

ENNEAGRAM PERSONALITY TYPES (ENNEATYPES) AND MARITAL SATISFACTION

¹Simon K. Ndirangu, ²Sr. Sabina Mutisya, ³Sr. Jane Gikonyo

¹PhD candidate, Department of Psychology, The Counseling Psychology

²PhD, Department of Psychology, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa

³PhD, Department of Psychology, Tangaza University College

ABSTRACT

The study examined the influence of Enneagram Personality types (enneatypes) and marital satisfaction among couples in Kiambu County, Kenya. The study was based on the Satir's human validation theory that connects couples intrapersonal dynamics to marital systems functioning. The study used a quasi-experimental time series A-B-A research design. The target population was married couples within 5-20 years of marriage from Kiambu County. Multi layered sampling involving purposeful and random sampling was used to select the sample. Priori power analysis was performed to determine the minimum sample size as 44 couples for experimental and control groups each, using free G*power 3.1 software. A sample of 115 couples was randomly assigned to experimental and control group where 58 out of the 115 couples were assigned to the experimental group and 57 to control groups. A short form of standardized 60 items free Enneagram Type Indicator Test and enneatype awareness and couple satisfaction index (CSI-16) questionnaire were used in identifying enneatypes, determining enneatype awareness and marital satisfaction for all the participants in pretest and posttests. Descriptive statistics and one way ANOVA tests were used in data analysis. The study found not significant means difference in marital satisfaction between the nine enneagram personality types suggesting that enneatypes did not significantly influence total marital satisfaction. The study further found significant mean difference in 13 out of 21 marital satisfaction sub-variables between the nine personality types indicating that enneatypes influenced various marital satisfaction sub-variables though largely without enneatype awareness. The findings may be significant in managing couples marital satisfaction through policy and psychotherapeutic treatment.

Keywords: Enneatypes, Enneagram, Marital Satisfaction, Relationship, Kiambu County

THE BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Personality traits strongly influence our psychological functions such as expectations, self-perceptions, values and attitudes, and predict our reactions to people, problems and stress. In the context of marriage, partners react to each other and experiences in their relationship based on their expectations, self-perception values and attitudes to achieve marital satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Studies agreed that personality traits influenced couples marital satisfaction. However, they disagree on whether it was couple's personality type's combination or levels of personality type awareness that affected marital satisfaction negatively or positively (Carpenter 2015, Mead, 2005; Najarpourian, Fatehizadeh, Etemadi, Ghasemi, Abedi and Bahrami, 2012; Raulo's, 2016).

In a study of 164 married people in Iran, Najarpourian, et al (2012) established that people with some personality traits enjoyed marital satisfaction more than others. Low neuroticism and high extroversion scored high in marital satisfaction while high neuroticism and low extroversion reported low marital satisfaction. They found out that each partner in a marital relationship had a different perception of what was needed for a satisfying life and for the fulfillment of the three basic needs of security, connection, and autonomy depending on his/her personality.

Gonzaga, Campo and Bradbury (2007) attributed relationship satisfaction to the combination of personality and interpersonal processes. In their study of dating and newlywed couples they identified that couples emotional similarity mediated association between personality and relationship satisfaction. These results indicate that similarity and convergence in personality may benefit relationships by promoting similarity and convergence in partners' shared emotional experiences.

Mead, (2005) corroborated findings by Najarpourian, et al (2012) in his study on personalities predictors of relationship satisfaction among 3436 engaged and married couples. The research studied seven personality traits being neuroticism, depression, Kindness, impulsivity, flexibility, self-esteem and extraversion. Kindness, flexibility and self-esteem were found to have a significant positive actor and partner effects for both males and females while neuroticism, depression and impulsivity had a significant negative actor and partner effects on both males and females. Extraversion was found to have insignificant effects on relationship satisfaction. It was found to contribute little in relationship satisfaction contrary to Najarpourian, et al. findings. Mead, and Najarpourian, et al confirmed the role of couple's personality traits on marital satisfaction. However, individual's Enneagram personality type is a combination of many personality traits and tends to behave differently at different levels of functioning. There is need for a study that would involve the whole person rather than specific traits, a gap the current study will fill by use of enneatypes.

Other studies attributed marital satisfaction to personality awareness rather than personality traits (Daniels, 2015; Erker, J. 2017; Raulo's, 2016.). Raulo's (2016) report on a study of 457 couples from Greece on how couples combination related to couples relationship found out that all enneagram personality types' combinations can be happy together or struggle in relationship depending on their levels of self-awareness. This assertion brought hope to couples, whose marital dissatisfaction was based on differences in their personalities. The findings brought optimism that it was possible to reverse marital dissatisfaction by enhancing personality awareness. This study was correlational and conclusions were made based on effects of enneatype awareness on individuals rather than in a marriage context. These assertions therefore needed to be tested empirically in a marital context, which was the aim of the current study.

Carpenter (2015) disagreed with Najarpourian et al. (2012 and Mead (2005) on personality types. His findings were corroborated by Raulos (2016) findings that any enneatype could be happy or together. Carpenter conducted a survey of 324 married couples recruited online in United States of America. The purpose was to find out whether enneagram personality types could be used to predict marital satisfaction compared to couples attachment styles: (a) secure attachment style, (b) mismatched attachment style and the other who demonstrates a secure attachment style, and (c) insecure attachment style. Carpenter found that attachment styles influenced marital satisfaction but enneatypes and interaction effect of Enneatypes and attachment types was not significant for global marital satisfaction. In his study Carpenter focused on enneatypes with a focus on interpersonal dynamics between personality types. Since marital satisfaction is perception of individual spouse there is need to focus on intrapersonal dynamics of each couple. A focus on each enneatype would help to capture the intrapersonal dynamics.

According to Daniels (2015), the differences among partners in marriage presented both synergistic and conflicting elements in a marital relationship. Synergistic elements helped the relationship to flourish while the conflicting attributes were the main sources of conflicts, disagreements, and challenges. When the partners were unaware of the differences and unique marital experiences, their deliberate efforts to change to healthy levels were limited. Unaware of intrapersonal dynamics in their personalities, they will worsen the crisis as they operate with their naturally occurring personality resources (Bowen, 2017). This research was correlational rather than experimental. Although the study was focused on intimate relationships, respondents were involved as individuals not as couples. There was need for an intervention research to explore strategies of helping couples to overcome challenges posed by personality differences.

Erker, (2017) in his study of Human Validation Process Theory asserted that a healthy self, translated to healthy marital interactions and psychological health could not be achieved without adequate level of self-awareness. This is a tradition in practice of Human Validation Theory in

recognizing that intrapersonal factors influence marital satisfaction. This assertion was supported by Wright (2016), who identified Enneagram personality typology as a good tool for facilitating self-awareness. With awareness, couples were able to self-explore and made changes in their lives and coped effectively with weaknesses of their enneatype and reduced stress in marriage. The more self-aware as explained in Human Validation theory (Brother, 2011) one was of the natural forces and pressures in his/her enneatype, the healthier and balanced he/she was in a marital relationship. It was on this premise the current study was founded.

Globally, there were many studies on marital satisfaction. Most of the studies had focused on defining marital satisfaction, describing factors that influenced marital satisfaction and effects of levels of satisfaction on couple's relationship. In their studying 100 Brazilian couples, Rebelo, Silva, and Brito (2014) concluded that marital satisfaction is a complex multidimensional concept that is based on socio-cultural factors such as culturally inherited values and practices, religion, state laws and education. These factors shape individuals' as well as couple's perception on satisfaction. This study identified the need to consider couple's socio-cultural context in order to understand their perception of marital satisfaction. The study failed to recognize the influence of partners' individual characteristics on marital satisfaction.

Dissatisfaction in marriage causes pain to couples (Collard, 2006). Dissatisfied couples live in desperate conditions such as, domestic violence, infidelity, neglect of marital roles, partners' emotional distress, suicide, murder of partners and children, psychosomatic symptoms in partners, separation and divorce as consequences of betrayal, anger and revenge (Rebelo, Silva, & Brito, 2014). In a study of 48 countries, W.H.O. (2002) reported that 10% - 69% of women reported being physically assaulted by an intimate male partner during their lifetime and 40% - 70% of all women who were murdered were killed by their current or former husbands or partners.

According to Mugambi, (1989) and Mbiti, (2003) Africans placed great value to children as a source of marital satisfaction. They identified other factors as effective performance of culturally defined gender roles in supporting each other and meeting each other's needs, connectedness with extended family and community and respect accorded to the couple in general. They acknowledged that many changes were being experienced in African marriages but maintained that many marriages still adhered to traditional perception of satisfaction. As marriages shift from collectivism to individualism there is increased need of understanding intrapersonal dynamics and how they influence interpersonal relationship in marriage.

The state of marriages in Kenya needed to be given more attention. Reports from international and national institutions and researches indicated that symptoms of marital dissatisfaction are

rampant in Kenya (The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), 2014 (a); KNBS, 2014(b); National Crime Research Center, (2014); Mutimba, 2016).

KNBS (2014a) reported an increase in divorce and separation cases from 2.2% in 1989 census to 3.0% in 2009 census. Any increase in separations and divorces in a community calls for attention. It signified reducing levels of marital dissatisfaction. Based on the psychosocial effects of separation and divorces and those other marriages that were experiencing dissatisfaction but still struggling to live together there was need to search for a solution to marital dissatisfaction.

According to National Crime Research Center, (2014) conducted a descriptive cross sectional study using mixed QUAN-QUAL method. The aim was to identify prevalence and pattern of Gender based violence in Kenya. The population was males and females between the age of 12-64 years. A sample of 1152 individuals was used of whom 921 were women and 231 men. The findings indicated that 49.3% of married women compared to 50% of married men were experiencing domestic violence from intimate partners. This was higher compared to domestic violence experienced by men and women in other marital statuses. The divorced and separated had a frequency of 39%, single 21.6% and widowed 3.7% for women. For men divorced and separated had a frequency of 33.3%, single 50% and widowed 3.7%. The findings indicated that men and women in marriages were experiencing more domestic violence in marriages. Such violence is both a cause and a symptom on marital dissatisfaction. The study did not focus on intrapersonal dynamics in gender based violence or ways of improving the situation.

Results by National Crime Research Center were corroborated by KNBS (2014b) report. Analyzing the 2009 national census results it revealed 56.6% of females and 11.2% of males experienced physical violence in their intimate relationships and 55.2 % of females and 36.5 % of males experienced sexual violence in their intimate relationship in Kenya. Mutimba (2016) observed that 4000 cases of domestic violence were reported within the first six months of the year 2016 to Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) pointed to a similar situation.

Mbunga (2010) conducted an exploratory study on 40 couples at African England Church in Jericho Nairobi on marital satisfaction. The results indicated that 88.75% of participants were experiencing significant global marital dissatisfaction. With such a high frequency of marital dissatisfaction in the population gender based violence remained a threat. The recent upsurge of murders and suicide in marriages often reported in mass media in Kenya is a worrying trend that can be attributed to documented high rate of marital dissatisfaction. Mbunga's study focused on a limited population. The study however highlights marital satisfaction as an area that needed more attention to improve on couples' satisfaction.

In Kiambu County separation and divorce rates were significantly higher than the national rate at 4.5% of its married population which was 1.5% above the national rate based on 2009 census (KNBS, 2014). The higher separation and divorce rates indicated higher rate of marital dissatisfaction. Kamatu, and M'arimi (2017) observed that young marriages from Ruiru in Kiambu County were experiencing marital dissatisfaction leading to alarming rate of separations shortly after marriage. Kamatu and M'arimi conducted an exploratory study of 234 using descriptive mixed method on married young couples on the parental influence on marital dissatisfaction among young couples. They concluded that parents in Ruiru sub-county in Kiambu strongly contribute to the instability of their own children's marriages through physical interference and their philosophies. They identified spouses' personalities as intervening variables in their study. This conclusion confirms that marital dissatisfaction is sometimes inherited from parental generations (Tumuti et al, 2012). They recommended further study to cover Kiambu county and to focus on issues they highlighted in the study. Such multigenerational transmissions as identified in the study are ingrained in individual's personality (Wright, 2016). The study did not focus on how the emerging challenges could be addressed. A focus on couple's enneatypes awareness may expose such dynamics and therefore empower couples to change and improve their marital satisfaction for the current and future generations.

Wamue and Njoroge (2011) painted a grim picture of marital situation in Kiambu. They conducted a descriptive baseline study of 200 respondents in Kiambu County on gender role and power relations. Information from respondents was corroborated by interviews from key opinion leaders from the location of study. In about 70% of the homes they surveyed, male adults were experiencing marital stress. The husbands' needs were neglected where they were denied basic things like food, shelter and sex. In such a situation marital dissatisfaction is eminent.

Wamue and Njoroge reported that 80% of surveyed women had made decisions about children single handedly and managed families. Considering the central role of children in marital satisfaction in Africa and patriarchal traditions, serious conflicts arose. Power struggles in such marriages resulted to rampant gender based violence and infidelity, separations, divorces, suicide and murder (Wamue & Njoroge, 2011). Couples resulted to blame game instead of resolving issues. The situation called for an intervention based research to come up with the remedy to the problem of dissatisfaction in marriages in Kiambu County. The survey generally captured the challenges experienced by marriages. Intrapersonal dynamics were not focused on. There is also need to develop solutions for the challenges being experienced. There was therefore need for an intervention study with a focus on intrapersonal dynamics a gap that the current study would bridge.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To establish couples enneatypes
2. To identify couples' levels of marital satisfaction
3. To find out couples enneatype's influence on marital satisfaction with and without enneatypes awareness

METHODOLOGY

This study used a quasi-experimental time series A-B-A research design. The quasi-experiment design was used because it allowed comparison of results and control of variables since it was neither practical nor feasible to assign subjects randomly to treatment (Christensen, Johnson and Turner, 2015). The target population was married couples in Kiambu County. Multi layered sampling involving purposeful and random sampling was used to select the sample. Priori power analysis was performed to determine the minimum sample size as 44 couples for experimental and control groups each, using free G*power 3.1 software (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner & Lang, 2009). A sample of 115 couples was randomly assigned to experimental and control group where 58 out of the 115 couples were assigned to the experimental group and 57 to control groups. A short form of 60 items free Enneagram Type Indicator Test and enneatype awareness and couple satisfaction questionnaire were used in identifying enneatypes, determining enneatype awareness and marital satisfaction for all the participants in pretest and posttests. Descriptive statistics and one way ANOVA tests were used in data analysis. Results were presented in tables, graphs and text.

FINDINGS

Demographic data

The sample demographic data comprised of sample size, age of couples, age of marriage and educational level. The respondents were also required to whether they had attended personality training and counseling sessions before. Data was analysed and summarized in the table 1.

Table 1: Sample characteristics

Variable		Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3	
		Experim ental	Control	Experim ental	Control	Experim ental	Control
Sample size	Valid	116	114	116	108	108	104

Age	20-29 years	8.6%	7.0%	8.6%	7.4%	8.3%	7.7%
	30-39 years	46.6%	50.9%	46.6%	50.0%	47.2%	50.0%
	40-49 years	39.7%	37.7%	39.7%	38.0%	38.9%	37.5%
	50-59 years	5.2%	4.4%	5.2%	4.6%	5.6%	4.8%
Age of marriage	5-10 years	34.5%	28.1%	34.5%	29.6%	35.2%	30.8%
	11-15 years	31.0%	38.6%	31.0%	37.0%	31.5%	34.6%
	16-20 years	34.5%	33.3%	34.5%	33.3%	33.3%	34.6%
Level of education	Secondary	24.1%	17.5%	24.1%	18.5%	23.1%	19.2%
	Certificate	20.7%	31.6%	20.7%	30.6%	21.3%	31.7%
	Diploma	26.7%	28.1%	26.7%	27.8%	27.8%	26.9%
	Bachelor	23.3%	20.2%	23.3%	20.4%	22.2%	19.2%
	Masters	5.2%	2.6%	5.2%	2.8%	5.6%	2.9%
	PhD	0.0%	05	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0%
Personal ity training	Yes	86.1%	92.1%	0.0	92.6%	0.0	92.3
	No	13.9%	7.9%	100%	7.4%	100%	7.7%
Counseli ng sessions	Yes	77.4%	86.8%	77.4%	87.0%	76.9%	87.5%
	No	22.6%	13.2%	22.6%	13.0%	23.1%	12.5%

The sample comprised of 58 couples (116 individuals) for the experimental in phase 1, 58 couples (116 individuals) in phase 2 and 54 couples (108 individuals) in phase 3. For the experimental group the sample comprised of 57 couples (114 individuals) in phase 1, 54 couples (108) in phase 2 and 52 couples (104 individuals) in phase 3 (see table 1). The sample size was above the minimum sample size of 44 couples per group for effective hypothesis testing, arrived at after the priori power analysis. Since they were couples the gender distribution was 50-50.

Their age was between 20-59 years. For both experimental and control groups the age group with the highest number of respondents was 30-39 years followed by 40-49 years a good representation of domestic violence, separation and divorce rates distribution among the Kenyan population (KDHS, 2010; KNBS, 2017). See table 1. The changes in percentages were due to some couples dropping out being 6 and 4 respondents in age groups 30-39 years and 40-49 years respectively. The homogeneity in age between the control and experimental groups provided a control for the age as a factor in marital satisfaction.

The age of marriage ranged from 5-20 years. The age marriage group was identified as a period when marital satisfaction decline (Musau, 2016; Rice and Stinet, 2016). Respondents were fairly distributed between 5-10, 11-15 and 16-20 year age of marriage groups with a range of 3.5% for experimental group phases 1 and 2 and 3.4% for experimental group phase 3 and a range of 10.5%, 7.4% and 3.8% in control group phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively. See table 1. The changes in percentages and ranges were due to some couples dropping out. The fair distribution controlled the age factor between the control and experimental groups.

Their educational level ranged from High school to Master Degree (see table 1). Secondary school education was the minimum level of education in the study to assure potential for understanding the psychoeducation treatment materials within a restricted period of time. In the experimental group majority of respondents were at the diploma level of education with 26.7% in phases 1 and 2 and 27.8% in phase 3, followed by Bachelor Degree with 23.3% in phases 1 and 2 and 22.2% in phase 3, secondary level 24.1% in phases 1 and 2 and 23.1% in phase 3 and certificate level with 20.7% in phases 1 and 2 and 21.3% in phase 3. The control group had most respondents with certificate education at 31.6%, 30.6% and 31.7% for phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively, then diploma at 28.1%, 27.8 and 26.9% for phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively, Bachelor Degree at 20.2%, 20.4% and 19.2% for phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively and secondary education 17.5%, 18.5% and 19.2% for phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Masters level had a few while none of the respondents had a PhD level of education. The distribution of the sample across the educational levels between the experimental and control group offered a control for the study. The differences in percentage frequency in different phases of experimental and control groups were due to some couples dropping out.

The study found that generally personality psychoeducation was rarely used as a method to improve marital satisfaction among couples. Overwhelming majority 86.1% against 13.9% of the experimental group phase 1 had not attended any personality psychoeducation. In phases 2 and 3 all reported they had trained in reference to the treatment they had received on Enneagram personality. In the control group 92.1%, 92.6% and 92.3% had not attended any personality psychoeducation for phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The initial homogeneity on personality

psychoeducation in the experimental and control groups was a control for this study in prior personality psychoeducation as a factor in marital satisfaction.

The study also found that generally counseling sessions were as well rarely used as a method to improve marital satisfaction among couples though they were slightly more used than personality psychoeducation. Majority of respondents being 77.4% against 22.6% of the experimental group phase 1 and 2 had not attended any counseling session. In phases 3 76.9% had not attended counseling sessions. In the control group 86.8%, 87.7% and 87.5% had not attended any counseling sessions for phases 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The slight changes in frequency of respondent were due to some couples dropping out. Considering that KNBS 2017 reported that about 40% females and 23% males who were of secondary school level of education and experienced violence sought help it was concluded that majority of respondents sought help from non-professionals in psychotherapeutic intervention on issues occasioned by dissatisfaction in marriage.

Confirmed Enneagram Personality type (self)

One’s own Enneagram Personality type was tested using a 60 item Enneagram Personality Test and scored online. The results were analyzed into nine Personality types: 1) perfectionist, 2) Helper, 3) Achiever, 4) Artist, 5) Thinker, 6) Loyalist, 7) Generalist, 8) Leader and 9) Peace Maker. The respondents in the experimental group were given the results at each phase but the respondents at the control group were given the results after phase 3 during training. The findings were summarized in table 2. The aim was to identify respondent’s Enneagram Personality types which formed a basis for accurate personality awareness. They were also compared to marital satisfaction to control for their influence on the study results.

Table 2: Confirmed Enneagram personality type

Personality type (self)	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3	
	Experiment al (%)	Control (%)	Experime ntal (%)	Contro l (%)	Experiment al (%)	Control (%)
Perfectionist	21.6	13.2	20.7	11.1	20.4	10.6
Helper	1.7	4.4	2.6	4.6	1.9	4.8
Achiever	6.0	10.5	6.0	11.1	6.5	11.5
Artist	2.6	7.0	1.7	7.4	1.9	7.7
Thinker	6.9	18.4	6.9	19.4	7.4	20.2
Loyalist	25.0	19.3	22.4	17.6	21.3	18.3
Generalist	10.3	13.2	11.2	13.9	12.0	12.5
Leader	5.2	1.8	6.9	1.9	5.6	1.0

Peace maker	20.7	12.3	21.6	13.0	23.1	13.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	116	114	116	108	108	104

The Perfectionist, Loyalist, Generalist and the peace maker had the highest frequency in the experimental group with 21.6%, 25.0%, 10.3% and 20.7% respectively. The helper had the least with 1.7%, then Artist 2.6%, Leader 5.2%, Achiever 6.3% and Thinker 6.9%. In the control group, the Loyalist had the highest with 19.3%, Thinker 18.4%, perfectionist and Generalist 13.2% and Peace Maker 12.3%. The Leader had 1.8%, Helper 4.4% and Artist 7.0% and therefore they were consistently low compared with the experimental group. See table 2. The personalities were consistent through the phases except for few changes indicating the validity of the personality test (see table 2). The results suggested that the respondents validly and reliably responded to the Enneagram Personality Questionnaire. They also suggested that Enneagram Personality types were not evenly distributed among the population especially considering the consistently low frequency in some personality types. It was observed that Enneagram personality types were not influenced by increasing awareness.

One’s own Enneagram Personality type and marital satisfaction

One way ANOVA tests were conducted to establish the influence of one’s own Enneagram Personality type on marital satisfaction. The one way ANOVA tests were conducted for control group three phases of data correction and experimental group pretreatment phase (phase 1), treatment phase (phase 2) and one month after treatment phase (phase 3). The means were compared for 10 conditions of the One’s own Enneagram Personality type - 1) I don’t know, 2) the Helper, 3) the Achiever, 4) the Artist and 5) the Thinker, 6) the Loyalist, 7) the Generalist, 8) the Leader, 9) the Peace Maker and 10) the Perfectionist. Tukey’s HSD post hoc test was conducted for the significant means of total marital satisfaction index. The tests included marital sub-variables- happiness level, frequency of positive thoughts, strength of relationship, warmth and comfort in relationship, understanding in communication, the extent to which communication brought togetherness, marital reward, extent to which personal needs were being met, whether original expectation were being met, perceived satisfaction and level of emotional positivity on six marital aspects- interest, goodness, commitment, confidence in marriage, motivation, and excitement. The means were compared at a confidence level of 95% and significance level $p < 0.05$. The aim was to determine the extent to which one’s own Enneagram Personality type influenced marital satisfaction. The results were tabulated in table 3.

Table 3: One's own Enneagram personality type and marital satisfaction

Enneagram personality type and marital satisfaction	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3	
	Experim ental (P<0.05)	Control (P<0.05)	Experim ental (P<0.05)	Control (P<0.05)	Experim ental (P<0.05)	Control (P<0.05)
Happiness Level	F(8,107)=2.861,P=.006**	F(8,105)=2.874,P=.006*	F(8,107)=1.432,P=.192	F(8,99)=.373,P=.22*	F(8,99)=1.010,P=.434	F(8,95)=.790,P=.089
Positive thoughts (frequency)	F(8,107)=1.718,P=.102	F(8,105)=.676,P=.711	F(8,107)=1.665,P=.115	F(8,99)=.097,P=.72	F(8,99)=1.321,P=.242	F(8,95)=.22,P=.837
Relationship Strength	F(8,107)=1.585,P=.138	F(8,105)=3.124,P=.003*	F(8,107)=2.026,P=.050	F(8,99)=.628,P=.01*	F(8,99)=1.853,P=.076	F(8,95)=2.131,P=.040*
Warmth and Comfort	F(8,107)=2.722,P=.009**	F(8,105)=3.127,P=.003*	F(8,107)=2.973,P=.005*	F(8,99)=.809,P=.08*	F(8,99)=1.661,P=.117	F(8,95)=1.993,P=.055
Total relationship Index	F(8,107)=2.719,P=.009**	F(8,105)=4.620,P=.000*	F(8,107)=2.586,P=.013*	F(8,99)=.948,P=.00*	F(8,99)=1.640,P=.123	F(8,95)=2.997,P=.005*
Understanding in communication	F(8,107)=.750,P=.47	F(8,105)=3.549,P=.001*	F(8,107)=1.148,P=.338	F(8,99)=.375,P=.02*	F(8,99)=1.571,P=.143	F(8,95)=3.235,P=.003*
Communication on togetherness	F(8,107)=1.148,P=.338	F(8,105)=1.040,P=.411	F(8,107)=1.850,P=.076	F(8,99)=.270,P=.68	F(8,99)=2.254,P=.029	F(8,95)=1.527,P=.158
Total communication index	F(8,107)=.937,P=.489	F(8,105)=1.025,P=.422	F(8,107)=1.456,P=.182	F(8,99)=.084,P=.81	F(8,99)=1.510,P=.163	F(8,95)=1.018,P=.428
Marital reward	F(8,107)=2.471,P=.017*	F(8,105)=3.888,P=.000*	F(8,107)=2.660,P=.011*	F(8,99)=.159,P=.03*	F(8,99)=2.773,P=.008	F(8,95)=4.796,P=.000*
Personal needs	F(8,107)=2.987,P=.006**	F(8,105)=3.349,P=.001*	F(8,107)=.464,P=.622	F(8,99)=.844,P=.000*	F(8,99)=1.336,P=.000*	F(8,95)=2.914,P=.000*

	005**	=.002*	879	07*	P=.235	6*
Meeting original expectations	F(8,107)=.938,P=.489	F(8,105)=2.287,P=.027*	F(8,107)=1.296,P=.253	F(8,99)=3.070,P=.004*	F(8,99)=2.142,P=.039	F(8,95)=2.409,P=.021*
Perceived satisfaction	F(8,107)=1.418,P=.197	F(8,105)=3.628,P=.001	F(8,107)=1.361,P=.222	F(8,99)=3.848,P=.001*	F(8,99)=.924,P=.500	F(8,95)=3.578,P=.001*
Total Needs Index	F(8,107)=.938,P=.488	F(8,105)=2.386,P=.021*	F(8,107)=2.627,P=.011*	F(8,99)=2.209,P=.033*	F(8,99)=1.765,P=.093	F(8,95)=1.291,P=.258
Emotional Positivity Interest	F(8,107)=2.033,P=.049*	F(8,105)=1.585,P=.138	F(8,107)=.886,P=.531	F(8,99)=.958,P=.474	F(8,99)=1.449,P=.186	F(8,95)=1.846,P=.078
Emotional Positivity Goodness	F(8,107)=2.300,P=.026*	F(8,105)=1.694,P=.108	F(8,107)=2.355,P=.023*	F(8,99)=2.140,P=.039	F(8,99)=.899,P=.521	F(8,95)=1.675,P=.114
Emotional Positivity Commitment	F(8,107)=2.501,P=.016*	F(8,105)=1.733,P=.099	F(8,107)=1.194,P=.309	F(8,99)=1.398,P=.207	F(8,99)=1.126,P=.353	F(8,95)=2.463,P=.08*
Emotional Positivity Confidence	F(8,107)=1.502,P=.165	F(8,105)=2.909,P=.006*	F(8,107)=1.178,P=.319	F(8,99)=1.434,P=.192	F(8,99)=.641,P=.742	F(8,95)=2.580,P=.04*
Emotional Positivity Motivation	F(8,107)=3.010,P=.004**	F(8,105)=1.806,P=.084	F(8,107)=1.372,P=.217	F(8,99)=2.299,P=.053	F(8,99)=2.232,P=.984	F(8,95)=1.909,P=.067
Emotional Positivity Excitation	F(8,107)=2.366,P=.022*	F(8,105)=2.315,P=.025*	F(8,107)=1.558,P=.146	F(8,99)=2.947,P=.005	F(8,99)=.498,P=.855	F(8,95)=2.361,P=.03*
Total Positivity Index	F(8,107)=2.339,P=.023*	F(8,105)=1.151,P=.336	F(8,107)=1.100,P=.369	F(8,99)=1.602,P=.134	F(8,99)=.512,P=.845	F(8,95)=1.691,P=.111
Total Satisfaction index	F(8,107)=1.904,P=.067	F(8,105)=2.022,P=.051	F(8,107)=1.934,P=.062	F(8,99)=2.142,P=.039	F(8,99)=.966,P=.467	F(8,95)=1.857,P=.076

* Where P value is $P \geq 0.010$ and above, ** where p value is $0.001 \leq P < 0.010$ and *** where p value is $p = .000$.

There was not significantly deferent means for total marital satisfaction scores between the ten conditions of one's own Enneagram personality type at the significance level $P < .05$ within the control group (see table 3). The results indicated that One's own Enneagram Personality type did not influence total marital satisfaction index in all the ten conditions.

From one way ANOVA tests on marital satisfaction sub-variables there were significant different means for some sub-variables between one's own Enneagram Personality types at the significance level $P = .05$ within the control and experimental groups. The findings suggested that Enneagram personality types influence specific marital sub-variables.

The means for Marital Reward were significantly different between one's Enneagram Personality type consistently in control and experimental groups (see table 3). This indicated that with or without awareness one's own Enneagram Personality influences how they assessed marital rewards.

Post hoc test on the means of marital reward and marital satisfaction for experimental phase 1 indicated that the achiever ($M=3.29$, $SD=.488$) and Loyalist ($M=2.90$, $SD=.618$) were significantly different from Generalist ($M=2.17$, $SD=.718$) at $P=0.17$ at $P > .05$. For experimental group phase 2 Artist ($M=4.00$, $SD=.000$) was significantly different from generalist ($M=2.62$, $SD=.650$) at $P=.027$. In phase 3 Achiever (3.57 , $SD=.535$) was significantly different from generalist $M=2.62$, $SD650$ at $P=0.004$. The results indicated that the Achiever, the artist and the loyalist were more likely to experience marriage as rewarding than the generalist.

Happiness Level, Relationship strength, warmth and comfort, Total relationship, understanding in communication, Personal Needs, Meeting Original Expectations, Total Needs Index and Emotional Positivity on Confidence in Relationship, Excitation, and Motivation were significantly different between one's own Enneagram Personality types at the experimental phase 1 and in control group in different phases). However the means were not significantly different in experimental phase 3 and or phase 2 (see table 3). The means plots for the subvariables in experimental group 1 were presented in figures 1-9.




Figure 1: Own enneatype and happiness level




Figure 2: Own enneatype and relationship strength




Figure 3: Own enneatype and communication and understanding




Figure 4: Own enneatype and total relationship




Figure 5: Own enneatype and understanding in communication




Figure 6: Own enneatype and personal needs




Figure 7: Own enneatype and original needs




Figure 8: Own enneatype and personality positivity




Figure 9: Own enneatype and Total needs index

The results suggested that one's own personality type influenced the nine marital sub-variables when the couples operated without Enneagram Personality awareness. With the awareness the influence of one's own personality on the sub-variables reduced. No personality type was consistently high or low in all the nine sub-variables. The artist personality operated at the extremes. The perfectionist, thinker, loyalist and the peace maker generally operated at the average. The results suggested that each personality type needed a unique focus on the marital sub-variables. The uniqueness could be explained by each enneatypes strength and liabilities.

The means for Communication Brought Togetherness and Meeting Original Expectations were not significantly different between one's own Enneagram Personality types in experimental group in phase 1 and phase 2 but in phase 3 the means for the two sub-variables were significantly different between one's enneatypes types (see table 3). The results indicated that enneatype interacted with awareness to influence the sub-variables.

DISCUSSION

The findings suggested that couples enneatypes did not influence total marital satisfaction. To this end the findings supported Carpenter (2015) findings that enneatypes did not influence marital satisfaction. Considering the holistic concept of marital satisfaction the findings

contradicted Najarpourian, et al, (2012) report that personality influenced marital satisfaction. Najarpourian et al. focused on personality traits. Any one enneatype is a combination of traits and therefore Najarlourian's et al. findings could not apply.

One's own Enneagram Personality type significantly influenced 12 out of 21 marital sub-variables (see table 3). One's own personality influenced marital reward sub-variable with and without awareness. The findings suggested that the achiever and the loyalist were more satisfied on marital rewards than the generalist in Experimental group phase 1. In experimental phase 2 the artist was significantly satisfied than the generalist while in phase 3 the achiever was significantly satisfied than the generalist. The findings on sub-variables supported Najarpourian, et al, (2012) findings that personality influenced marital satisfaction but only in some aspects. However no enneatype that scored high in both sub-variables. Enneatypes had a potential for some sub-variables than others indicating their areas of strengths and liabilities. Daniels (2015) identified strengths and challenges each couple would experience on the basis of nine enneatypes. The findings supported the current findings that couples are good in some sub-variables but not in others.

The means for 11 sub-variables were consistently influenced by one's own Enneagram Personality where respondents did not have enneagram personality awareness. The sub-variables were: Happiness Level, Relationship Strength, Warmth and comfort, Total relationship Index, Understanding in Communication, Personal Needs, Meeting Original Expectations, Total Needs Index and Emotional Positivity on Confidence in Relationship, Excitation, and Motivation. The results disagreed with Watson, et al. (2000) that individual's personalities played a lesser role in marital satisfaction. Though holistically enneatypes did not influence marital satisfaction influence of enneatypes on some sub-variables could not be ignored. The influence of personality on the 11 sub-variables would impact on the marital relationship and couples sense of marital functionality substantially. Since many couples marry without formal training on their personalities Najarpourian, et al, (2012) findings remain relevant because the 11 sub-variables were being influenced by personality types before the treatment in control group and experimental group phase 1 (see table 3). The findings were pointing at enneatype awareness as a tool that could be used in marital satisfaction.

Communication Bringing Togetherness and Meeting Original Expectations sub-variables were not influenced by personalities before awareness in experimental group phase 1. After the awareness in experimental group 3, awareness interacted with one's own Enneagram personality type to a significant influence on the two sub-variables. The findings were supported by McGuiness (2007) conclusion that knowledge of enneatypes allows couples to relate to each other with greater empathy and compassion leading to lesser conflicts and clearer

communication. In such a context couples would be more authentic and constructive. Their needs and expectations would be clearer. Realistic expectations would be met and unrealistic expectations changed. The interaction therefore made couples to respond to individuals unique needs.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, one's own Enneagram Personality type did not have a significant influence on total marital satisfaction index. However it significantly influenced 12 out of 21 marital sub-variables when couples operated without Enneagram Personality awareness. With awareness the influence of one's own Enneagram Personality on the marital sub-variables it influenced reduced to insignificant levels. In the contrary, awareness levels in experimental group phase 3 influenced one's own Enneagram personality type to a significant influence on Communication Bringing Togetherness and Meeting Original Expectations sub-variables. One's own Enneagram Personality type was potentially a confounding variable for the current study only in 1 out of 21 marital satisfaction sub-variables. Any influence on the dependent variable was therefore insignificant and therefore was not a confounding variable to the current study.

REFERENCES

- Bowen, J. (2017). *Relation intimacy and the enneagram: resource or stress points on the journey to marriage satisfaction*. Retrieved from sexualintimacyboulder.com
- Brothers, B. J. (Ed.). (2011). *Virginia Satir: Foundational ideas*. New York: Routledge.
- Carpenter, D. G. (2015). *Resonating personality types for couples: An Enneagram application for predicting marital satisfaction*. PhD dissertation: Walden university. <http://scholarsworks.waldenu.edu/dissertation>
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B. & Turner, L. A. (2015). *Research methods, designs and analysis* (12th ed.). Boston, Pearson Education Limited.
- Collard, D. (2006). Research on well - being some advice from Jeremy Bentham. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 36 (3), 330 - 354.
- Daniels, D. (2015). *The 45 combinations of enneagram types relationships: How each pairing can disintegrate or Thrive*. Retrieved from drdaviddaniels.com/relationships-intimacy/enneagram-types-in-relationship
- Erker, J. (2017). A Summary of a Qualitative Study of Satir Family Therapy: Theoretical and Practical Developments over the Past 30 Years. *Satir International Journal*, 5 (1), 76-81.

- Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, and Lang (2009) Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods* 2009, 41 (4), 1149-1160 doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149
- FIDA (K), (2011). *Domestic Violence in Kenya: Report of Baseline Survey among Women in Nairobi*; Nairobi, FIDA (K).
- Funk J. L. & Rogge R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *J Fam Psychol.* 21(4): 572-83. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572.
- Graham, J. M., Diebels, K. J., & Barnow Z. B. (2011). The Reliability of Relationship Satisfaction: A Reliability Generalization Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25 (1), 39 – 48.
- Kamatu, K. D. & M'arimi, E. K. (2017). Parental influence on the marital instability of the young couples aged between twenty and thirty-five years in Ruiru Sub-county, Kiambu County-Kenya. *International journal of innovative research & development.* 6 (4), 112-121.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2014). *Marital status by county and districts*. Nairobi, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2017). *Men and women in Kenya: Facts and figures*. Nairobi, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- McGuinness, M. (2007). *An introduction to the enneagram*. Retrieved from www.wishfulthinking.co.uk/Blog
- Mbiti J. S. (2003). *An introduction to African religion 2nd ed.* Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Mbunga, J. M. (2010). An exploratory study of marital satisfaction of forty couples at the Africa Inland Church, Jericho, Nairobi, with the view to inform premarital counseling practices in Kenya Retrieved from <https://trove.nla.gov.au/version/237918019>
- Mead, N. L., (2005). Personality Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction among Engaged and Married Couples: An Analysis of Actor and Partner Effects. *All Theses and Dissertations.* 552. Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/552>.

- Musau J. M. (2016). *Demographic and spatial-temporal dimensions of marital instability and its effects on the family livelihoods in Machakos County, Kenya*. Doctoral Dissertation, Kenyatta University School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nairobi, Kenya
- Najarpourian, S., Fatehizadeh M., Etemadi, O., Ghasemi, V., Abedi M. R., & Bahrami, F. (2012). Personality types and marital satisfaction: *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*. 4 (5), 372-38.
- Raulo, L. (2016). *The enneagram in relationships: What types go well together?* Retrieved from www.lynnroulo.com/enneagram-love-types-go-well-together
- Rebelo, K., Silva, Jr. M. D., & Brito, R. C. S. (2014). Fundamental factors in marital satisfaction: An assessment of Brazilian couple. *Psychology*, 5(4), 777-784.
- Schneider, J. P. & Corn, R., (2013). *Understand Yourself, Understand Your Partner: The Essential Enneagram Guide to a Better Relationship*. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform
- Stinnett, N., Stinnett, N., DeGenova, M. K. & Rice, F. P. (2016). *Intimate Relationships, Marriages, and Families 9th Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tumuti, D. W., Ileri, A. M., & Tumuti, J. W. (2012). Relationship guidance sources, fear and reasons for marriage among young urban christians in Kenya. *International journal of prevention and treatment*, 1(2), 31-39.
- Wamue, N. G. & Njoroge, W. N. (2011). Gender paradigm shift within the family structure in kiambu, Kenya: *African Journal of Social Sciences* 1 (3), 10- 20.
- Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D. (2000). General traits of personality and affectivity as predictors of satisfaction in intimate relationships: Evidence from self- and partner-ratings. *Journal of Personality and social psychology*, 68(3), 413-449.
- World Health Organization, (2002). *Facts on Intimate Partner Violence*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/factsheets/en/ipvfacts.pdf.
- Wright, C. (2016). *The conscious couple relationship; a new orientation of self-awareness, skills and tools for sustained love & harmony—Based on the spiritual & inner Enneagram*. Virginia: McLean.