by Intimacy Level of Male and Intimacy Level of Female

Intimacy Level of Male	Intimacy Level of Female			
	High		Low	
	M	SD	M	SD
High	13.9	3.51	13.29	4.36
Low	14.9	3.91	11.89	4.90

Table 3

A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement A as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Intimacy level of male	40.19	1	40.19	2.17
Intimacy level of female	.48	1	.48	.03
Interaction	17.57	1	17.57	.95
Within	888.44	48	18.51	



served as the dependent variable. The proceeding table, Table 4, provides the mean scores on Agreement A questionnaire for couples by the Loving scale score level of the partners. The reader is again reminded that in Agreement A questionnaire, the higher the score the more agreement between the partners' responses. The proceeding table, Table 5, provides the 2x2 ANOVA table using Agreement A questionnaire as the dependent variable.

A 2x2 ANOVA table was calculated with the two factors being the Liking scale score level of the male and the Liking scale score level of the female (for both, either high or low), and the dependent variable being the Agreement A questionnaire. Table 6 shows the mean scores on Agreement A for couples by the Liking scale score level (high or low) of the partners.

Table 7 displays the ANOVA table using the group means above with the factors being the Liking scale score level of the male and the Liking scale score level of the female with the dependent variable being Agreement A questionnaire.

As can be seen from the table, no significant results were found for any of the two factors or their interaction. These results also address themselves to hypothesis 3, which states that couples in which both partners score high on Rubin's Liking scale will have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship as assessed by the Agreement A questionnaire. No significant results were found to support this hypothesis. In summary, no significant results were found for the intimacy motive level of the partners, the Loving scale score level of

Table 4

Mean Score on Agreement A by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female

Loving Level of Female	Loving Level of Female			
	High		Low	
	M	SD	M	SD
High	14.72	3.75	11.33	3.28
Low	12.46	5.53	12.42	4.25

Table 5

A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement A as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Loving level of male	4.33	1	4.33	.18
Loving level of female	36.13	1	36.16	1.54
Interaction	34.11	1	34.11	1.45
Within cell	1129.76	48	23.53	

Table 6

Mean Score on Agreement A by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female

Liking Level of Male	Liking Level of Female			
	High		Low	
	M	SD	M	SD
High	13.44	3.97	12.50	6.03
Low	14.89	3.66	12.00	3.32

Table 7

A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement A as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Liking level of male	2.73	1	2.73	.12
Liking level of female	44.95	1	44.95	2.03
Interaction	11.57	1	11.57	.52
Within cell	1060.33	48	22.09	

the partners, and the Liking scale score level of the partners on the partners' perception of the relationship as assessed by Agreement A.

### Agreement B Questionnaire

Three separate 2x2 ANOVA'S using the Agreement B questionnaire as a dependent measure were calculated. For the first 2x2 ANOVA, using Agreement B questionnaire as a dependent variable, the two factors were 1) the intimacy motive (as assessed by the TAT) level (high vs. low) of the male and 2) the intimacy motive level of the female. Note that the Agreement B questionnaire consisted of five questions concerning the partners' commitment and satisfaction with the relationship (e.g. "All in all how satisfied would you say you are with your relationship with\_?") with the respondents having to mark their appropriate answer from a seven point scale. In this case, the higher the score, the less agreement among the partners' responses. Table 8 provides the mean scores on Agreement B questionnaire for couples by the intimacy level (high or low) of the partners. The following table, Table 9, provides the 2x2 ANOVA table with the two factors being the intimacy motive level of the male and of the female using Agreement B questionnaire as the dependent variable.

The results reported in this Table 9 address themselves to hypothesis 1 (Based on the premise of the intimacy motive, the couples in which both partners have high intimacy scores, as assessed by the TAT, would have the most agreement in perceiving the relationship, as assessed by Agreement B questionnaire) and to hypothesis 2 (Couples which are comprised of one high intimacy scoring partner and one low intimacy

Table 8

Mean Score on Agreement B by Intimacy Level of Male and Intimacy Level of Female

Intimacy Level of Male	Intimacy Level of Female			
	M	High SD	M	Low SD
High	3.60	2.80	4.11	4.09
Low	4.50	3.41	5.06	2.82

Table 9

A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement B as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Intimacy level of male	10.53	1	10.53	.99
Intimacy level of female	3.41	1	3.41	.32
Interaction	.01	1	.01	.001
Within cell	510.74	48	10.64	



scoring partner would have the least agreement in the perception of their relationship as assessed by Agreement B questionnaire). As shown in Table 9, no significant results were found to support these two hypothesis.

Another 2x2 ANOVA was conducted using the Agreement B questionnaire as a dependent measure. In this 2x2, the two factors were 1) the Loving scale score level (high vs. low) of the male and the Loving scale score level of the female. Table 10 provides the mean scores on Agreement B questionnaire for couples by the Loving score level of the partners. The reader is reminded that in the Agreement B questionnaire, the higher the score, the less agreement between the partners' responses. Table 11 provides the 2x2 ANOVA table using the Agreement B questionnaire as the dependent measure.

As seen in Table 11, the effect of the Loving score level was found to be statistically significant for females on the Agreement B questionnaire. A probing of the analysis using t-tests between all group means yielded significant differences between groups of HH (wherein both partners scored high on the Loving scale) and LL (both partners scored low), as the HH group scored lower, meaning that the HH group, as assessed by Agreement B, agreed more than the LL group on the perception of their relationships. In addition, significant differences were also found between the LH group (male low, female high) and the LL group. This finding provided qualified support for hypothesis 3, which stated that couples in which both partners score high on Rubin's Loving scale would have more agreement in the perception of their relationship than

Table 10

Mean Score on Agreement B by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female

Loving Level of Male	Loving Level of Female			
	M	High SD	M	Low SD
High	3.33	2.38	4.78	4.44
Low	3.77	2.05	6.58	3.55

Table 11

A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement B as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Loving level of male	15.36	1	15.36	1.67
Loving level of female	55.47	1	55.47	6.01*
Interaction	5.74	1	5.74	.62
Within cell	442.78	48	9.22	

\* $p < .05$

the other groups of couples. However, since the HH group did not score significantly higher than all the groups, as hypothesis 3 stated, results were not unequivocally supportive of hypothesis 3.

A 2x2 ANOVA was also calculated with the two factors being 1) the Liking scale score level (high vs. low) of the male and 2) the Liking scale score level of the female, with the Agreement B questionnaire again serving as the dependent measure. Table 12 provides the mean scores on Agreement B by Liking scale score level of the partners. The following table, Table 13, provides the 2x2 ANOVA table with the factors of the Liking scale score level of the male partner and the Liking scale level of the female partner, using Agreement B questionnaire as the dependent variable.

The results from Table 13 address themselves to hypothesis 3, which stated that couples in which both partners scored high on Rubin's Liking scale would have more agreement in the perception of their relationship. No significant results were found in this 2x2 analysis. Hence, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

In summary, qualified support was found for hypothesis 3, which states that couple in which both partners score high on the Loving scale have more agreement in the perception of their relationship, as assessed by Agreement B questionnaire. However, the intimacy motive level of the partners and the Liking scale score level of the partners did not yield significant differences on the perception of the relationship, as assessed by Agreement B questionnaire.

Table 12

Mean Score on Agreement B by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female

Liking Level of Male	Liking Level of Female			
	M	High SD	M	Low SD
High	4.22	3.28	4.17	4.02
Low	3.11	2.57	5.92	3.61

Table 13

A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) ANOVA with Agreement B as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Liking level of male	1.28	1	1.27	.03
Liking level of female	23.25	1	23.25	2.32
Interaction	25.15	1	25.15	2.51
Within cell	480.59	48	10.01	

### Needs/Needs Fulfillment Questionnaire

Six separate 2x2x2 ANOVA's with repeated measures on the last factor were calculated using the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire as a dependent measure. Three of the 2x2x2's utilized the agreement on how important certain needs (Murray's 20 needs) were for the partners within the relationship as the dependent measure; the other three 2x2x2 ANOVA's used the agreement of the partners on the fulfillment of these needs for each other within the relationship. The importance of needs and the fulfillment of these needs are examined separately to present the results in a more understandable manner.

For the first 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor conducted, the three factors were 1) the level (high vs. low) of the intimacy motive (as assessed by the TAT) of the male; 2) the level (also either high or low) of the intimacy motive of the female; and 3) the partners' perception of certain needs for each other within the relationship (the male's perception of the importance of each others' needs vs. the female's perception of the importance of each others needs). The agreement of the partners' perception on the importance of needs for each other within the relationship was assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire, the dependent measure. More specifically, responses from the two questions addressing the importance of certain needs were used in this analysis. The other two questions in the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire addressed the fulfillment of certain needs within the relationship, which will be discussed later.

The reader is reminded that to obtain an agreement score on the

partners' perception on the importance of the male's needs within the relationship, responses of question 1 of the male's Needs/Needs Fulfillment and question 3 of the female's Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire were compared across all the needs. Question 1 of the male's questionnaire read "For each need, please reply how important each need is to you using the following scale as possible answers?" while question 3 of the female's questionnaire read "For each need, please reply how important you think each need is to your boyfriend." Hence, these two questions focused on the same thing, the importance of certain needs for the male partner. The replies consisted of marking the appropriate answer on a seven point scale ranging from scale point 1, "not important at all" to scale point 7, extremely important. By correlating these scale point responses across all 20 needs, an agreement score on the partners' perception of the importance of the male's need was obtained. Likewise, to obtain the partners' perception on the importance of the female's needs, the response to question 3 from the males's questionnaire ("For each need please reply how important you think each need is to your girlfriend using the following scale as possible answers") was compared to the response from question 1 of the female's questionnaire ("For each need please reply how important each need is to you using the following scale as possible answers?"). A correlation of the scale point answers was obtained across needs to represent the partners' perception of the female's needs.

Table 14 provides the mean scores for the correlation score on the importance of the needs for each partner as perceived by the partners in



Table 14

Mean Correlation Scores on Need Importance by Intimacy Level of Male  
and Intimacy Level of Female and Perception of Partners

Intimacy Level of Male	Intimacy Level of Female	Importance of male's needs		Importance of female's needs	
		M	SD	M	SD
High	High	.51	.16	.46	.18
Low	Low	.46	.13	.49	.18
	High	.43	.16	.45	.19
	Low	.49	.17	.50	.17

Table 15

A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Importance as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between subjects	284.53	48		
Intimacy of male	.01	1	.01	.01
Intimacy of female	.01	1	.01	.01
Interaction	.02	1	.02	.01
Error	284.50	44	1.92	
Within subjects	12.85	48		
Perception of NI by partners	.00	1	.00	.00
Interaction of intimacy of male and perception of partners	.01	1	.01	.00
Interaction of intimacy of female and perception of partners	.00	1	.00	.00
3-way interaction	.01	1	.01	.00
Error	12.82	45	.28	

the romantic couple by the intimacy motive level of the male, by the intimacy level of the female and by the perception of the two partners in the romantic couple. Table 15 provides the 2x2x2 ANOVA (with repeated measures on the last factor) using the above mentioned three factors and need importance as the dependent measure, as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire.

The results from Table 15 address themselves to hypothesis 1 (Based on the premise of the intimacy motive, the couples in which both partners have high intimacy score, as assessed by the TAT, would have the most agreement in perceiving their relationship as assessed by the Needs/ Needs Fulfillment questionnaire) and to hypothesis 2 (Couples which are comprised of one high intimacy scoring partner and one low scoring partner would have the least agreement in the perception of their relationship as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire). In this analysis, the perception of the relationship entailed the partners' agreement on the importance of certain needs for each other within the relationship. As shown in Table 15, no significant results were found to support these two hypotheses.

Another 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor was conducted with the three factors being 1) the Loving scale score level (high vs. low) of the male; 2) the Loving scale score level of the female (also high vs. low); and 3) the perception of the importance of needs (male partner vs. female partner). The agreement of the partners' perception of the relationship in this instance was again assessed by Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire, the dependent measure. More spe-

cifically, as in the previous analysis, the questions addressing the importance of need (comparing questions 1 and question 3 of the male's and female's questionnaire, respectively; and question 2 and question 4 of the male's and female's questionnaire, respectively) were used in this analysis. The proceeding table, Table 16 provides the mean correlation scores of the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire (N/NF) addressing the perception of importance of needs by the Loving scale score level of the male, the female, and the perception of the relationship regarding importance of needs.

Using these mean correlation scores, the 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor was calculated. The results of this calculation addressed themselves to hypothesis 3 (Couples in which both partners score high on Rubin's Loving scale will have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire). Table 17 shows this ANOVA table. As can be seen in Table 17, the results of the 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor, using the N/NF questionnaire as the dependent measure, were not significant. Hence, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

A 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor was calculated. The factors were the Liking scale score level of the male, the Liking (LIK) scale score level of the female (for both high vs. low), and the perception of the relationship (male vs. female). The dependent variable was, as in the last two ANOVA's, the perception of the partners' importance of needs. Table 18 provides the mean correlation scores in this analysis. Table 19 shows the ANOVA table using the group

Table 16

Mean Correlation Scores on Need Importance by Loving Level of Male and Loving Level of Female and Perception of Partners

Loving Level of Male	Loving Level of Female	Importance of male's needs		Importance of female's needs	
		M	SD	M	SD
High	High	.51	.15	.49	.17
Low	Low	.45	.11	.38	.20
	High	.40	.16	.40	.18
	Low	.46	.17	.57	.16

Table 17

A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Importance as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between subjects	274.20	47		
Loving score of male	.00	1	.00	.00
Loving score of female	.00	1	.00	.00
Interaction	.24	1	.24	.03
Error (between)	273.96	44	6.23	
Within subjects	9.58	48		
Perception of needs	.00	1	.00	.00
Interaction (Male Loving score and perception)	.06	1	.06	.26
Interaction (Female Loving score and perception)	.01	1	.01	.03
Interaction (all 3 factors)	.04	1	.04	.02
Error (within)	9.47	44	.22	

Table 18

Mean Correlation Scores on Need Importance by Liking Level of Male and Liking Level of Female and Perception of Partners

Liking Level of Male	Liking Level of Female	Importance of Male's Needs		Importance of Female's Needs	
		M	SD	M	SD
High	High	.50	.12	.55	.19
Low	Low	.43	.18	.46	.16
	High	.51	.15	.43	.13
	Low	.45	.18	.41	.20

Table 19

A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Importance as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between subjects	219.97	47		
Liking score of male	.028	1	.028	.0056
Liking score of female	.091	1	.091	.0182
Interaction	.0084	1	.0084	.0017
Error (between)	219.84	44	5.0	
Within subjects	53.87	48		
Perception of need importance	.0001	1	.0001	.00008
Interaction (Liking score male and perception)	.06	1	.06	.051
Interaction (Liking score male and perception)	.012	1	.012	.010
Interaction (all 3 factors)	.0001	1	.0001	.00008
Error (within)	53.80	44	1.195	



means from Table 18.

As can be seen from Table 19, there are no significant results. Hypothesis 3, which stated that couples in which both partners who scored high on Rubin's Liking scale would have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire, was not supported.

For the next three 2x2x2 ANOVA's, the dependent variable was still the the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire, but this time, more still specifically, the focus was on the fulfilment of needs. Recall that the first three 2x2x2 ANOVA's focused on the perception of the importance of certain needs. These next ANOVA's use as the dependent measure, the partners' perception of the fulfillment of these needs within the relationship. Also recall that to obtain an agreement score on the importance of needs, responses from two questions of the partners' Needs /Needs Fulfillment questionnaire were correlated. The agreement score on the fulfillment of these needs is similarly calculated. To obtain a score on the perceptions of the partners' on the fulfillment of these needs for the male, 'question 2 ("For each need, please reply to what extent this need is being fulfilled for you in your present relationship') is compared to question 4 of the female partner's questionnaire ("For each need, please reply to what extent you think each need is being fulfilled for your boyfriend in the present relationship?"). Again, a 7 point scale ranging from "not fulfilled at all" (point 1) to "extremely fulfilled" (point 7) is used. The scale point responses from these questions are correlated across needs to obtain an agreement score

on the fulfillment of needs for the male partner within the relationship. Similarly, to obtain an agreement score on the partner's perception of the fulfillment of certain needs for the female, the scale point responses from question 4 of the male's questionnaire ("For each need, please reply to what extent you think each need is being fulfilled for your girlfriend in the present relationship?") is correlated with the female's responses on question 2 of her questionnaire ("For each need, please reply to what extent this need is being fulfilled for you in your present relationship?") using the same response point scale.

A 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor using the agreement on the partners' perception of the fulfillment of certain needs for each other as the dependent measure was calculated. The three factors were 1) the level (high vs. low) of the intimacy motive (as assessed by the TAT) of the male ; 2) the level of the intimacy motive of the female; and 3) perception of the relationship (male partner vs. female partner. Table 20 provides the mean correlation scores for the perception of the fulfillment of certain needs , or need fulfillment for him/herself. The 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor was calculated with the mean correlation scores from Table 20. Table 21 displays this 2x2x2 ANOVA table.

The 2x2x2 ANOVA in Table 21 addressed itself to the hypothesis 1 (Based on the premise of the intimacy motive, the couples in which both partners have high intimacy motive scores, as assessed by the TAT, would have the most agreement in perceiving their relationship as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire) and to hypothesis 2 (Couples

Table 20

Mean Correlation Scores on Need Fulfillment by Intimacy Level of Male  
and Intimacy Level of Female and Perception of Partners

Intimacy Level of Male	Intimacy Level of Female	Fulfillment of Male's Needs		Fulfillment of Female's Needs	
		M	SD	M	SD
High	High	.46	.16	.42	.16
Low	Low	.44	.18	.40	.20
	High	.44	.15	.40	.23
	Low	.31	.18	.39	.19

Table 21

A 2(Intimacy Level of Male) by 2(Intimacy Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Fulfillment as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between subjects	204.21	47		
Intimacy level of male	.05	1	.05	.01
Intimacy level of female	.04	1	.04	.01
Interaction	.01	1	.01	.00
Error (between)	204.10	44	4.64	
Within subjects	18.36	48		
Perceptions by partners	.00	1	.00	.01
Interaction (male intimacy score X perception)	.00	1	.00	.00
Interaction (female intimacy score X perception)	.03	1	.03	.06
Interaction (all 3 factors)	.02	1	.02	.06
Error (within)	18.30	44	.42	

which are comprised of one high intimacy scoring partner and one low intimacy scoring partner would have the least agreement in the perception of their relationship, as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire). In this ANOVA, the perception of the partners' perception of need fulfillment for each other was focused on. This 2x2x2 ANOVA yielded no significant results. Hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2 were not supported.

Another 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor was calculated. In this ANOVA, the dependent measure was, again, the partners' perception of need fulfillment for each within the relationship. The three factors were: 1) the level (high vs. low) of the Loving scale score of the male; 2) the level (high vs. low) of the Loving scale score of the female; and 3) the perception of the relationship (male partner vs. female partner). Table 22 provides the mean correlation scores of this analysis. the mean correlation scores of this analysis. Table 23 provides the 2x2x2 ANOVA Table (with repeated measures on the last factor) using the group means from Table 22.

As seen in Table 23, no significant results were produced from this 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measure on the last factor. This ANOVA addressed hypothesis 3, which stated that Couples in which both partners scored high on Rubin's Loving scale would have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire. Specifically, this ANOVA focused on how the partners perceived need fulfillment for each other within the relationship. The results obtained did not support hypothesis 3.

Table 22

Mean Correlation Scores on Need Fulfillment by Loving Level of Male  
and Loving Level of Female and Perception of Partners

Loving Level of Male	Loving Level of Female	Fulfillment of Male's Needs		Fulfillment of Female's Needs	
		M	SD	M	SD
High	High	.47	.17	.40	.17
Low	Low	.40	.22	.44	.16
	High	.34	.14	.28	.20
	Low	.36	.21	.48	.20

Table 23

A 2(Loving Level of Male) by 2(Loving Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Fulfillment as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between subjects	198.81	47		
Loving score level of male	.097	1	.097	.022
Loving score level of female	.052	1	.052	.011
Interaction	.106	1	.106	.023
Error (between)	198.56	44	4.513	
Within groups	30.04	48		
Perception of relationship	.0019	1	.0019	.003
Interaction (loving score, male X perception)	.0173	1	.0173	.025
Interaction (loving score, female X perception)	.1300	1	.1300	.19
Interaction (all three factors)	.0090	1	.0090	.013
Error (within)	29.88	44	.68	

A final 2x2x2 AVOVA (with repeated measures on the last factor) was calculated using the partners' perception of need fulfillment for each other, as the dependent measure. In this ANOVA, the three factors were: 1) the level (high vs. low) of the Liking scale score for the male; 2) the level of the Liking scale score of the female; and 3) the perception of the relationship (male partner vs. female partner). Table 24 displays the mean correlation for this analysis. Table 25 provides the 2x2x2 ANOVA (with repeated measures on the last factor) using the mean correlations scores from Table 24 for the factors of the Liking scale score level of the male partner, the Liking scale score level of the female, and the perception of the partners, with need fulfillment as the dependent variable.

The results from Table 25 addressed hypothesis 3 (Couples in which both partners score high on the Liking scale will have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship, as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire. Specifically, this analysis focused on the perception of need fulfillment for each partner. The 2x2x2 ANOVA (with repeated measures on the last factor) yielded no significant result. Hence, this analysis did not provide support for hypothesis 3. In summary, the intimacy motive level, the Loving scale score level, and the Liking scale score level of the male partner, the female partner, and the partners' perception did not yield any significant differences of the perception of the relationship, as assessed by the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire. None of the hypothesis were supported when the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire was used as the



Table 24

Mean Correlation Scores on Need Fulfillment by Liking Level of Male  
and Liking Level of Female and Perception of Partners

Liking Level of Male	Liking Level of Female	Fulfillment of Male's Needs		Fulfillment of Female's Needs	
		M	SD	M	SD
High	High	.47	.19	.46	.19
Low	Low	.37	.14	.33	.16
	High	.43	.15	.47	.17
	Low	.33	.18	.38	.21

Table 25

A 2(Liking Level of Male) by 2(Liking Level of Female) by 2(Perception of Partners) ANOVA with Repeated Measures on the Last Factor with Need Fulfillment as the Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between subjects	219.97	47		
Liking level of male	.00	1	.00	.00
Liking level of female	.28	1	.28	.06
Interaction	.00	1	.00	.00
Error (between)	218.54	44	4.97	
Within subjects	.71	48		
Perception by partners	.01	1	.01	.38
Interaction (male liking level X perception)	.03	1	.03	1.97
Interaction (female liking level X perception)	.00	1	.00	.00
Interaction (all 3 factors)	.002	1	.002	.16
Error (within)	.67	45	.01	

dependent measure to assess the partners' perception of their relationship

#### Length of relationship

A t-test was calculated to assess the effect of the length of the relationship. The mean of the length of the relationships in this study was 13.29 months,  $SD=16$ . The median of all couples was used to divide the couples into two groups. The median was 11 months. Scores on the Agreement A questionnaire were compared. There were 25 couples in the group which had been dating regularly for 11 months or less. 26 couples had dated regularly for at least 12 months. Recall that Agreement A questionnaire consisted of eight open ended questions (e.g., Areas in the relationship which need improvement are:). A t-test yielded no significant differences between these two groups on their scores on Agreement A questionnaire.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 predicted that based on the premise of the Intimacy motive, (caring, receptive, etc.), the couple in which both partners had high intimacy scores would have the most agreement in perceiving their relationship. The perception of the relationship was assessed by three different measures. The first measure was Agreement A. Agreement A questionnaire consisted of eight open ended questions such as "Some aspects of the relationship which I derive much satisfaction from are:," and "Areas in the relationship which need improvement are". The questionnaire was intended to elicit information about the relationship from the partners. The second measure was Agreement B questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of five questions (e.g., "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with the relationship") whereby the subjects were asked to mark the appropriate response from a 7 point scale ( ranging from, for example, "Not satisfied at all" to "extremely satisfied"). The third measure was used to assess the partners' perception of the relationship. This third measure consisted of of four questions regarding Murray's 20 needs. The questions asked each partner to respond how important each need was for him/her, to what extent each need was fulfilled for him/her within the relationship, to respond how important he/she thought each need was for his/her partner, and to reply to what

extent he/she thought each need was fulfilled for his/her partner within the relationship. Responses entailed the subject marking the appropriate response from a 7 point scale ranging from "not important/fulfilled at all" (point 1) to "extremely important/fulfilled (point 7). A 2x2 ANOVA and a 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor were calculated using these three measures as the dependent variable. Analysis did not yield significant results. Hence, hypothesis 1 was not supported by the data obtained.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that couples which were comprised of one high intimacy scoring partner (as assessed by the TAT) and one low scoring intimacy partner (again, as assessed by the TAT) would have the least agreement, as assessed by Agreement A questionnaire, Agreement B questionnaire, and the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire (those dependent measures described above). A 2x2 ANOVA and a 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor were calculated using the Agreement A questionnaire, Agreement B questionnaire, and the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire as dependent measures. Analysis did not yield any significant results. Hypothesis 2 was also not supported by the data obtained.

Hypothesis 3 actually had two parts to it. The first part stated that couples in which both partners scored high on Rubin's Loving scale have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship. To assess the perception of the relationship, Agreement A questionnaire, Agreement B questionnaire, and the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire were used as dependent measures. A 2x2 ANOVA and a 2x2x2 ANOVA with

repeated measures on the last factor were calculated using these dependent measures. Some evidence was found supporting this hypothesis. Couples in which both score high on the Loving scale were found to score significantly higher in agreement in the perception of their relationship, as assessed by Agreement B questionnaire, than couples where both partners scored low on the Loving scale. It was also found that the Loving scale also differentiated between couples in which the male scored low and the female partner scored high on the Loving scale, and the group in which both partners scored low. In this case, the LH group expressed more agreement in how they perceived their relationship, as measured by Agreement B questionnaire, than the LL group. These two findings taken together indicate that in couples in which the female partner scores high on the Loving scale (regardless of how the male partner scores on the Loving scale); these couples express more agreement in perceiving their relationship (as assessed by Agreement B questionnaire) than couples in which both partners scored low on the Loving scale.

The second part of hypothesis 3 predicted that couples in which both partners scored high on Rubin's Liking scale have the highest agreement in the perception of their relationship, as assessed by the Agreement A questionnaire, Agreement B questionnaire, and the Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaire. A 2x2 ANOVA and a 2x2x2 ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor were calculated using the three above mentioned measures (Agreement A questionnaire, etc.) as the dependent variables. The analysis yielded no significant result. The part

of hypothesis 3 regarding the Liking scale was not supported.

The findings obtained regarding hypothesis 3 were consistent with some of Rubin's findings about the Loving and Liking scales. Rubin (1973) found the Loving scale a good predictor for a romantic couples' progress six months later. As assessed by the Agreement B questionnaire, couples with more agreement on this questionnaire were those which in at least the female scored high on the Loving scale. Based on the type of questions of Agreement B questionnaire (e.g. "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your present relationship"), it would seem that those who score high (at least those females) on the Loving scale have a good general idea as to how satisfied they and their partner are. Rubin (1973) did not find the Liking scale to be a good predictor of romantic couples' progress in his study. These findings are similar to result obtained in the present study, as the Liking scale scores did not differentiate between the couples on how much agreement there was between the partners regarding how they perceived the relationship. It seems that how much the partners like each other has little bearing on whether they perceive the relationship similarly.

It was surprising to find no significant relationship between the partners' intimacy motive score and their perception of their relationship. Earlier studies had found that individuals scoring high in the intimacy motive were perceived by friends as "warm," "sincere," and "loving," (McAdams, 1980, p. 425). High intimacy individuals were also found to highly correlate with reporting interpersonal thoughts. Based on these previous findings a high intimacy score would suggest some pos-

sible agreement on the individual's interpersonal relationships, but the results of the present study do not support this. McAdams and Vailliant (1982) also found that intimacy motivation has predicted psychosocial adjustment, including marital enjoyment, seventeen years later. However, this study did not find a relationship between a couples' intimacy motivation and how they perceive their relationship nor perception of importance and fulfillment of needs within the relationship.

The incongruence of the present study's results with the implications of previous intimacy motivation studies may be due to several factors. For example, the total number of couples used in the study (the mean N of the four groups was 12 with a total of 52 couples) may have required higher differences between groups for these differences to reach significance. Other studies on social motives have not differentiated groups on the basis of the motive level beforehand, instead taking all the couples as one group. For example, on studies of the effect of the power motive on dating couples (Stewart & Rubin, 1974) and married couples (Winter, Stewart, & McClelland, 1977), the researchers used 63 couples, and 51 couples, respectively, without breaking them down further into groups, as was done in the present study. Also, the non-familiarity with some of the questionnaires, especially the questionnaire using Murray's needs and asking for the importance and fulfillment of these needs, may have contributed to nonsignificant findings. It is possible that if the individuals did not have a good understanding of the need described, the importance and fulfillment of that need could be scored as close to "can't say" which would result in little differentiation.



tion among the groups of couples. However, after randomly picking 22 of the partners' Needs/Needs Fulfillment questionnaires, the author found that the "can't say" response made up only 9% of the total responses given in those 22 questionnaires, not a high percentage at all.

Another possible explanation is that the other dependent measures, Agreement A questionnaire and Agreement B questionnaire, did not really elicit information that would discriminate between couples on the quality of their relationship. For example, couples differing on the length of their relationship did not score significantly different on the Agreement A questionnaire. Perhaps the questionnaires themselves were unable to sufficiently discriminate between the quality of the relationship to the point that it could assess the effect of the intimacy.

Another possible explanation for the absence of a relationship between intimacy motivation and perception of the relationship may be the effect of a high intimacy partner within the couple. If an individual scoring high on the intimacy motive is more receptive and open, then perhaps he/she can be more aware of the expectations, commitment, and perception of the other partner's and adjust his/her perception of the relationship accordingly. Hence, the high intimacy partner may change her/ his attitude toward the relationship to be similar to that of her/ his partner (whether high or low scoring on the intimacy motive) and, thereby, both partners will be able to perceive the relationship similarly. Couples with both partners scoring low on the intimacy motive may have similar, possibly low, expectations of the relationship and, thereby, both partners would perceive the relationship similarly also.

Hence, differentiation in couples' perception of their relationship by the intimacy motive would be small to the point of, as in the present study, not yielding statistically significant differences between the four groups of couples. Consequently, the hypotheses, themselves, could be inaccurate in their predictions.

Perhaps another problem in the study is that the median score was used of differentiate between high and low subjects. The median score may not have been the best measure to use to differentiate. Perhaps another procedure that could more reliably differentiate between the high and low scores would result in obtaining significant differences between the groups. It seems that in the present study, the use of the median as a cutoff score between high and low scores did not significantly differentiate between the different groups.

Future research should continue to focus on the effect of the level of intimacy motivation on interpersonal relationships. For example, a longitudinal study comparing the four groups of couples (e.g., HH, HL, LH, and LL) may yield important information. Perhaps high intimacy individuals are willing to change their attitudes and expectations to match those of their partner, as suggested earlier, but only for so long. This study was done with college students. Of interest would be if the intimacy motive differentiates on perception of interpersonal relationships with different populations, such as older couples. For example, the effect of the intimacy motivation on marital satisfaction could also be examined with young and older couples. Also perhaps some other measure could be developed to assess a relationship without over-

lapping so much with individual personality characteristics. This study attempted to do this, however, some of the dependent measures may not have been understood adequately by the respondents to insure accurate responses.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakan, D. (1966) The Duality of human existence. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Banta, T.J. & Hetherington, M. (1963) Relations between needs of friends and fiancés. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 401-404.
- Barton, K & Cattell, R.B. (1972) Real and perceived similarities in personality between spouses: Test of "likeness" versus "completeness" theories. Psychological Reports, 31, 15-18.
- Bentler, P. & Newcomb, M. (1978) Longitudinal study of Marital successes and failure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1053-1070.
- Bowerman, C.E., & Day, D. B. (1956) A test of the theory of complementary needs as applied to couples during courtship. American Sociological Review, 21, 602-605.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1973) Affiliation motivation. In David C. McClelland and R.S. Stale (Eds.) Human Motivation: A Book of readings. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.
- Buber, M. (1965) Between man and man. New York: Macmillan.
- Buber, M. (1970) I and Thou. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons,
- Centers, R. (1975) Attitude similarity-dissimilarity as a correlate of heterosexual attraction and love. Journal of Marriage and Family, 37, 305-312.
- Corsini, R.J. (1956) Understanding and similarity in marriage. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52, 327-332.
- Drewery, J. (1969) An interpersonal perception technique. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 42, 171-184.
- Dymond, R. (1953) The Relation of accuracy of perception of the spouse and of marital happiness. American Psychologist, 8, 344.
- Entwistle, D.R. (1972) To dispel fantasies about fantasy-based measures of achievement motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 77, 377-391.

- Epstein, N. & Santa-Barbara, J. (1975) Conflict behavior in clinical couples: Interpersonal perceptions and social outcomes. Family Process, 14, 51-66.
- Ferguson, L. & Allen, D. (1978) Consequence of parental perception, marital satisfaction, and child adjustment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 345-346.
- Heiss, J.S. & Gordan, M. (1964) Need patterns and the mutual satisfaction of dating and engaged couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 337-338.
- Hendrick, S. (1981) Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 1150-1159.
- Heyns, R.W., Veroff, J., & Atkinson, J.W. (1958) A scoring manual for the Affiliation motive. In J.W. Atkinson (Ed.), Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Hill, C.T., Rubin, Z. & Peplau, L.A. (1976) Breakups before marriage: The End of 103 affairs. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 147-168.
- Katz, I., Cohen, M., & Castiglione, L. (1963) Effect of one type of need complementarity on marriage partners' conformity to one another's judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 8-14.
- Kerckhoff, A.C., & Davis, K.E. (1962) Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 27, 295-303.
- Kogan, K., & Jackson, J. (1963) Conventional sex role stereotypes and actual perceptions. Psychological Reports, 13, 27-30.
- Kudson, R., Sommers, A., & Golding, S. (1980) Interpersonal perception and model of resolution in marital conflict. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 751-763.
- Laing, R.D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A.R. (1966) Interpersonal perception: A Theory and a method of research. New York: Springer Publishing Co. bib Levinger, G. (1964) Note on need complementarity in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 61, 153-157.
- Levinger, G. (1974) A three level approach to attraction: Toward an understanding of pair relatedness. In T.L. Huston (Ed.) Foundations of interpersonal attraction. New York: Academic.
- Levinger, G., Senn, D.J., Jorgenson, B. (1970) Progress toward in permanence in courtship: A Test of the Kerckhoff-Davis hypotheses. Sociometry, 33, 427-443.

- Locke, H.J., & Wallace, K.M. (1959) Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 251-255.
- Luckey, E.B. (1960) Marital satisfaction and congruent self-spouse concepts. Social Forces, 39, 153-157.
- Luckey, E.B. (1964) Marital satisfaction and its concomitant perceptions of self and spouse. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 11, 136-145.
- Lundgren, D., Jergens, V., & Gibson, J. (1980) Marital relationships, evaluations of spouse and self, and anxiety. Journal of Psychology, 106, 227-240.
- Maslow, A. (1954) Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. (1968) Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand.
- McAdams, D.P. (1979) Validation of a thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- McAdams, D.P. (1980) Thematic coding system for the Intimacy motive. ✕ Journal of Research in Personality, 14, 413-432.
- McAdams, D.P. (1984) Scoring manual for the intimacy motive. Psychological Documents, 14, No. 2613.
- McAdams, D.P. (1982) Experiences of intimacy and power: Relationships between social motives and autobiographical memories. ✕ Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 292-302.
- McAdams, D.P., Booth, L., & Selvik, R. (1981) Social motiveness, ego stage, and the development of religious identity among young adults at a private college. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 27, 219-239.
- McAdams, D.P., & Healy, S. (in press) Social motives and patterns of friendship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.
- McAdams, D.P., & Powers, J. (1981) Themes of intimacy in behavior and ✕ thought. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 573-587.
- McAdams, D.P. & Vaillant, G.E. (1982) Intimacy motivation and ✕ psychosocial adjustment: A Longitudinal study. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 586-593.
- McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., & Lowell, E.L. (1953) The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

- McClelland, D.C. (1971) Assessing human motivation. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.
- Meyer, J. & Pepper, S. (1977) Need compatibility and marital adjustment in young married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 331-342.
- Mitchell, H. (1959) The interrelatedness of alcoholism and marital conflict. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 29, 547-559.
- Murray, H. (1938) Explorations in personality: A Clinical and experimental study of fifty men of college age by the workers at the Harvard Psychological center. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Murray, H.A. (1943) Thematic Apperception Test. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Murstein, B. (1961) The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle-aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 194-197.
- Murstein, B. (1972) Person perception and courtship progress among pre-marital couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 621-626.
- Murstein, B., & Beck, G. (1972) Person perception, marriage adjustment, and social desirability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 396-403.
- Noller, P. (1980) Misunderstandings in mutual communication: A study of couples nonverbal communication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 1135-1148.
- Noller, P. (1981) Gender and marital adjustment level differences in decoding messages from spouses and strangers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 945-960.
- Orford, J. (1976) A Study of the personalities of excessive drinkers and their wives using the approaches of Leary and Eysenck. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 543-545.
- Rae, J.B., & Drewery, J. (1972) Interpersonal patterns in alcoholic marriages. British Journal of Psychiatry, 120, 615-621.
- Rubin, Z. (1973) Liking and Loving. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

- Sabatelli, R., Buck, R. & Dreyer, A. (1982) Nonverbal communication accuracy in married couples: Relationships with marital complaints. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 1088-1097.
- Schellenberg, J.S., & Bee, L.S. (1960) A Re-examination of the theory of complementary needs in mate selection. Marriage and Family Living, 22, 227-232.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953) The Interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton.
- Taylor, R. (1957) Role Perception, empathy, and marriage adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 52, 22-34.
- Tharp, R.G. (1963) Psychological patterning in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 60, 97-117.
- Udry, J.R. (1967) Personality match and interpersonal perception as predictors of marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 722-725.
- Winch, R. F. (1958) Mate selection: A Study of complementary needs. New York: Harper.
- Winch, R. (1967) Another look at the theory of complementary needs in mate selection. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 556-562.
- Winter, D. G. (1973) The Power motive. New York: The Free Press.
- Winter, D.G., & Stewart, A. (1977) Power motive reliability as a function of retest instructions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 436-440.
- Winter, D.G., Stewart, A., & McClelland, D.C. (1977) Husband's Motives and Wife's Career Level. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 159-166.



**APPENDIX A**

## THE INTIMACY MOTIVATION SCORING SYSTEM

The following is a summary of the thematic categories which comprise the intimacy motivation scoring system. From McAdams (1984)

+A: Relationship produces positive affect (Intimacy Imagery 1). An interpersonal encounter precipitates, facilitates, or is decidedly connected with a positive affective experience on the part of at least one of the characters. Positive affect must fall under one of five rubrics: love, friendship, happiness, peace, or tender behaviors connoting positive affect. A special case for mourning or sadness associated with the separation from or loss of another person may also score for +A.

Dlg: Dialogue (Intimacy Imagery 2) Dialogue is defined as a verbal or nonverbal exchange of information between characters that meets at least one of three criteria (a) reciprocal, non-instrumental communication, (b) discussion of an interpersonal relationship, or (c) conversation for the purpose of helping another person in distress.

Psy: Psychological growth and coping. An interpersonal encounter is demonstrably instrumental in facilitating or promoting psychological growth, self-fulfillment, adjustment, coping with problems, identity formation, the search for self knowledge, spiritual salvation, creative inspiration, maturity, or the like.

CC: Commitment or concern: A character feels a sense of commitment to or concern for another that is not rooted in guilt or reluctant and begrudging duty. Commitment includes feelings of loyalty to and responsibility for another. Concern generally indicates a felt responsibility for another's welfare usually leading to some kind of helping or humanitarian behavior, and sometimes personal sacrifice.

TS: Time-space. Two or more characters are engaged in a relationship that transcends the usual limitations of time and/or space. This includes any explicit references made to the enduring quality of a relationship over an extended period of time and in the face of physical separation.

U: Union. The writer makes explicit reference to the physical or figurative coming together of people who have at one time or another been apart.

H: Harmony. Characters find that they are in harmony with one another. They are "on the same wavelength," their actions are in synchrony, one "understands" another, they find "something in common," they share similar views, etc.

Sr.: Surrender. A character finds that interpersonal relations are subject to control that is in some way beyond him or her. He or she surrenders to this outside control.

Esc.: Escape. Characters actively or mentally escape from a particular situation or state to another situation or state that affords the experiencing of happiness, peace, liberation,

fulfillment, meaning, etc. in the context of interpersonal relations.

COW: Connection with the outside world. A story manifests explicit evidence of a connection between one of the characters and the outside world. The connection must be manifested by the writer as either direct interaction between a character and the outside world or a metaphoric parallel between the outside world and a character or relationship.

**APPENDIX B**

## NEEDS/NEEDS FULFILLMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions have to do with the importance and satisfaction of needs in the relationship. There will be four questions to answer for each need. There are 20 needs. In doing this exercise, read the following instructions first.

First, look over page 2 and familiarize yourself with the four questions that will be asked of each individual need. Also familiarize yourself with the scale from which your answers will come from.

Second, turn to page 3 and read the definition of the first need slowly and carefully so that you understand it.

Thirdly, turn back to page 2 and read over the questions and decide on your your answers from those provided by the scale.

At this point, you should not have wirtten yet.

Fourthly, turn to page 5, the answer sheet. Write in your answer chosen from the scale, on the space provided.

Do the same for all the other needs. In all, you will make 80 responses (four questions for each of the 20 needs).

Ask if you have any questions.

The following were the four questions: 1) For each need please reply how important each need is to you using the following scale as possible answers, 2) For each need, please reply to what extent this need is being fulfilled for you in your present relationship, 3) For each need, please reply how imortant you think each need is to your girl/boyfriend,

4) For each need, please reply to what extent you think each need is being fulfilled for your girl/boyfriend in the present relationship. The response scale ranged from not important/fulfilled at all (scale point 1) to extremely important/fulfilled (scale point seven). Following is the list of needs and their definitions. {From Murray (1938).}

**Abasement:** to submit passively to external force. To accept injury, blame, criticism, punishment. To surrender. To become resigned to fate. To admit inferiority, error, wrongdoing, or defeat. To confess and atone. To blame, belittle, or mutilate the self. To seek and enjoy pain, punishment, illness, and misfortune.

**Achievement:** To accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate, or organize physical objects, human beings, or ideas. To do this as rapidly and as independently as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel oneself. To rival and surpass others. To increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent.

**Affiliation:** To draw near and enjoyably co-operate or reciprocate with an allied other (an other who resembles the subject or who likes the subject).. To please or win affection of a cathected other. To adhere and remain loyal to a friend.

**Aggression:** To overcome opposition forcefully. To fight. To revenge an injury. To attack injure or kill another. To oppose forcefully or punish another.

Autonomy: To get free, shake off restraint, break out of confinement. To resist coercion and restriction. To avoid or quit activities prescribed by domineering authorities. To be independent and free to act according to impulse. To be unattached, irresponsible. To defy convention.

Counteraction: To master or make up for a failure by restriving. To obliterate a humiliation by resumed action. To overcome weakness or repress fear. To search for obstacles and difficulties to overcome. To maintain self-respect and pride on a high level.

Defendance: To defend the self against assault, criticism, and blame. To conceal or justify a misdeed, failure, or humiliation. To vindicate the ego.

Deference: To admire and support a superior. To praise, honor, or eulogize. To yield eagerly to the influence of an allied other. To emulate an exemplar.

Dominance: To control one's human environment. To influence or direct the behavior of others by suggestion, seduction, persuasion or command. To dissuade, restrain, or prohibit.

Exhibition: To make an impression. To be seen and heard. To excite, amaze, fascinate, shock, intrigue, amuse, or entice others.

Harmavoidance: To avoid pain, physical injury, illness, and death. To escape from a dangerous situation. To take precautionary measures.



Infavoidance: To avoid humiliation. To quit embarrassing situations or to avoid conditions which may lead to belittlement: the scorn, derision, or indifference of others. To refrain from action because of the fear of failure.

Nurturance: To give sympathy and gratify the needs of a helpless object: an infant or any object that is weak, disabled, tired, and inexperienced, infirm, defeated, humiliated, lonely, dejected, sick, mentally confused. To assist an object in danger. To feed, help, support, console, protect, comfort, nurse, heal.

Order: To put things in order. To achieve cleanliness, arrangement, organization, balance, neatness, tidiness, and precision.

Play: To act for "fun" without further purpose. To like to laugh and make jokes. To seek enjoyable relaxation of stress. To participate in games, sports, dancing, drinking parties, cards.

Rejection: To separate oneself from a negatively cathected object. To exclude, abandon, expel, or remain indifferent to an inferior object. To snub or jilt an object.

Sentience: To seek and enjoy sensuous expression.

Sex: To form and further an exotic relationship. To have sexual intercourse.

Succorance: To have one's needs gratified by the sympathetic aid of an allied object. To be nursed, supported, sustained,

surrounded, protected, loved, advised, guided, indulged, forgiven, consoled. To remain close to a devoted protector. To always have a supporter.

Understanding: To ask or answer general questions. To be interested in theory. To speculate, formulate, analyze, and generalize.

**APPENDIX C**

## AGREEMENT A QUESTIONNAIRE

The following are the eight questions of Agreement A questionnaire. For each question, five spaces were provided for possible answers.

1. Some interests which my boy/girlfriend and I share are:
2. Some aspects of the relationship which I derive much satisfaction from are:
3. I think our relationship is better or different than other's relationships because:
4. Five positive things about our relationship are:
5. Five negative things about our relationship are:
6. Areas which I feel neither of us have revealed too much about but which I think are important are:
7. Areas which both of us have revealed to each other and which I think

are important are:

8. Areas in the relationship which need improvement are:

**APPENDIX D**

## AGREEMENT B QUESTIONNAIRE

The following are the five questions from Agreement B questionnaire. The respondents marked their answers on a seven point scale ranging from "not satisfied/serious at all" (scale point 1) to "extremely satisfied/serious" (scale point 7).

9. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your relationship with \_\_\_\_\_?

10. All in all, how satisfied would you say \_\_\_\_\_ is in his/her relationship with you?

11. How close does your present relationship compare to your idea of an "ideal" relationship?

12. How serious (i.e., devotion to relationship, extent of emotional involvement) would you consider your present relationship?

13. Do you think that your present relationship may eventually lead to marriage?

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Rogelio Rodriguez has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Dan P. McAdams, Director  
Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola


Dr. James E. Johnson  
Associate Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

12/4/84

Date

  
Director's Signature