Published in final edited form as:

Assessment. 2011 June ; 18(2): 217–226. doi:10.1177/1073191110394772.

Level of Agreement between Self and Spouse in the Assessment of Personality Pathology

Susan C. South,
Purdue University

Thomas F. Oltmanns,
Washington University in St. Louis

Jarrold Johnson, and
Purdue University

Eric Turkheimer
University of Virginia

Abstract

Informant reports can provide important information regarding the presence of pathological personality traits, and they can serve as useful supplements to self-report instruments. Ratings from a spouse may be a particularly valuable source of personality assessment because spouses are very well acquainted with the target person, have typically known the person for a long time, and witness behaviors across a variety of situations. In the current study, self- and spouse report measures based on the DSM-IV personality disorder criteria were collected from a non-clinical sample of 82 couples ($N=164$). Agreement between self- and spouse report for several pathological personality factors was significant and somewhat higher than has been found for self- and peer agreement. Nevertheless, the magnitude of self-spouse agreement was still moderate in size (Mean $r=.36$). Findings are discussed with regard to utilizing spouse-report in the assessment of personality pathology.

Keywords

pathological personality; assessment; informant; spouse

Informant reports have a long history in personality research. Ratings by knowledgeable others were used in early factor analyses of personality traits and in the development of several personality scales. Although good convergent validity was found between self-report of Five-Factor Model (FFM) traits and ratings by acquaintances (Norman & Goldberg, 1966), some researchers in the 1970s concluded that “there is no consistent agreement between people’s self-perceptions and how they are actually perceived by others” (Schraugher & Schoeneman, 1979, p.549). Over the past several decades, the field of interpersonal perception has utilized self- and other reports of normal personality to show that interjudge agreement is usually statistically significant, although varying with acquaintanceship and type of trait being measured (Funder, 1999; John & Robins, 1993; McCrae, 1994; Watson & Clark, 1991). A recent meta-analysis of the FFM traits (Connolly, Kavanaugh, & Viswesvaran, 2007), for instance, found congruence between self- and observer report ranging from .46 (Agreeableness) to .62 (Extraversion). Despite the

substantial overlap, information provided by self- and informant report is not symmetrical (Vazire & Carlson, 2010) and informants may describe aspects of a target's personality not captured by self-report alone (Vazire, 2010; Vazire & Mehl, 2008).

The use of informant ratings for the study of pathological personality traits is less common, although the use of ratings by knowledgeable others is growing. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV-TR; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) explicitly recommends the supplementation of self-report by report from other informants, and investigators have suggested that informants may be more willing or able to endorse the target's negative behaviors (Bernstein, et al., 1997; First, Spitzer, Gibbon, & Williams, 1995; Zimmerman, 1994). Certainly, informant reports should not be considered a replacement for self report (Paunonen & O'Neill, 2010); rather, both forms of report appear to provide unique and important information about personality pathology (Klein, 2003; Lara, Ferro, & Klein, 1997; Ready, Watson, & Clark, 2002). Klonsky et al. (2002) conducted a literature review of all informant studies of personality disorders (PDs) published since DSM-III (American Psychiatric Association, 1980) and reported that agreement was higher for dimensional ratings of PDs and personality pathology outside the DSM categories (median correlation for dimensional scores = .36, median kappa for categorical diagnoses = .14). While Narcissistic PD had the lowest interrater agreement across the studies, the rest of the Cluster B disorders had higher agreement than Cluster A and Cluster C disorders, although these differences were not statistically significant. Not enough studies reported who the informant was to provide comparisons (i.e., whether agreement was higher for spouses vs. parents vs. friends), and findings were mixed as to whether targets or informants reported higher levels of pathology in the target.

Level of acquaintanceship between the target and the informant will certainly affect the magnitude of self-other agreement. Increased acquaintance and greater intimacy are typically associated with higher interjudge agreement and rater-target agreement on normal personality traits (Connolly, et al., 2007; Funder, 1999; Vazire, 2010). Since the spousal relationship is assumed to be the apex of acquaintanceship (McCrae, Stone, Fagan, & Costa, 1998), self-informant agreement may increase when the informant is the target's spouse. Spousal agreement has been widely studied for normal personality traits, most often using some version of the FFM. McCrae (1982) found self-spouse correlations from .36 to .58 on the Anxiety, Hostility, Depression and Positive Emotions facet scales of the NEO-PI. More recently, Smith et al. (2008) reported similar self-spouse correlations (between .44 and .57) for Anxiety, Hostility, and Depression, as well as substantial agreement on dimensions of dominance and affiliation. Other studies have found correlations ranging from .47 (Extraversion, male target) to .68 (Agreeableness, female target; Foltz, Morse, Calvo, & Barber, 1997), .49 (Conscientiousness) to .61 (Extraversion; Watson, Hubbard, & Wiese, 2000b) and .46 (Neuroticism) to .74 (Extraversion; McCrae, et al., 1998).

Only two previous studies have examined self-spouse agreement on more problematic or maladaptive personality features. In a community sample of young adult couples completing the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems Circumplex (IIP-C; Alden, Wiggins, & Pincus, 1990), Foltz, Morse, and Barber (1997) reported that the correlation between women's self-report and men's partner ratings ranged from .18 to .51 across the eight IIP-C scales, while agreement between men's self-report and women's partner ratings ranged from .22 to .59. In the only previous study to measure the convergence between self- and spouse report of PD criteria, Coolidge, Burns, and Mooney (1995) found an average correlation of .51 across the 13 DSM-III-R PD scales. The authors collected self-report and spousal ratings from each participant (one member of a married couple) as well as informant reports from a friend of each participant. The mean self-friend correlation was .36, and the mean spouse-friend correlation was .41. There was considerable variability in the findings, with self-spouse

agreement ranging from $-.40$ to $.99$, self-friend ranging from $-.76$ to $.94$, and spouse-friend ranging from $-.47$ to $.96$. Thus, the average level of self-spouse convergence for dysfunctional personality traits and behaviors appears moderate, although there may be greater variation in agreement than has been found for more normative personality features.

The current study adds to the literature on self-other agreement by collecting self- and spouse-report of PD criteria from both members of 82 married community couples. Our primary research goal was to determine the level of agreement between self- and spouse-report of pathological personality traits. Getting multiple perspectives has promise to increase the breadth and depth of psychological assessment, and knowing which PD traits demonstrate the highest and lowest self-other agreement can help to guide when to utilize other-report information. There is reason to believe that the substantial self-spouse agreement found for normal personality traits may extend to PD features. Ready and Clark (2002), in a sample of non-psychotic female patients, found no significant differences in magnitude of self-other agreement on the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP; Clark, 1993) between patients with a PD diagnosis and patients without a PD diagnosis. Although PD diagnosis was treated as a dichotomous variable, the growing consensus is that PD's are best represented dimensionally rather than categorically (Widiger & Trull, 2007). Ready and Clark's findings indicate that one's level of personality pathology may, in general, have only a minimal effect on self-other agreement on PD traits.

There is also reason to believe, however, that self-spouse agreement regarding features of PDs may be relatively modest. Many of the PDs are characterized by limited insight, guardedness, lying, or self-serving biases (Zimmerman, 1994). Therefore, information obtained from the target person may not be completely accurate (Bernstein, et al., 1997). Research on socially desirable responding from individuals high in personality pathology (McKeeman & Erickson, 1997) and self v. informant report of personality pathology (Oltmanns & Turkheimer, 2006) provides tentative empirical support for this hypothesis. Even persons who are relatively free from the types of maladaptive behavior and cognition found in those with PDs may interact with the world in an idiosyncratic way motivated by reasons unknowable even to that person (Wilson, 2002; Wilson & Dunn, 2004). A person's explanation of his or her own actions and behavior often focuses on factors that are only tangentially related to the behavior (Oltmanns, Klonsky, & Turkheimer, 2005), and presence of psychopathology increases the likelihood of distortions in self- and other-perception (Erickson & Pincus, 2005). The possibility of such effects should temper expectations about the magnitude of self-spouse agreement.

Further, factors that limit agreement on normal personality traits may be magnified in regard to PD traits. Accumulating data have established the existence of a *trait visibility effect*—that is, easily observable personality traits (i.e., those with clear, frequent behavioral manifestations) yield better interjudge agreement and higher self-other correlations than do more internal, subjective traits (e.g., Funder & Colvin, 1988; John & Robins, 1993; Watson & Clark, 1991). Low-visibility traits like neuroticism that are composed of more internal cognitive and affective components require a greater degree of acquaintanceship before they can be accurately judged (Vazire, 2010; Watson, 1989; but see Paunonen & O'Neill, 2010). The observability of pathological personality traits may be important for level of self-informant agreement (Klonsky, et al., 2002). For instance, there is evidence that the maladaptive nature of narcissism is more apparent as familiarity increases between the rater and target (Paulhus, 1998). John and Robins (1993) also found that the *evaluateness* of traits demonstrated a curvilinear relation with self-other agreement; traits rated as being very desirable or undesirable showed lower self-other agreement than traits that are more neutral in tone. Simms and colleagues (2008, 2010) reported that self-informant agreement is higher for normal personality traits (i.e., Big 5) than for traits with strong evaluative components.

The fact that most PD criteria are related to internal thoughts and motivations, and/or relatively (often negative) extreme behaviors, would suggest lower agreement between self- and spouse reports.

We also examined two potential sources of influence that might produce spurious levels of self-spouse agreement (Cronbach, 1955; Kenny, 1994). First, we determined whether there was significant *similarity* between self-reports of both partners (i.e., assortative mating). As others have noted, dyadic data are inherently non-independent. Married couples, in particular, because of similar daily milieu and situational contexts, present various issues of non-independence. So far, there is little evidence for similarity of normal personality traits (Botwin, Buss, & Shackelford, 1997; Buss, 1991; Watson, Hubbard, & Wiese, 2000a), but some support for similarity for antisocial behavior (Galbaud du Fort, Boothroyd, Bland, Newman, & Kakuma, 2002; Krueger, Moffitt, Caspi, Bleske, & Silva, 1998). Therefore, we hypothesized that if there was any significant similarity for the couples in our sample it would be for antisocial personality traits. We also examined the other potential source of influence, *assumed similarity*, in which one partner's personality colors how he or she views his or her spouse. Kenny (1994) showed that people do have a tendency to rate others as they rate themselves, particularly on the trait of agreeableness. Watson et al. (2000b) found correlations ranging from .17 to .20 for assumed similarity on the FFM traits; correlations for affect scales were higher, particularly for negative affect. To our knowledge, no evidence in the literature has been reported with regard to assumed similarity for pathological personality traits in married couples.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited through newspaper advertisements, television bulletins on a community access channel, and community flyers inviting couples to “participate in a research project examining personality and marriage.” Flyers were also sent to professionals working with potential study participants (therapists, physicians). Couples responding to the advertisements were screened in a telephone interview to determine whether (a) both participants were at least 21 years old, (b) both spouses were comfortable with reading and writing English, (c) the couple had been married for at least one year but less than 11 years¹, and (d) the couple was currently living together. Persons were excluded if they had a history of, were currently in treatment for, or were taking medication for a psychotic illness. All participants attended a 2-hour laboratory session during which they completed the self-report measures. Written consent was obtained from all participants. Husbands and wives were separated from each other and placed in different rooms while they completed the questionnaires. Participants were given \$50 per couple as compensation for their participation in the study².

The sample consisted of 82 married heterosexual couples from central Virginia. Participants had been married an average of 3.7 years ($SD=2.6$), with a minimum of 12 months and a

¹A secondary goal of the current study was to examine the relationship between pathological personality traits and marital satisfaction (data to be presented in a separate article). As part of that goal, we decided to collect a sample that had gotten beyond the “honeymoon” period of their marriage, when any ratings of satisfaction might be most positively biased, but had not yet reached the point of already separating or divorcing because of dissatisfaction with their marriage. As such, we settled on these constraints (married at least one year but less than 11) for the sample utilized in these analyses.

²At the time of the assessments, participants were asked to provide the names of up to two informants (family members and friends) per spouse. Each collateral informant completed the informant report version of the MAPP. Complete data was collected from at least one of the two selected informants for 41 wives and 39 husbands. For 26 wives and 23 husbands, data were collected from both informants provided. This limited the ability of our analysis to detect significant agreement between informants and spouses, if such an effect was there. Therefore, these analyses are not presented, but they are available from the first author upon request.

maximum of 10 years, 11 months. The number of children per couple ranged from zero to four children ($M=0.5$, $SD=0.85$). Twenty three percent of wives and 20% of husbands reported having been in couples counseling and/or psychotherapy with their current spouse.

Husbands ranged from 23 to 69 years old, with a mean of 34 ($SD=9.55$). Wives ranged in age from 21 to 59 years old, with a mean of 32 ($SD=8.60$). A majority of husbands (92%) and wives (84%) identified themselves as Caucasian. Most of the husbands had at least a college degree (72%), 38% had been in individual therapy, and 18% had been married previously. A majority of the wives had at least a college degree (85.4%), 50% had been in individual therapy at some point, and 13% had been married previously.

Personality Assessment

Multisource Assessment of Personality Pathology (MAPP)—The MAPP (Oltmanns & Turkheimer, 2006) consists of 105 items, with 81 based on the features of the 10 personality disorders listed in DSM-IV (Paranoid, Schizoid, Schizotypal, Antisocial, Borderline, Histrionic, Narcissistic, Avoidant, Dependent, Obsessive-Compulsive) and an additional 24 items based on other, mostly positive, personality characteristics. MAPP items were constructed by translating the DSM-IV criterion sets for PDs into lay language. The 79 DSM-IV PD criteria were rewritten in such a way as to avoid the use of technical psychopathological terms and psychiatric jargon. One of the criteria for Narcissistic PD, “is often envious of others or believes that others are envious of him or her,” was split into two items (“is jealous of other people” and “thinks other people are jealous of him/her”). Similarly, the Schizotypal PD criterion, “inappropriate or constricted affect” was split into the items “shows emotional responses that seem strange or ‘out of sync’” and “is cold; doesn’t show any feelings.”

The MAPP consists of both a self-report version and an informant report version. For both, the participant assigns a score (0,1,2, or 3) on each item to the target, indicating that the person “never,” “sometimes,” “often,” or “always” displays this characteristic. In the current study, each participant (husband and wife) completed the self-report version of the MAPP and the informant report version regarding their spouse. The self-report version of the MAPP has good test-retest reliability, and comparisons between the MAPP and other standard PD questionnaires have shown moderate agreement (Okada & Oltmanns, 2009). The level of agreement between the MAPP and two commonly used PD instruments, averaged across the PD scales and across time, was .73 for the MAPP and the *Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire—4+* (PDQ-4+; Hyler, 1994), and .77 for the MAPP and the *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis II Personality Disorders Questionnaire* (SCID-IIQ; Spitzer, Williams, Gibbon, & First, 1990). In general, the MAPP tended to be more conservative than the PDQ-4+ or the SCID-IIQ.

A previous factor analysis of the MAPP items in two different samples identified seven factors that resemble the DSM-IV personality disorders (Thomas, Turkheimer, & Oltmanns, 2003): Detachment, Schizotypal, Aggression-Mistrust, Antisocial, Histrionic-Narcissistic, Dependent-Avoidant, and Obsessive-Compulsive. The first two factors correspond to DSM-IV Cluster A disorders, the next three are similar to the Cluster B disorders, and the last two factors are comparable to Cluster C. For the current study, personality scales based on these factors were calculated by summing the items associated with each one, as reported in Thomas, et al. (2003). The number of items per factor is reported in Table 1. For ease of presentation, we refer to the scales based on these seven factors as the MAPP scales throughout the rest of the paper.

Results

Table 1 presents basic descriptive statistics and internal consistency reliabilities for the MAPP scales as assessed by self and spouse report. Internal consistency ranged from .59 to .90 for wife self-report and .50 to .87 for husband self-report, and from .40 to .91 for wife spouse-report and .49 to .86 for husband spouse-report. Reliabilities were good to excellent for self- and spouse-report for husbands and wives on four of the seven scales (Detachment, Aggression-Mistrust, Histrionic-Narcissistic, and Dependent-Avoidant), while lower reliability was found for the Antisocial, Obsessive-Compulsive, and Schizotypal scales. Alphas for three spouse-report scales (wife Antisocial and Schizotypal, husband Schizotypal) were particularly low, although comparable to previous research using informant-report temperament and trait scales (Ready & Clark, 2002).

For each personality scale, the scores of the individual items (0–3) scale were summed, with the range of scores listed in the third column. The means and standard deviations presented are averages of the sums of the items for each particular scale. In general, self- and spouse ratings were low on personality pathology. Self-report ratings tended to be higher than ratings by spouses, significantly so for wife on the Histrionic-Narcissistic ($t(81)=2.11, p<.05$) and Obsessive-Compulsive ($t(81)=2.54, p<.05$) scales and for husband on the Histrionic-Narcissistic ($t(81)=2.38, p<.05$), Dependent-Avoidant ($t(81)=2.61, p<.05$), Detachment ($t(81)=2.98, p<.01$), Obsessive-Compulsive ($t(81)=2.11, p<.05$), and Schizotypal ($t(81)=2.13, p<.05$) scales. Wife self-report was significantly higher than husband self-report for the Histrionic-Narcissistic ($t(81)=2.29, p<.05$), Dependent-Avoidant ($t(81)=2.30, p<.05$), and Aggression-Mistrust ($t(81)=3.25, p<.01$) scales.³

Similarity

We began by examining levels of similarity between couples on personality pathology. Determining the level of actual similarity between married couples is important for two reasons. First, significant similarity between spouses, in combination with significant assumed similarity, can lead to spuriously high levels of self-other agreement (Cronbach, 1955; Kenny, 1994). If self-report personality ratings from both spouses are not significantly related, this nullifies the possibility of concluding that assumed similarity artificially inflated self-other agreement. Second, similarity of personality can also introduce a level of non-independence into the data which would make it inappropriate to examine individual-level data (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). Kenny (1995) recommended that if the level of non-independence (essentially the similarity correlation when the dyad is a married couple) is less than $|\lambda|.30$, then the individual can be used as the level of analysis.

Table 2 presents the similarity correlations for the MAPP scales. To handle the skewed personality data, all MAPP scale scores were normalized with a log transformation. Only the Schizotypal scale ($r=.24$) was significantly positively correlated between the spouses in this sample. (The members of a heterosexual married couple are distinguishable, or non-exchangeable, and can be readily identified by gender. Thus, the similarity correlations in Table 2 are simple Pearson product-moment correlations). There was also a negative relationship between husband and wife self-report for the Antisocial scale ($r=-.40$). The other five similarity correlations were small and non-significant, indicating that, in general,

³Additionally, self-report ratings were significantly different from ratings of one's spouse for wives on the Histrionic-Narcissistic ($t(81)=6.56, p<.0001$), Dependent-Avoidant ($t(81)=5.56, p<.0001$), Aggression-Mistrust ($t(81)=5.02, p<.0001$), and Obsessive-Compulsive ($t(81)=2.03, p<.05$) scales and for husbands on the Detachment ($t(81)=2.79, p<.01$), Aggression-Mistrust ($t(81)=2.15, p<.05$), and Obsessive-Compulsive ($t(81)=3.11, p<.01$) scales. Husbands' ratings of wives were significantly different from wives' ratings of husbands for Dependent-Avoidant ($t(81)=3.18, p<.01$), Aggression-Mistrust ($t(81)=2.84, p<.01$), and Antisocial ($t(81)=2.13, p<.05$) scales.

there was little support for spousal similarity for pathological personality traits. These findings also suggested that there was little evidence of non-independence in this sample, and that it was appropriate to use individual-level data, rather than the dyad, as the unit of analysis (except for the Antisocial scale). However, to guard against the possibility of any bias potentially distorting our results, we used Kenny's (1995) program to calculate adjusted p values for the self-spouse agreement and assumed similarity correlations⁴. These corrected values are shown in Table 2.

Self-Spouse Agreement

As expected, there was significant self-spouse agreement for almost all of the scales (see Table 2). When looking at agreement for husband as target, six of the seven MAPP scales were significantly correlated, with the exception of the Schizotypal scale. All of the seven agreement correlations for wife as target were significant. For the combined sample, all of the correlations were significant, and ranged from $r=.21$ (Schizotypal) to $r=.47$ (Aggression-Mistrust) (mean $r=.36$). In general, these agreement statistics are somewhat higher than has been found in previous studies of self- and peer agreement of pathological personality traits using the same inventory (Oltmanns & Turkheimer, 2006), but they are also lower than self-spouse agreement found for normal personality traits (Watson, et al., 2000b).

Assumed Similarity

Finally, we conducted analyses to determine the level of assumed similarity—or the tendency to judge your spouse as you see yourself. Actual similarity between spouses was generally low or non-significant, with the exception of the Schizotypal and Antisocial scales, indicating that even if found here, assumed similarity would most likely not be a source of spurious levels of self-other agreement. These analyses were conducted separately by gender and for the total combined sample: for each scale, correlations were computed between a person's own self-rating and his or her spouse-rating (i.e., husband self-report and his ratings of his wife, wife self-report and her ratings of her husband) (see Table 2). For husband-as-rater correlations, six of the seven scales were significantly related. When looking at correlations between wife ratings, six of the seven scales were again significantly correlated. For the total combined sample, six of the seven assumed similarity correlations were significant, ranging from $r=.38$ (Aggression-Mistrust, Dependent-Avoidant) to $r=.58$ (Schizotypal). The only MAPP scale with a non-significant correlation for assumed similarity ($r=.04$) was Antisocial, the only scale to demonstrate a significant negative similarity correlation. The large, positive assumed similarity correlation for the Schizotypal scale, in combination with the finding of significant positive actual similarity, suggests that the self-other agreement correlation of .21 for this scale may reflect a higher level of accuracy than truly exists in this sample.

Discussion

The current study provides important information on the presence of personality pathology and level of self-other agreement in a sample of married couples from the community. Previous studies have reported moderate levels of agreement between targets and informants with regard to presence of psychopathology, including pathological personality features (Achenbach, Krukowski, Dumenci, & Ivanova, 2005; Klonsky, et al., 2002). In line with these results, we found evidence of generally modest agreement between self- and spouse report, along with little evidence of any actual similarity of self-report. Evidence of

⁴Adjusted p values were calculated only for the Total Sample correlations. Correlations for husbands as rater/target and wife as rater/target do not need to be corrected for any potential bias because the two variables of interest, self- and spouse-report, each come from only one member of the dyad.

significant assumed similarity also suggests the presence of a self-based heuristic at work. Overall, the findings from the current study confirmed our prediction that greater acquaintance would increase self-informant agreement of pathological personality. Our results also suggest that factors which limit absolute levels of self-informant agreement are particularly relevant for assessment of PD traits.

As expected in a community sample, participants in this study endorsed relatively low levels of personality pathology. In fact, targets tended to rate themselves as higher in pathological personality features than they were rated by their spouses. This pattern of self-derogation, where informant reports are more positive than self-reports, has been replicated across different cultures (Allik, et al., 2010) and is particularly robust when other-ratings come from close others (Vazire, 2010). Of all possible informants, spouses are most likely to both know and like the target, and certainly liking is significantly correlated with positivity of judgments, even after taking into account level of knowing (Leising, Erbs, & Fritz, 2010). Recent work suggests that wording of informant items may reduce this positivity bias. Simms and colleagues (2010) found that traditional informant ratings (i.e., ratings on traits that are translated from first-person descriptors) were more positive and less negative than self-report ratings; however, this other-enhancement bias was greatly reduced or eliminated when compared to informant report on items that were written to tap the informant's perceptions of the target's self-view. Other-enhancement as found in the current study with regard to PD traits may have been reduced with different item wording, an important step for future research.

As predicted, self-spouse agreement for pathological personality features as measured by the MAPP was significant and somewhat higher than has been found previously in studies of self-peer agreement (Oltmanns & Turkheimer, 2006; Thomas, et al., 2003). In the current study, mean and median self-spouse agreement was $r=.36$. This is analogous to the median agreement found in a review of 17 major studies of self-other agreement that utilized different assessment inventories and types of informants (Klonsky, et al., 2002). The magnitude of agreement found in the current sample is also comparable to the findings of Ready and Clark (2002), who reported a mean correlation of $r=.34$ in a psychiatric sample where targets and informants completed either the full SNAP or an informant version. Notably, in that study, self-other agreement on scales of Aggression ($r=.61$), Dependency ($r=.36$), Detachment ($r=.42$), and Eccentric Perceptions ($r=.24$) are broadly comparable to the findings of the current study: Aggression-Mistrust ($r=.47$), Dependent-Avoidant ($r=.42$), Detachment ($r=.36$), and Schizotypal ($r=.21$). This suggests consistency in the magnitude of self-other agreement for pathological personality traits across clinical and community samples.

The results of the current study suggest that, in general, self-spouse agreement was not spuriously influenced by the combination of similarity and assumed similarity. Our findings provide little evidence of spousal similarity of personality, which indicates that assumed similarity generally does not exert a substantial influence on the accuracy of these particular trait ratings (Cronbach, 1955; Kenny, 1994). However, self-reports of schizotypal features were significantly positively related. This, in combination with the significant assumed similarity correlation for the Schizotypal scale, suggests the need for caution in interpreting the significant self-other agreement for this scale. There was also a negative correlation between self-reports of antisocial features. This stands in contrast to research which has found similarity (e.g., positive assortative mating) for antisocial behaviors (Galbaud du Fort, et al., 2002; Krueger, et al., 1998). Rather, this may be evidence of complementarity (e.g., negative assortative mating), that is, the idea that we are attracted to others whose personality traits complement our own. Research has generally found little evidence of complementarity for personality (e.g., Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Bouchard & Loehlin, 2001;

Luo & Klohnen, 2005), although Watson, et al. (2004) found evidence for modest complementarity for extraversion. It may be that the MAPP items capture an antisocial personality style, which shows less evidence of similarity (Krueger, et al., 1998) than socially disruptive behaviors per se. Persons with this antisocial style of interacting with the world, without concurrent deviant and/or illegal behavior, may be drawn to spouses with a relative absence of these antisocial features.

There was significance evidence of assumed similarity for almost all of the MAPP scales. When actual similarity is minimal, as was the case for most of the personality scales in this sample, significant assumed similarity can attenuate self-other agreement (Kurtz & Sherker, 2003). Watson and colleagues (2000b, p.557) suggested that “other-ratings should be viewed with caution if assumed similarity correlations far surpass the corresponding agreement correlations.” Assumed similarity as found here may represent evidence of a self-based heuristic (Dawes, 1990; Funder, Kolar, & Blackman, 1995; Ready & Clark, 2005), such that people rely on their own personality when making difficult judgments about another person’s personality. Spouses should have less need to rely on this type of heuristic because, by virtue of their access to the target, they have an abundant supply of observations to personality trait-relevant behaviors (Watson, et al., 2000b). As one method of determining how much assumed similarity affected self-spouse agreement, we computed partial self-other agreement correlations, controlling for the self-rating of the spouse rating the target (thereby eliminating the assumed similarity effect). These correlations were generally similar to those reported in Table 2⁵, with three increasing slightly (.01 to .05 higher), three decreasing slightly (.01 to .03 lower), and one decreasing substantially (the Schizotypal scale, reflecting the spurious influence of both significant similarity and assumed similarity). We cannot rule out the possibility that people rely on perceptions of their own personalities when rating their spouse.

Another factor which may affect the level of self-spouse agreement is the quality of the marital relationship. Certainly, the knowledge that a spouse can provide regarding their partner’s personality will be confounded by his or her global evaluation of the relationship (Kurtz & Sherker, 2003). Research has shown that negative sentiment toward one’s partner can affect perceptions of that partner’s behavior (Christensen, Sullaway, & King, 1983; Jacobson & Moore, 1981). Persons in unhappy or distressed marriage report higher daily frequencies of negative events, tend to overestimate the rate of occurrence of negative behaviors, and focus on displeasing behavior by their spouse (Floyd & Markman, 1983; Jacobson, Follette, & McDonald, 1982; Johnson & O’Leary, 1996; Sillars, Roberts, Leonard, & Dun, 2000). Thus, the relationship between spouse-report and important outcome measures may be attributed to marital quality (but see Smith, et al., 2008). Anyone wishing to utilize spouse report as a source of personality assessment may wish to also assess relationship satisfaction.

Having established that there is moderate overlap between self- and spouse report in the assessment of pathological personality features, it is important for future research to examine the incremental validity of spouse report. For example, Klein (2003) compared patients’ versus informants’ reports of personality disorders in predicting depressive symptoms, global functioning, and social adjustment 7½ years after treatment for depression. While both sources of information were predictive of outcomes, informant reports of any PD symptoms *uniquely* predicted global functioning and social adjustment at follow-up. The informants in Klein’s study were a mix of friends, spouses, and other relatives, although the size of the sample most likely precluded analyzing outcomes by type

⁵Partial correlations were as follows: Histrionic-Narcissistic ($r=.33$), Dependent-Avoidant ($r=.46$), Detachment ($r=.35$), Aggression-Mistrust ($r=.45$), Antisocial ($r=.42$), Obsessive-Compulsive ($r=.31$), and Schizotypal ($r=.09$).

of informant. However, future studies could examine which types of informants are most informative in regard to different outcome measures, including continued PD diagnosis, Axis I diagnosis, social and interpersonal relationships, or other types of adjustment (e.g., physical health, Smith, et al., 2008).

Several limitations of this study deserve comment. First, internal reliability of three scales, Antisocial, Obsessive-Compulsive, and Schizotypal, was below .70, a minimal standard of acceptability. The low reliability of the Schizotypal scale might be explained by the small number of items (3) composing the scale; in fact, previous studies have found low reliabilities for personality scales with only a few items (Harlan & Clark, 1999; Ready & Clark, 2002). It is possible that self-spouse agreement on these scales might have been attenuated by the low internal consistency of the scales. Thus, caution must be used in interpreting the self-other agreement correlations for these personality features. Second, we studied a largely white, well-educated, and relatively high-functioning community sample. It is unknown whether the findings reported here are generalizable to different ethnic groups, persons from different SES levels, or individuals with greater levels of psychopathology who may be struggling with various issues that were largely not at play with the current sample. Ready and Clark's (2002) findings do provide room for optimism in this regard. Further, self-other agreement was computed using self- and spouse reports of PD features assessed through questionnaire methods. It is unknown how the self-spouse agreement correlations found in the current study would compare to results of self-informant agreement using different informants (friends, family members, clinicians, or objective observers) and/or different assessment instruments (interview, behavioral observation). Presumably, spouses would possess more comprehensive and detailed knowledge of participants than would other informants. It is possible, however, that certain traits are systematically more salient to other types of informants due to systematic differences in the situations in which they interact.

Despite these limitations, this study adds to the growing literature on the use of informant reports for the assessment of personality pathology. Agreement found here was higher than previous studies of cross-informant agreement using peer report, possibly due, in part, to a spouse being a better "judge" of the target's personality. Self-spouse agreement for personality features as assessed in the current study was generally lower in magnitude than correlations between self- and spouse-report of normal personality, a not unexpected finding given the low observability and highly evaluative nature of many PD criteria. The discrepancy between self- and spouse report could also suggest inattentiveness on the part of the spouse or a lack of insight on the part of the target. The challenge for future studies will be to determine how to utilize both types of information, self-report and informant report, to assess current personality pathology and predict future functioning.

References

- Achenbach TM, Krukowski RA, Dumenci L, Ivanova MY. Assessment of adult psychopathology: Meta-analyses and implications of cross-informant correlations. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2005; 131:361–382. [PubMed: 15869333]
- Alden LE, Wiggins JS, Pincus AL. Construction of circumplex scales for the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1990; 55:521–536. [PubMed: 2280321]
- Allik J, Realo A, Mottus R, Borkenau P, Kuppens P, Hrebickova H. How people see others is different from how people see themselves: A replicable pattern across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2010; 99:870–882. [PubMed: 20954788]
- American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 3. Washington, DC: 1980.

- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association; 2000. Text Revision
- Bernstein D, Kasapis C, Bergman A, Weld E, Mitropoulou V, Horvath T, et al. Assessing Axis II disorders by informant interview. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 1997; 11:158–167. [PubMed: 9203110]
- Berscheid, E.; Reis, HT. Attraction and close relationships. In: Gilbert, DT.; Fiske, ST., editors. *The handbook of social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1998. p. 193-281.
- Botwin MD, Buss DM, Shackelford TK. Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*. 1997; 65:107–136. [PubMed: 9143146]
- Bouchard TJ Jr, Loehlin JC. Genes, evolution, and personality. *Behavior Genetics*. 2001; 31:243–273. [PubMed: 11699599]
- Buss DM. Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality*. 1991; 59:663–688. [PubMed: 1774615]
- Christensen A, Sullaway M, King CE. Systematic error in behavioral reports of dyadic interaction: Egocentric bias and content effects. *Behavioral Assessment*. 1983; 5:129–140.
- Clark, LA. *Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press; 1993.
- Connolly JJ, Kavanaugh EJ, Viswesvaran C. The convergent validity between self and observer ratings of personality: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. 2007; 15:110–117.
- Coolidge FL, Burns EM, Mooney JA. Reliability of observer ratings in the assessment of personality disorders: A preliminary study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1995; 51:22–28. [PubMed: 7782470]
- Cronbach LJ. Processes affecting scores on “understanding of others” and “assumed similarity”. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1955; 52:177–193. [PubMed: 14371889]
- Dawes, RM. The potential nonfalsity of the false consensus effect. In: Hogarth, RM., editor. *Insights in decision making: A Tribute to Hillel J Einhorn*. Chicago University of Chicago Press; 1990. p. 179-199.
- Erickson TM, Pincus AL. Using Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB) measures of self- and social perception to give interpersonal meaning to symptoms: Anxiety as an exemplar. *Assessment*. 2005; 12:243–254. [PubMed: 16123246]
- First MB, Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, Williams JBW. *The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III-R Personality Disorders (SCID-II)*. Part I: Description. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 1995; 9:83–91.
- Floyd FJ, Markman HJ. Observational biases in spouse observation: Toward a cognitive/behavioral model of marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1983; 51:450–457. [PubMed: 6863707]
- Foltz C, Morse JQ, Calvo N, Barber JP. Self- and observer ratings on the NEO-FFI in couples: Initial evidence of the psychometric properties of an observer form. *Assessment*. 1997; 4:287–295.
- Funder, DC. *Personality judgment: A realistic approach to person perception*. New York: Academic Press; 1999.
- Funder DC, Colvin CR. Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship, agreement, and the accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1988; 55:149–158. [PubMed: 3418488]
- Funder DC, Kolar DC, Blackman MC. Agreement among judges of personality: Interpersonal relations, similarity, and acquaintanceship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1995; 69:656–672. [PubMed: 7473024]
- Galbaud du Fort G, Boothroyd LJ, Bland RC, Newman SC, Kakuma R. Spousal similarity for antisocial behavior in the general population. *Psychological Medicine*. 2002; 32:1407–1416. [PubMed: 12455939]
- Harlan E, Clark LA. Short forms of the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive Personality (SNAP) for self- and collateral ratings: Development, reliability, and validity. *Assessment*. 1999; 6:131–145. [PubMed: 10335018]

- Hyler, SE. The personality diagnostic questionnaire 4+. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute; 1994.
- Jacobson NS, Follette WC, McDonald DW. Reactivity to positive and negative behavior in distressed and nondistressed married couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1982; 50:706–714. [PubMed: 7142544]
- Jacobson NS, Moore D. Spouses as observers of the events in their relationship. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1981; 49:269–277. [PubMed: 7217493]
- John OP, Robins RW. Determinants of interjudge agreement on personality traits: The big five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and the unique perspective of the self. *Journal of Personality*. 1993; 61:521–552. [PubMed: 8151500]
- Johnson PL, O’Leary KD. Behavioral components of marital satisfaction: An individualized assessment approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1996; 64:417–423. [PubMed: 8871427]
- Kenny, DA. Interpersonal perception. New York: Guilford; 1994.
- Kenny DA. The effect of nonindependence on significance testing in dyadic research. *Personal Relationships*. 1995; 2:67–75.
- Kenny, DA.; Kashy, DA.; Cook, WL. Dyadic data analysis. New York: Guilford; 2006.
- Klein D. Patients’ versus informants’ reports of personality disorders in predicting 7.5-year outcome in outpatients with depressive disorders. *Psychological Assessment*. 2003; 15:216–222. [PubMed: 12847782]
- Klonsky ED, Oltmanns TF, Turkheimer E. Informant-reports of personality disorder: Relation to self-reports and future research directions. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*. 2002; 9:300–311.
- Krueger RF, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Bleske A, Silva P. Assortative mating for antisocial behavior: Developmental and methodological implications. *Behavior Genetics*. 1998; 28:173–186. [PubMed: 9670593]
- Kurtz JE, Sherker JL. Relationship quality, trait similarity, and self-other agreement on personality ratings in college roommates. *Journal of Personality*. 2003; 71:21–48. [PubMed: 12597236]
- Lara ME, Ferro T, Klein DN. Family history assessment of personality disorders: II. Associations with measures of psychosocial functioning. *Journal of Personality Disorders*. 1997; 11:137–145. [PubMed: 9203108]
- Leising D, Erbs J, Fritz U. The letter of recommendation effect in informant ratings of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2010; 98:668–682. [PubMed: 20307137]
- Luo S, Klohnen EC. Assortative mating and marital quality in newlyweds: A couple-centered approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 88:304–326. [PubMed: 15841861]
- McCrae RR. Consensual validation of personality traits: Evidence from self-reports and ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1982; 43:293–303.
- McCrae RR. The counterpoint of personality assessment: Self-reports and observer ratings. *Assessment*. 1994; 1:159–172. [PubMed: 9465146]
- McCrae RR, Stone SV, Fagan PJ, Costa PTJ. Identifying causes of disagreement between self-reports and spouse ratings of personality. *Journal of Personality*. 1998; 66:285–313. [PubMed: 9615420]
- McKeeman J, Erickson M. Self and informant ratings of SCID-II personality disorders items for nonreferred college women: Effects of item and participant characteristics. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1997; 53:523–533. [PubMed: 9316807]
- Norman WT, Goldberg LR. Raters, ratees, and randomness in personality structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1966; 4:681–691.
- Okada M, Oltmanns TF. Comparison of three self-report measures of personality pathology. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*. 2009; 31:280–290.
- Oltmanns, TF.; Turkheimer, E. Perceptions of self and others regarding pathological personality traits. In: Krueger, RF.; Tackett, JL., editors. *Personality and psychopathology*. New York: Guilford; 2006. p. 71-111.

- Oltmanns TFG, MEJ, Klonsky ED, Turkheimer E. Meta-perception for pathological personality traits: Do we know when others think that we are difficult? *Consciousness and Cognition*. 2005; 14:739–751. [PubMed: 16256371]
- Paulhus DL. Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 74:1197–1208. [PubMed: 9599439]
- Paunonen SV, O'Neill TA. Self-reports, peer ratings and construct validity. *European Journal of Personality*. 2010; 24:189–206.
- Ready RC, Clark LA. Correspondence of psychiatric patient and informant ratings on personality traits, temperament, and interpersonal problems. *Psychological Assessment*. 2002; 14:39–49. [PubMed: 11911048]
- Ready RE, Clark LA. Psychiatric patient and informant reports of patient behavior. *Journal of Personality*. 2005; 73:1–21. [PubMed: 15660671]
- Ready RE, Watson D, Clark LA. Psychiatric patient- and informant-reported personality: Predicting concurrent and future behavior. *Assessment*. 2002; 9:361–372. [PubMed: 12462756]
- Schraugher JS, Schoeneman TJ. Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1979; 86:549–573.
- Sillars A, Roberts LJ, Leonard K, Dun T. Cognition during marital conflict: The relationship of thought and talk. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2000; 17:479–502.
- Simms LJ, Yufik T, Thomas JP, Simms EN. Exploring evaluative person descriptors through scale development. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2008; 42:1271–1284.
- Simms LJ, Zelazny K, Yam WH, Gros DF. Self-informant agreement for personality and evaluative person descriptors: Comparing methods for creating informant measures. *European Journal of Personality*. 2010; 24:207–221. [PubMed: 21541262]
- Smith TW, Uchino BN, Berg CA, Florsheim P, Pearce G, Hawkins M, et al. Associations of self-reports versus spouse ratings of negative affectivity, dominance, and affiliation with coronary artery disease: Where should we look and who should we ask when studying personality and health? *Health Psychology*. 2008; 27:676–684. [PubMed: 19025262]
- Spitzer, RL.; Williams, JBW.; Gibbon, M.; First, MB. User's guide for the structured clinical interview for DSM-III-R: SCID. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric; 1990.
- Thomas C, Turkheimer E, Oltmanns TF. Factorial structure of pathological personality as evaluated by peers. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2003; 112:81–91. [PubMed: 12653416]
- Vazire S. Who knows what about a person? The self-other knowledge asymmetry (SOKA) model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2010; 98:281–300. [PubMed: 20085401]
- Vazire S, Carlson E. Self-knowledge of personality: Do people know themselves? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 2010; 4:605–620.
- Vazire S, Mehl MR. Knowing me, knowing you: The accuracy and unique predictive validity of self-ratings and other-ratings of daily behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2008; 95:1202–1216. [PubMed: 18954202]
- Watson D. Strangers' ratings of the five robust personality factors: Evidence of a surprising convergence with self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1989; 57:120–128.
- Watson D, Clark LA. Self- versus peer-ratings of specific emotional traits: Evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1991; 60:927–940.
- Watson D, Hubbard B, Wiese D. General traits of personality and affectivity as predictors of satisfaction in intimate relationships: Evidence from self- and partner-ratings. *Journal of Personality*. 2000a; 63:413–449.
- Watson D, Hubbard B, Wiese D. Self-other agreement in personality and affectivity: The role of acquaintanceship, trait visibility, and assumed similarity. *Journal Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000b; 78:546–558.
- Watson D, Klohnen EC, Casillas A, Nus Simms E, Haig J, Berry DS. Match makers and deal breakers: Analyses of assortative mating in newlywed couples. *Journal of Personality*. 2004; 72:1029–1068. [PubMed: 15335336]
- Widiger TA, Trull TJ. Plate tectonics in the classification of personality disorder: Shifting to a dimensional model. *American Psychologist*. 2007; 62:71–83. [PubMed: 17324033]

- Wilson, TD. Strangers to ourselves: Discovering the adaptive unconscious. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2002.
- Wilson TD, Dunn E. Self-knowledge: Its limits, value, and potential for improvement. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2004; 55:493–518.
- Zimmerman M. Diagnosing personality disorders: A review of issues and research methods. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 1994; 51:225–245. [PubMed: 8122959]

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency Reliabilities for Pathological Personality Traits

	Wife						Husband									
	Self-Report			Spouse-Report			Self-Report			Spouse-Report						
	M	SD	Range	alpha	M	SD	Range	alpha	M	SD	Range	alpha	M	SD	Range	alpha
Scale (# of items)																
Histrionic-Narcissistic (24)	8.98	5.86	0–31	0.83	7.04	6.50	0–33	0.88	7.11	4.73	0–24	0.80	5.38	5.38	0–35	0.86
Dependent-Avoidant (22)	11.32	7.54	1–34	0.90	10.00	7.88	0–41	0.91	8.88	6.29	0–31	0.87	6.91	5.09	0–29	0.75
Detachment (13)	6.12	3.77	0–19	0.76	5.56	4.14	0–20	0.78	6.99	3.80	0–21	0.70	5.52	4.37	1–26	0.72
Aggression-Mistrust (12)	6.27	4.95	0–22	0.86	5.51	5.12	0–24	0.88	4.30	3.25	0–15	0.75	3.67	3.62	0–18	0.81
Antisocial (7)	1.34	1.51	0–7	0.60	1.22	1.31	0–5	0.40	1.54	1.42	0–6	0.50	1.83	2.08	0–12	0.69
Obsessive-Compulsive (6)	5.10	2.55	0–12	0.59	4.23	2.75	0–15	0.62	5.16	2.63	0–12	0.61	4.44	2.67	0–13	0.62
Schizotypal (3)	1.23	1.40	0–6	0.63	1.32	1.22	0–5	0.40	1.45	1.34	0–5	0.57	1.07	1.19	0–5	0.49

N=164.

Table 2
Self-Spouse Agreement, Assumed Similarity, and Actual Similarity for Pathological Personality Traits

Scale	Actual Similarity			Agreement			Assumed Similarity		
	Husband Target	Wife Target	Total Sample	Husband Target	Wife Target	Total Sample	Husband Rater	Wife Rater	Total Sample
Histrionic-Narcissistic	0.27*	0.36**	0.32***	0.64***	0.50***	0.54***			
Dependent-Avoidant	0.39***	0.43***	0.42***	0.45***	0.40***	0.38***			
Detachment	0.40***	0.33**	0.36***	0.29**	0.52***	0.40***			
Aggression-Mistrust	0.42***	0.47***	0.47***	0.42***	0.44***	0.38***			
Antisocial	0.40***	0.32**	0.37***	0.10	0.02	0.04			
Obsessive-Compulsive	0.28*	0.40***	0.34***	0.55***	0.39***	0.48***			
Schizotypal	0.21	0.23*	0.21**	0.62***	0.54***	0.58***			

Note. N=82 couples (164 individuals).

* p<.05,

**

p<.01,

*** p<.001.