

however, can be more clearly disentangled than the authors seem to believe. I do not agree with the authors' somewhat pessimistic outlook on this complex field of research. I would say, though, that it calls for larger arrays of data and more persistent theorizing than various clinical and social psychologists seem to have patience for.

## REFERENCES

1. LEVINGER, G., & SONNHEIM, M. Complementarity in marital adjustment: reconsidering Toman's family constellation hypothesis. *J. Indiv. Psychol.*, 1965, 21, 137-145.
2. TOMAN, W. *Family constellation*. New York: Springer, 1961.
3. TOMAN, W. Family constellation of the partners in divorced and married couples. *J. Indiv. Psychol.*, 1962, 18, 48-51.
4. TOMAN, W. Large age differences among spouses and their family constellations. *Psychol. Rep.*, 1963, 13, 386.
5. TOMAN, W. Choices of marriage partners by men coming from monosexual sibling configurations. *Brit. J. med. Psychol.*, 1964, 37, 43-46.

COMPLEMENTARITY IN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT:  
REJOINDER

GEORGE LEVINGER

*University of Massachusetts*

In his comment on our paper (1), Toman (6) makes several points which we should like to discuss. His first point, that our samples of normal and disturbed couples differed less in marital conflict than did his own groups, is a matter for speculation. One would wonder why parents of children in psychotherapy (7) would necessarily have any more severe marital conflicts than agency couples. In our two groups there was slight overlap in a composite factor index of marital satisfaction, but the difference between the groups was very large ( $t = 4.78, p < .0001$ ).

His second point, concerning the validity of paper-and-pencil self-ratings of dominance, is a valid criticism. Nevertheless, Table 5 and further data presented in conjunction with it give no reason to believe that actual back-home relative influence was associated with birth order. Furthermore, Jones (3) and Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb (4) have reported contradictory and inconclusive evidence on this topic, and Schachter (5) has maintained that first-borns are more dependent and influencible than later-borns.

In his third point, Toman suggests that to test his hypotheses on birth rank and sex disposition one should not omit cases of only children, with stepsiblings, or from broken homes. This is surprising. We believe that such cases *must* be omitted in order to make a pure test of his rank and sex dissimilarity hypotheses.

However, we quite agree that a home broken *by divorce* in childhood predisposes a person to greater proneness for divorce in his adulthood. Excellent data concerning this issue have been presented by Gurin, Veroff and Feld (2) from their analysis of 2353 responses from a national sample of adults. For example, while only 8% of the respondents from intact homes had ever been divorced, 19% of those from divorce-broken homes had experienced divorce prior to their interview (2, pp. 247-248). However, Gurin et al. distinguished between respondents from divorce-broken homes and those from death-broken homes—the latter frequently being more similar to intact-home persons than to divorced-home persons. Therefore, that distinction should be remembered when Toman or others try to test family constellation hypotheses in their entirety. Our own paper intentionally limited its focus to birth order and sex complementarity.

Toman's final two points would be stronger if he could support his statement by citing evidence from studies other than his own. One initial aim of our study had been to render such additional support. However, in view of the obtained findings, and those reviewed by Jones, by Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb, and by Schachter, we believe that the issue remains open.

#### REFERENCES

1. LEVINGER, G., & SONNHEIM, M. Complementarity in marital adjustment: reconsidering Toman's family constellation hypothesis. *J. Indiv. Psychol.*, 1965, 21, 137-145.
2. GURIN, G., VEROFF, J., & FELD, SHEILA. *Americans view their mental health*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
3. JONES, H. E. Order of birth in relation to the development of the child. In C. Murchison (Ed.), *A handbook of child psychology*. Worcester: Clark Univer. Press, 1931.
4. MURPHY, G., MURPHY, LOIS B., NEWCOMB, T. M. *Experimental social psychology*. New York: Harper, 1937.
5. SCHACHTER, S. Birth order and sociometric choice. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1964, 68, 453-456.
6. TOMAN, W. Complementarity in marital adjustment: comment. *J. Indiv. Psychol.*, 1965, 21, 145-147.
7. TOMAN, W., & Gray, B. Family constellation of "normal" and "disturbed" marriages: an empirical study. *J. Indiv. Psychol.*, 1961, 17, 93-95.