

RELATIONSHIP ENHANCEMENT WITH PREMARITAL DYADS:  
AN ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS ON COMPATIBILITY

by

Ingrid E. Sladeczek

---

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the  
SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
WITH A MAJOR IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY RELATIONS  
In the Graduate College  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1983

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: *Angela E. Harkness*

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

*Carl A. Ridley*                      *June 7, 1983*  
Carl A. Ridley, Ph.D.                      Date  
Professor of Child Development  
and Family Relations

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my mentor and thesis director, Dr. Carl Ridley, for his continual guidance and support for the past two years. His expertise and insight were invaluable for the completion of my thesis. Further, I would like to thank him for the encouragement and motivation he has given me to become a competent young scholar.

I would also like to thank my co-chairperson, Dr. Art Avery for serving on my committee. His constructive suggestions were very helpful. In addition, I had the opportunity to exchange thoughts and ideas with him, beyond what was possible in the classroom setting.

In addition, I am very grateful to my co-chairperson, Dr. George Domino for serving on my committee. His helpful suggestions and continued support over the past four years has been invaluable to me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW . . . . .	5
Disintegrating Relationships . . . . .	5
Relationship Enhancement: Rationale, Goals, and Assumptions . . . . .	11
The RE Educational Model . . . . .	14
Procedures and Skills . . . . .	15
Expressive Skills . . . . .	15
Empathic Skill . . . . .	16
Facilitation . . . . .	17
Mode Switching . . . . .	17
Generalization and Maintenance . . . . .	18
Outcome Research of RE . . . . .	18
Comparative Studies . . . . .	20
III. METHODS . . . . .	23
Subjects . . . . .	23
Measures . . . . .	24
Procedure . . . . .	27
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	29
1. Factors Generated . . . . .	35
2. Factors Generated . . . . .	44
3. Analysis of Derived Factors . . . . .	46

	Page
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	57
Limitations and future research directions . . . . .	65
APPENDIXES	
A. Additional Descriptive Data about subjects . .	68
B. Firo-B Questionnaire . . . . .	70
C. Scoring Procedures for the FIRO-B Questionnaire . . . . .	73
REFERENCE NOTES . . . . .	81
REFERENCES . . . . .	82

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations on the Reciprocal Compatibility (RC) Scores . . . . .	30
2. Means and Standard Deviations of Inclusiveness, Control, and Affection Dimensions . . . . .	31
3. Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix After Rotation with Kaiser Normalization for "Frequency of Encounter" Category . . . . .	37
4. Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix after Rotation with Kaiser Normalization for "Number of People Engaged in the Encounter" Category . . . . .	40
5. Summary of the derived factors for "frequency of Encounter" and "Number of People Engaged in the Encounter" categories . . . . .	47
6. Means and Standard Deviations of all derived Factors for "Frequency of Encounter" Category . . . . .	51
7. Means and Standard Deviations of all Derived Factors for "Number of People Engaged in the Encounter" Category . . . . .	53
8. Means and Standard Deviations of Derived Reciprocal compatibility (RC) Scores . . . . .	56
9. Academic Information . . . . .	68
10. Socioeconomic Information . . . . .	68
11. Background Information . . . . .	69

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the effect of Guerney's Relationship Enhancement Program (RE) on premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility as compared to a lecture/discussion (LD) group. It was hypothesized that those premarital couples that participated in RE would evidence greater reciprocal compatibility than the contact control group. Couples were randomly assigned to the relationship enhancement group or the lecture/discussion group. From pretest to posttest, 27 couples participated in the RE group and 30 couples in the LD group. Both groups participated in eight-weeks of training, three-hours per week in their respective groups. Comparison between the RE and LD group on changes in the premarital couples reciprocal compatibility from pretest to posttest indicated no significant differences. However, significant differences did occur in terms of individual changes (i.e. wanted inclusiveness, expressed and wanted affection). Discussion focused around the issue of differences between the changes that occurred on an individual level as opposed to the relationship level.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In recent years social and behavioral scientists have begun to examine the intricacies involved in the disintegration of interpersonal relationships. Undoubtedly, the lack of effective communication is a problem area in marriage (Bolte, 1970; Mace, 1975; Satir, 1972) and a major contributor to the dissolution of marital relationships. However, marital couples are not the only type of dyadic relationship to experience difficulty in communicating. One case in particular are premarital couples, who are unique in that their communication patterns are not "set." In other words, their mode of communication has not become habituated thereby making it less difficult to change or alter the existing communication style.

In response to this need to improve interpersonal relationships via effective communication, a vast assortment of communication and enrichment programs have been established (Boscoe, 1972; Guerney, 1977; Mace and Mace, 1976; Miller, Nunally, and Wackman, 1975; Travis and Travis, 1976). One of the most widely evaluated and systematic programs has been Guerney's Relationship Enhancement Program

(RE; Guerney, 1977). This program was developed for use by a variety of target populations such as premarital couples (Schlein, 1971); marital couples (Ely, Guerney, and Stover, 1973; Rappaport, 1976); mothers and daughters (Coufal, 1975; Vogel song, 1971); and fathers and sons (Ginsberg, 1971). RE provides premarital couples with specific instructions in a set of skills designed to improve the overall communicative quality of the relationship. As such, Guerney (1977) has focused on empathy and self-disclosure as components of communication and stresses the importance of reciprocity in the exchange of thoughts and feelings. Communicating one's own thoughts and feelings to one's partner leads to an interchange that is two-dimensional. On a communicative level, the person who is communicating begins to clarify his own needs relative to the partner's needs. Once a person understands their own needs as well as their partner's (i.e. through the use of empathy and self-disclosure) a behavioral change can take place. Thus, the partner(s) can act upon the needs and desires being expressed. With the event of behavioral changes in the partners behavior, one would expect that the partners would move closer towards each other, in terms of matching each others' needs and wants. The upshot of this reciprocal interchange is that the partners become more compatible.

Compatibility refers to the degree to which a match exists between partners, relative to their needs and wants. Furthermore, compatibility has been viewed as being comprised of three dimensions: inclusion, control, and affection (Schutz, 1958). Each dimension is further delineated into "expressed" and "wanted" needs. Expressed needs are conveyed to others, whereas, wanted needs are those we would like others to satisfy. There is a need for inclusion that is expressed towards the partner and others; likewise, there is a level of wanted inclusion. Inclusion refers to interacting with people--acknowledgement, attention, and identity are elements of this need. Control is associated with a person's desire to control the behavior of another person, and vice versa, a desire to be controlled. Finally, affection refers to the need to express affection toward a partner, and in turn, how a person would want affection expressed towards him/herself. In summary, compatibility can be viewed in relation to three needs: inclusion, control, and affection.

An inherent characteristic of a compatible relationship is that the process is reciprocal. For example, by comparing how person A likes to be responded to with person B's description of how one reacts to other people, and vice versa, reciprocal compatibility can be determined (Schutz, 1958). To the extent that an individual desires affection

in the same degree that their partner expresses affection, there is reciprocal compatibility. A dilemma occurs when there is an incongruence in both partner's expressed and wanted needs. Thus, compatibility is based on understanding both your own needs as well as the needs of one's partner.

Effective communication involves the learning of one's own needs and one's partner which provides a basis for determining how your needs match your partner's. To the extent then that empathy and self-disclosure improve communication, the learning of these skills will also likely result in increased couple compatibility. This study was designed to determine if the attainment of empathy and self-disclosure is related to a change in reciprocal compatibility. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to assess the effect of RE on premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility as compared to a contact control group. It is hypothesized that those premarital couples that participate in RE will evidence greater reciprocal compatibility than the contact control group.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

In the introduction it was hypothesized that a relationship enhancement program is most likely to be more effective than a contact control group in improving pre-marital couples reciprocal compatibility. In order to display the reasoning underlying this study, the review of literature will be divided into three sections. The fundamental notion in the first section is that interpersonal relationships are disintegrating and behavioral scientists want to know why. Included in this section is an expansion of what behavioral scientists have found to contribute to the disintegration of such relationships (i.e., due to ineffective communication). Next, Guerney's relationship enhancement program will be examined in light of how this program teaches effective communication skills. Finally, the empirical evidence with regard to RE will be presented.

#### Disintegrating Relationships

Over the last few decades it has become evident that increasing numbers of people are experiencing difficulties

in their relationships with significant others. This point is made strikingly clear when one examines the rising divorce rate. In a 1948 study, Goode (1956) found that the divorce rate was 11.2 per 100 married females. In 1974, the divorce rate was up to 19.3 per 100 when Kitson and Sussman (1982) started to collect their data on patterns of marital complaints in a sample of divorcing men and women. Research has focused on many other areas, including: demographic characteristics of divorced couples, symptoms of mental distress in divorce (Kitson and Sussman, 1982); marital alternatives and marital disruption (Dury, 1982); marital instability (Greenbery and Nay, 1982); understanding and misunderstanding in the marital dyad (Indvik and Fitzpatrick, 1982).

Mace (1975) elaborates on the need to study marriages in our society, "It has become a matter of urgency because our contemporary society is confronted with a major crisis--the widespread disintegration of family life." (Mace, 1975, pp. 36-37). From his viewpoint the work that has been done on couple communication is of the greatest importance. Mace states: "An extensive research project covering four years, undertaken by the Family Service Association of America, reached the conclusion that ineffective communication is the principle cause of marriage failure, identified as such much more frequently than

difficulties with sex, money, or inlaws." (Mace, 1975, p.41).

Communication has been defined as, "all those procedures by which one mind may affect another. This of course involves not only written and oral speech, but also music, the pictorial arts, the theater, the ballet, and in fact all human behavior." (Shannon and Weaver, 1949, p.117). In addition it should be noted that intentional and unintentional components of a message cannot be based on the verbalized message only (Bolte, 1982). Rather, one must also take into account the situation, the tone of voice, facial expression, and other gestures.

Within the broad base of communication theory Satir states: "This theory means that any behavior that occurs between any two people is the product of both of them," and adds, "everything can be understood once the premises from which any behavior is derived are made explicit and clear." (Satir, 1965, p.121). It is evident that Satir believes that all communication has some kind of a purpose and that it is not just incidental or accidental noise (Bolte, 1982).

Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) made a strong point in maintaining that one cannot NOT communicate. Watzlawick sees communication not only as conveying information but also imposing behavior. The wife who asks her husband, "Would you like to take me out to dinner tonight?" is probably asking much more than is apparent (Bolte, 1982).

She may want reassurance that her husband still loves her. Communication is basic, yet also highly complex because it is composed of both verbal and non-verbal components.

Considering both verbal and nonverbal components of communication, it is essential to disclose our thoughts, emotions, and wants to significant others in order to achieve lasting satisfaction in such relationships (Guerney, 1977). Some inadequate communication styles which hinder such a lasting satisfaction have been identified: (1) Double bind (Haley, 1963); (2) Crossed-transactions (Berne, 1967); (3) Disqualification (Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson, 1967); and (4) Physical symptoms (Haley, 1963). Briefly, double-bind refers to the conflict that occurs when messages are delivered at different levels, they "offer each other messages which defines one type of relationship at one level and incompatible type of relationship at another" (Haley, 1963, p.123). Crossed-transactions is a term that Eric Berne (1967) used to indicate that a breakdown in communication occurs when the message that is being sent is received by an uncomplementary egostate (e.g. an adult-to-adult message is received by a child-parent response). A disqualification "...enables one to say something without saying it; to take a stand for which one does not accept responsibility" (Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson, 1967, pp. 75-76). Physical symptoms also hinder effective communication (e.g., when a wife develops a headache in order to

avoid her husbands' sexual advances). Haley states:  
"Symptoms can be seen as a product of, or a way of handling a relationship in which there are incompatible definitions of the relationship" (Haley, 1963, p.132). Hence, the strength of the communication approach is its ability to detect and alter negative communication patterns that are causing an interference in the dyadic relationship.

Schauble and Hill (1976) took communication theory one step further by implementing a laboratory approach to treatment in marriage counseling. The lab sessions were conducted by leaders which trained the couples in communication skills. The primary focus was to develop responding and receiving skills (i.e., speaking and listening roles). Homework was assigned, usually consisting of two 30-minute discussion sections that were tape recorded at home, and at least one tape was given to the leader prior to the next session. The authors concluded that the laboratory approach works well with couples that are not undergoing severe communication impasses (i.e., wherein one spouse has not entered the counseling situation with the intent of pulling out of the relationship). Schauble and Hill (1976) maintain that the earlier a couple works at improving their communication skills the better it is. Ideally, an extension of this model would include the premarital couple, which would come at a time when the couple is in the "courtship" phase

and thus can use these skills to build a sincere and straightforward relationship. Further, the authors state, "...to train premarital couples in communication skills seems to have significant value" (Schaubel and Hill, 1976, p.284).

Bienvenu (1975) also stresses the importance of effective communication and asserts that the literature suggests the foundation for establishing good communication patterns is in the premarital dating and engagement period. The couple should discuss how they communicate with others, and look ahead toward the problems and challenges that lie before them (Rutledge, 1966). Ard and Ard (1969) believe that communication frequently gets off to a bad start during the dating period because each individual is trying to present the best view of their personality to his/her partner in order to keep things peaceful, and of course, to impress each other.

Research has shown that communication plays a significant role in that the couples' perceptions of each other rely upon accurate and in-depth communication (Murstein, 1970). Goodman (1968) who used a sample consisting of seven engaged couples and seven newly introduced couples found a definite trend--with greater commitment there was an increase in communication efficiency and empathy. In a factor-analytic study by Stinnet (1969) whose sample contained 407 undergraduates in a family relations course,

communication correlated highly with marital competence. Consequently, the premarital couple is unique in many ways, perhaps the most important variable being that their communication patterns are not "set", thereby making them an ideal population to study for intervention.

Because of the interest in the communication approach there has been a dramatic increase in the number of programs designed to teach couples how to communicate (Guerney, 1977; Mace and Mace, 1976; Miller, 1975; Wells and Figuerl, 1979). Of these programs, one of the most widely evaluated and systematic programs has been Guerney's Relationship Enhancement Program (RE; Guerney, 1977).

Relationship Enhancement:  
Rationale, Goals, and Assumptions

Guerney's RE program can be effective as a type of therapy, problem prevention, or enrichment program (Guerney, 1977). The RE program has been researched since 1962, thereby facilitating the very detailed and systematic approach that is characteristic of RE. Ultimately, RE strives to produce behavior modification in terms of how the couple demonstrates empathy and self-disclosure. Not only does RE have a great impact on the relationship experience but in addition, there should be a "general" psychological and emotional well-being of the participants (Guerney, 1977).

Further, it is believed that RE solves more problems more quickly than other programs because a) RE reduces the amount of defensiveness the client feels toward the therapist; b) reduces tension between family members because they did not need to seek the sanction of the therapist, who is not interested in family members putting the blame on each other; c) it targets on the fundamental issues in the relationship efficiently--as soon as both partners are ready to discuss them, and d) RE promotes problem-solving in the couple as opposed to relying on the therapist to bring about the "cure" (Guerney, 1977).

The cardinal goal of RE then is to increase the understanding of one's self as well as one's partner, in order to make for a sincere, honest, and straightforward relationship. However, this is not to imply that greater understanding is the goal everyone strives for - in some cases it may produce a conflict in the relationship (e.g., resulting in divorce). Guerney (1977) does not believe that this could occur in more than one case in a thousand, and even if it did, the individuals' would still benefit from RE. By definition, an improved or "enhanced" relationship is one "...in which the participants have developed a greater capacity, within and by virtue of the relationship, to better understand themselves and each other" (Guerney, 1977, p.12). To "understand" means "...to appreciate

relationship-relevant needs, desires, preferences, aspirations, values, motivations, and emotions of one's own self and one's partner" (Guerney, 1977, p. 12). Relationships that evidence a high level of understanding are referred to as "empathic relationships." Other values that are of paramount importance in RE are showing honesty and compassion for each other. Honesty allows us to predict (to some extent) what our partner will do. This is a very important trait that is valued in order to obtain other goals in our society. Likewise, showing compassion (empathy, intimacy, sympathy, gentleness, etc.) is probably universally valued. Without honesty and compassion as components in the couples' make-up, they will run into many difficulties. Again, one must be cautious--not everyone values these goals as much as RE. A person who wants power, may not want to show any compassion for others, because doing so may be indicative of his/her vulnerability. With the above terms in mind, a definition of an empathic relationship can be entertained, "(the empathic relationship). . .has been defined as one wherein the participants more frequently exercise compassionate understanding of their own and the other's thoughts, needs, wishes, and feelings. In an empathic relationship, each person can view and express the issues in their relationship more openly: with relatively little defensiveness,

guilt and blame" (Guerney, 1977, pp.14-15). Is a relationship necessarily "better" if it is empathic? Again, this is a value judgement but Guerney asserts that an empathic relationship enhances all the other qualities.

### The RE Educational Model

In RE we are dealing with an educational model. In other words, RE tries to change the persons behavior, but only if they want to change. By no means is RE trying to cure an "illness" as in a medical model. In summary, RE sees its functions as being (Guerney, 1977):

1. Providing skills to be used adaptively. The purpose of RE is to teach the couple to understand each other better. It encourages the participants to use these skills when they think it is advisable or desirable to do so. Therefore, the couple decides when or when not to use their empathic skills. This adds flexibility to RE.
2. Programmatic instruction to serve the widest range of needs. Educational programs are designed to help large numbers of people, in our case, to resolve interpersonal difficulties. Once an area such as communication is identified, appropriate skills and principles can be drawn up.
3. Economy in professional manpower and cost. Ideally RE is designed for small groups, however, with appropriate materials and the training of more teachers, it may permit much larger groups. Therefore, it conserves professional manpower and if indeed RE proves to be successful, it also is less expensive than traditional therapy.
4. Reaching more people. RE reduces the apprehension people feel about participating in a program of this type, specifically because it is an educational model, and lacks the "stigma" of more traditional approaches.

5. Reducing the obstacle of defensiveness. One of the major psychological factors that hinder effective learning is the use of defense mechanisms. By giving the client a sense of confidence and respect the professional should be able to keep these defense mechanisms at a minimum.
6. Preventive function. The advantage of an educational approach is that it teaches the participants skills that can be used for a lifetime. Relationship Enhancement can be a remedial program, therapy program, or can serve a preventive function.

#### Procedures and Skills

Outlined below is a review of the procedure and skills which are taught to clients in RE. For a more detailed account, refer to Guerney's (1977), Relationship Enhancement: Skill Training Programs for Therapy, Problem Prevention and Enrichment, San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1977.

#### Expressive Skill

There are two main purposes for the Expressive Skill. The first purpose is to increase the client's receptivity to his own emotions, desires, needs, conflicts, etc. Secondly, the client should be able to communicate this self-awareness to the other partner. Further sub-skills are needed for this particular mode of behavior.

1. Before you express your own views make sure that the person you are interacting with knows that you have respect and compassion for his/her views.

2. If you are about to express a negative attitude to your partner (e.g. anger), search for and express a positive attitude (e.g. affection) which is more basic and may even have been the catalyst to the negative attitude, thereby facilitating the expression of negative attitudes in a more positive manner.
3. Whenever a possibility exists that you may disagree with the other person, state your views subjectively (e.g., "I feel," "I think," etc.). The purpose of this guideline is to make you the authority on everything you express, which reduces argumentativeness and allows the other person to respond to your views as such.
4. Decide if your view is an important component of the problem; if so express it.
5. When the "time is right," present an interpersonal message, which is a request to change an old behavior(s) and to elicit a new one instead. This interpersonal message helps the client to understand what you would like and gives him/her a chance to consider the suggestion.

#### Empathic Skill

The purpose of Empathic Skill is to elicit self-revealing statements from the other person in order to understand the other person's desires, needs, etc. Secondly, the effective use of Empathic Skill should increase the clients' attractiveness to the other person in the pair. Expression of empathy enhances the likelihood of obtaining both of the former objectives because it instills a sense of being respected and understood by the other person. The third purpose is humanitarian--to help the other person to understand his own emotions and needs.

Remodeling or reforming the person's attitude is of paramount importance in making an effective "Empathic Response." The prevalent attitude should be one of finding it useful to be able to see the inside world of another person.

### Facilitation

The purpose of Facilitation is to draw out interpersonal responses from others in order to resolve your own conflicts or problems; to enrich or enhance the growth of the relationship; and to facilitate the persons' own growth. This mode can either be used once or it can involve a long-term situation where there is a gradual reshaping of a partner's behavior.

### Mode Switching

The purpose of Mode Switching is to train the client to know which mode of behavior is being used; to be able to employ certain behavioral modes at appropriate times; to be able to switch from one mode to another based on the partner's views.

The guidelines as to when to switch vary according to your role as Expressor, Responder, or Facilitator.

1. The Expressor switch mode occurs when you have either expressed your own views OR when you want to know your partner's views.

2. The Empathic Responder switch mode occurs when you have expressed your deepest feelings to the other person and have done so two times.
3. The Facilitator switch mode is used when any of the other activities described above are occurring to the other person whose discussion you are trying to facilitate.

### Generalization and Maintenance

Generalization and maintenance are necessary skills which enable clients to incorporate RE skills into their daily lives. Devices such as practicing RE skills at certain times or in certain situations enhance the probability that a transfer will occur from the training program to their routine schedules.

### Outcome Research of RE

#### Treatment Effects

The first scientific study to focus on premarital relationship improvement by maximizing empathy and self-disclosure was conducted by Schlein (1971) and also reported by Ginsberg and Vogelsong (1977). In this study the couples met weekly for two and a half hours over a period of eight to twelve weeks. Couples were randomly assigned to an RE group or a waiting list control group. The final sample consisted of 15 couples in the experimental group and 27 in the control group.

The hypothesis that the couples who participated in RE would show greater gains in communication was confirmed.

The RE group relative to the control group expressed more empathy towards their partner and improved their ability to express their own feelings as well.

The hypothesis that the RE couples would show a greater improvement in overall communication skills as measured by the Premarital Communication Inventory (Locks, Sabagh, and Thomas, 1956) was not confirmed. While the mean differences between the two groups were in the expected direction, they failed to reach statistical significance. It was speculated (Schlein, 1971) that this result may have been a "ceiling effect" whereby the premarital couples were at such a high level of romanticism that little room existed for upward mobility on paper-pencil measures.

The hypothesis that there would be an improvement in the quality of the relationship was confirmed. The experimental group relative to the control group, showed an increase in empathy, warmth, and genuineness as measured by the Relationship Scale (Guerney, 1977). In addition the experimental group showed an increase in the amount of satisfaction the relationship provided for the couples as compared to a control group.

D'Augelli, Deyss, Guerney, Herschenberg, and Sborofsky (1974) coded significant dialogues that Schlein's premarital couples engaged in and measured the amount of communicative skillfulness the couples displayed using the

behavioral rating scales by Carkhuff (1969) which are used to evaluate professional counselors. Upon completion of RE training, the experimental couples showed a significant movement from levels typical of a college student to those typical of a professional counselor.

The effectiveness of RE as a preventive program was recently established by Most (1980). In this study a one weekend marathon session of RE was conducted by married couples who themselves had only two weekends of training. The final sample consisted of 12 couples who improved significantly in their self-perceptions of their own skill levels on empathic skills, expressive skills, and the potential capacity of transferring what was learned in RE to their daily existence. The premarital couples also expressed a higher level of confidence in their ability to handle problems effectively, and in actuality displayed more effective problem-solving.

#### Comparative Studies

A study by Avery, Ridley, Leslie, and Millholland (1980) compared a RE group (n=19 couples) to a lecture discussion group (LD; n=18 couples) and made a behavioral assessment of how the couples expressed empathy and self-disclosure prior to training, immediately after training, and six-months after training was completed. The RE group

significantly increased in empathy and self-disclosure skills as compared to the LD group. The follow-up results are encouraging insofar as they show that skill maintenance takes place.

Ridley, Jorgensen, Morgan, and Avery (1982) conducted a study to determine the effect RE has on premarital couples' relationship adjustment, trust and intimacy, empathy, warmth and genuineness. The sample was made up of 25 experimental couples who completed weekly three-hour sessions over a period of eight weeks (24 hours). The contact control group participated in a relationship discussion group (RD) wherein issues were discussed about dyadic relationships but no formal training occurred. The authors put an emphasis on measuring relationship quality from pretest to posttest. Five scales were used: the Relationship Change Scale, the Interpersonal Relationship Scale, the Relationship Scale-Self, the Relationship Scale-Partner (Guerney, 1977; Shapiro, Krauss, and Traux, 1969) and the Primary Communication Inventory (Guerney, 1977). The scales measure relationship dimensions such as intimacy, sensitivity, openness, understanding, satisfaction, and communication skills. The authors tested for the amount of movement over a two-month training period; and results indicated that there was a significant increase in reported

adjustment, empathy, warmth, genuineness, trust, and communication skills. The RE group increased on all measures from pretest to posttest; whereas, the contact control group decreased on the relationship quality measures.

In summary, the literature pertaining to the use of RE as a preventive program for premarital couples seems to be very positive. In virtually every study an increase occurred in some dimension related to the quality of the relationship. Although various aspects of communication skills have been discussed, no one has examined how compatible the premarital couples are, and if indeed a change takes place due to RE. Further, in this study it is hypothesized that those premarital couples that participate in RE will evidence greater reciprocal compatibility than the contact control group.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

The data used in the present study were collected by Arthur Avery and Carl Ridley in a study designed to assess the short-term and long-term effectiveness of a relationship enhancement program on self-disclosure and empathy skills of premarital dating couples. Avery et al. (1980) have analyzed the behavioral data from the Relationship Enhancement Program, which indicated couples did learn RE skills. Results indicated that the relationship enhancement group as compared to a lecture/discussion group, significantly increased in both self-disclosure and empathy skill levels from pretest to posttest and from pretest to follow-up, thereby demonstrating skill maintenance.

#### Subjects

Premarital couples were recruited from an undergraduate population at a southwestern university, through the use of posters, local radio and newspaper announcements, and an information table at class registration. In addition, the couples were screened by the principal investigator to identify those couples who had serious relationship problems, and those willing to participate. Couples were

randomly assigned to the experimental group (relationship enhancement group) or to the contact control group (lecture discussion group). From pretest to posttest, 27 couples participated in the RE group, while 30 couples participated in the LD group. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 24 with a mean age of 19.92. Twelve percent were classified as seniors, 17% juniors, 40% sophomores, and 25% freshmen (see Appendix A for additional demographic information).

#### Measures

For the purposes of this study, the dependent variable, reciprocal compatibility, will be operationalized using the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation Behavior (FIRO-B) questionnaire (Schutz, 1958). The FIRO-B was selected because it has been used consistently since 1958 to study a diverse range of subjects such as: (1) teacher-pupil (Bloom, 1976; Vargo, note 1); (2) graduate counseling psychology students (Bugen, 1977); and (3) special education groups (Brown, Cobb, and Finch, note 2). The FIRO-B has been used in couple counseling where it is viewed as an innovative instrument (Robbins and Toomer, 1976) that aids both the counselor and client in conceptualizing interpersonal compatibility, specifying counseling goals, assessing behavior change, and operating an action-oriented process. In addition to the scales' wide applicability, studies have

contributed to establish the reliability (Schutz, 1958) and validity of the instrument (Kramer, 1967; Gluck, 1979). Using the coefficient of stability as one measure of reliability, Schutz found that for all six scales the stability coefficient was greater than .70. The validity of the FIRO-B has been demonstrated by Kramer (1967) who had 25 subjects take the test and also had them rate themselves on three dimensions (e.g., inclusion, control, and affection). Rank-order correlations were performed between FIRO-B scores and the subject's self-ratings. Five of the six resulting coefficients were significant beyond the .05 level. Therefore, Kramer's study contributed toward the validation of the FIRO-B. However, Froehle (1970) failed to replicate Kramer's original findings whereupon Gluck (1979) tried to establish whether the earlier failure to replicate Kramer's study was due to a difference in design or to an actual lack of construct validity. Gluck (1979) supported Kramer's original findings. Most important for this study, however, is that the FIRO-B specifically addresses the key issue of "reciprocal compatibility" and allows for the analysis of couple data.

Reciprocal compatibility refers to the goodness of fit between the need configuration of two individuals. A "need" configuration consists of three needs (e.g., Inclusion, Control, and Affection) defined by Schutz (1958) as

follows: (a) Inclusion is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to interaction and association; (b) Control is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people, with respect to control, power, influence, and decision making; and (c) Affection is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to love and affection.

In order to define an individual's needs in terms of other people he interacts with, Schutz considered the three needs with reference to "expressed" and "wanted" needs. The active or "expressed" mode in inclusion, control, and affection are how the individual behaves towards others; the passive "wanted" mode is how the person wants others to behave towards him. Thus, there are six separate FIRO-B scores for each person. These six scores are: Inclusion-expressed (Ie); Inclusion-wanted (Iw); Control-expressed (Ce); Control-wanted (Cw); Affection-expressed (Ae); and Affection-wanted (Aw).

Schutz introduced the concept of reciprocal compatibility (RC) as a measure of how a person wants to act toward another person (expressed behavior) and how he wants others to act toward his own person (wanted behavior). The formula used to calculate RC is:

$$P_{1e} - P_{2w} + P_{2e} - P_{1w}$$

and is interpreted as "Partner 1 expressed behavior minus Partner 2 wanted behavior, plus Partner 2 expressed behavior minus Partner 1 wanted behavior." A score of zero represents very high compatibility, whereas a score of 18 indicates extreme incompatibility (see Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire and Appendix C for a detailed description of the scoring procedures).

#### Procedure

Pretreatment and post treatment assessment. The FIRO-B was one of several measures administered to the RE and LD group at pretest and posttest. Questionnaires were individually administered with no collaboration between partners, in the presence of the principal investigators. At post-test the questionnaires were individually administered after training. Both RE and LD groups were tested in the same time period, so that duration of the groups and testing completely overlapped in the experimental and contact control groups.

Control Treatment. The lecture/discussion group served as a contact control group in this study. During the eight-week period, the LD group participated in lecture and discussion groups designed to review material on relationship development issues. Participants in LD group were encouraged to explore their relationships, but did not

receive specific communication skills to do so. The LD group met for three hours per week over the eight-week period (24 hours total).

Experimental Treatment. The experimental treatment in this study was RE training which was discussed in detail in Chapter 2. The training for the RE group consisted of eight-weekly three hour sessions (24 hours total), with groups composed of three or four couples and two group leaders, one male and one female. Graduate students served as the group leaders who had 15 hours of RE training conducted by the principal investigators. The function of the graduate students was to present, clarify and model effective communication skills and to provide the couples with feedback.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

It was hypothesized that the experimental group (RE), relative to the contact control group (LD), would show an increase in reciprocal compatibility from pretest to posttest. In order to test this hypothesis, a reciprocal compatibility (RC) score was computed taking into account all items representing the inclusiveness, control, and affection dimensions of the FIRO-B scales. Then separate RC scores were computed for each dimension (i.e. inclusion, control, and affection). Means and standard deviations of all RC scores for both the RE and LD group are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE  
 RECIPROCAL COMPATIBILITY (RC) SCORES

		RE (N = 27)		LD (N = 30)	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post
RC	Mean	11.48	11.07	14.47	15.23
	S.D.	5.53	6.64	6.64	7.69
RC (Inclusiveness)	Mean	6.37	5.93	6.70	6.90
	S.D.	3.76	2.74	2.67	2.87
RC (Control)	Mean	5.74	6.78	5.50	5.73
	S.D.	2.81	3.47	2.57	2.90
RC (Affection)	Mean	5.59	5.11	7.00	6.33
	S.D.	2.52	3.23	3.34	3.30

In order to assess the effects of treatment (RE, LD) on couples RC scores, a one-way analysis of covariance was performed using the pretest as the covariate and the post-test as the dependent variable. Based on the analysis of covariance for all RC scores (i.e., expressed and wanted dimensions on inclusiveness, control, and affection for both sexes), results indicated no significant differences between the RE and LD groups.

The foregoing results in Table 1 indicate that collapsing the expressed and wanted behaviors into a couple RC formula may mask any real differences due to treatment.

Therefore, since no significant changes occurred in the couples' relationship, the next step is to see if a change occurred in the individuals themselves. Means and standard deviations on inclusiveness, control, and affection for both experimental (RE) and contact control groups are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INCLUSIVENESS,  
CONTROL, AND AFFECTION DIMENSIONS

		RE (N = 27)		LD (N = 30)	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<u>MALES</u>					
Expressed inclusiveness					
Males	Mean	5.07	5.41	4.77	4.45
	S.D.	2.29	1.99	2.04	2.25
Females	Mean	5.37	5.33	6.17	5.59
	S.D.	2.39	1.88	1.71	1.59
Total Sample	Mean	5.22	5.37	5.45	5.00
	S.D.	2.32	1.91	2.00	2.03
Wanted inclusiveness					
Males	Mean	5.30	5.63	4.97	4.03
	S.D.	3.29	2.94	3.09	3.24
Females	Mean	4.70	5.26	6.41	5.38
	S.D.	3.60	3.30	2.98	3.08
Total Sample	Mean	5.00	5.44	5.67	4.68
	S.D.	3.43	3.10	3.10	3.21
Expressed control					
Males	Mean	5.41	5.89	4.32	4.16
	S.D.	1.99	2.86	2.44	2.56
Females	Mean	5.41	5.89	4.32	4.16
	S.D.	2.40	2.94	2.76	2.93
Total Sample	Mean	4.24	4.46	3.82	3.92
	S.D.	2.48	3.21	2.63	2.73

TABLE 2 (Continued)

		RE (N = 27)		LD (N = 30)	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Wanted control</b>					
Males	Mean	4.22	4.15	4.39	4.84
	S.D.	2.26	2.46	1.99	1.93
Females	Mean	5.19	4.85	5.41	5.66
	S.D.	2.27	1.96	2.10	2.24
Total Sample	Mean	4.70	4.50	4.88	5.23
	S.D.	2.30	2.23	2.09	2.11
<b>Expressed Affection</b>					
Males	Mean	4.26	4.77	4.58	3.65
	S.D.	2.51	2.18	1.96	1.96
Females	Mean	4.56	4.85	6.55	5.14
	S.D.	2.67	2.49	1.94	2.15
Total Sample	Mean	4.41	4.80	5.53	4.37
	S.D.	2.57	2.32	2.17	2.17
<b>Wanted affection</b>					
Males	Mean	4.74	4.78	4.97	3.94
	S.D.	2.78	2.45	3.03	2.71
Females	Mean	5.78	6.00	7.03	5.90
	S.D.	2.34	2.32	2.01	2.47
Total Sample	Mean	5.26	5.39	5.97	4.88
	S.D.	2.60	2.45	2.77	2.76

In order to assess the effects of treatment (RE, LD), sex (male, female), and treatment by sex interaction, a two-way analysis of covariance was performed for expressed inclusiveness, wanted inclusiveness, expressed control, wanted control, expressed affection, and wanted affection. Based on the analysis of covariance for wanted inclusiveness, results indicated a significant effect for treatment  $F(1,109) = 5.786, p < .018$ . The effect for treatment indicated that the experimental group, relative to the contact control group significantly increased on wanted inclusiveness (posttest means, experimental males = 5.63, experimental females = 5.26, control males = 4.03, and control females = 5.38). Results for wanted control indicated a significant effect for treatment  $F(1,109) = 3.989, p < .048$ . The effect for treatment indicated that the LD group had a significant increase in wanted control relative to the RE group (posttest means, experimental males = 4.15, experimental females = 4.85, control males = 4.84, and control females = 5.66). For both experimental and control females the need for wanted control increased from pre to posttest. The analysis of covariance for the expressed affection dimension also indicated a significant effect for treatment  $F(1,109) = 6.47, p < .012$ . Here the RE group showed a significant increase in expressed affection from pre to posttest (posttest means, experimental

males = 4.74, experimental females = 4.85, control males = 3.65, and control females = 5.14). Finally, the analysis of covariance for wanted affection showed both significant main effects  $F(2,198) = 4.190, p < .018$  and sex effects  $F(1,109) = 4.608, p < .034$ . The pre and posttest means indicate the greatest increase in wanted affection for the experimental females (posttest means, experimental males = 4.78, experimental females = 6.00, control males = 3.94, and control females = 5.90).

Next, a factor analytic technique was used to further explore the data in a different way than Schutz has done. Factor analysis consists of a variety of statistical techniques used to determine if a set of variables can be represented by a smaller number of hypothetical variables (Kim and Mueller, 1982). The first step involves investigating the interrelationships between the variables (i.e., using correlational analysis). Then factor analysis was used to explore if the observed correlations can be explained in terms of a smaller number of hypothetical variables. Since the FIRO-B has been standardized for different samples, not including premarital couples, it was decided to use a factor analytic technique for exploratory purposes in order to reduce the data. It was determined to treat the response categories as being on a continuum from

one to six, rather than of accepting only some responses and assigning a zero to others (see Appendix C for a detailed account of Schultz coding technique and the author's). Further, the two response categories "frequency of encounter" (i.e., usually, often, sometimes, occasionally, rarely, and never) and "number of people engaged in the encounter" (i.e., most people, many people, some people, a few people, one or two people, and nobody) were treated independently, for the purpose of factor analytic procedures.

#### 1. Factors Generated

- a. Males at pretest. The varimax rotated factor matrix after rotation with Kaiser normalization for the frequency of encounter category is depicted in Table 4. Five factors met the minimum eigenvalue ( $\geq 1.0$ ) criterion. Four of the items (e.g., 10, 11, 12, 13) had very high loadings on Factor 1. Based on the content of the items, this factor appears to represent how a person wants others to include them in their activities. This dimension depicts a person who does not initiate activities, therefore this factor is termed the NON INITIATOR. Factor 2 includes six items that represent someone who takes charge of things and likes to control others. This factor is termed the CONTROLLER. Factor 3 includes three items that typify someone who likes to have close, personal relationships

with others. This factor is labeled the PERSONAL PERSON. Factor 4 contains three items that portray someone who lets other people influence his/her life to a very great extent. This factor is designated as someone who is NOT IN CONTROL. Factor 5 is represented by very high loadings on items 18 and 19. This shows someone who likes other people to act distant and cool towards his person. Therefore, this factor is labeled wants DISTANCE.

- b. Females at pretest. As seen in Table 4, five factors were derived in the factor analysis for the females at pretest. The high loadings on the first factor include four items that are equivalent to those of the males at pre-test. This factor will again be termed the NON INITIATOR. Factor 2 includes six items that are the same items as those for the males at pretest and will therefore be referred to as the CONTROLLER. Factor 3 consists of three items identical to the ones found for the males at pretest minus one item. This factor is termed the PERSONAL PERSON. Factor 4 consists of three items and will be labeled NOT IN CONTROL. Factor 5 includes two items and will be designated as WANTS DISTANCE.

TABLE 3

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX AFTER ROTATION WITH KAISER NORMALIZATION FOR  
 "FREQUENCY OF ENCOUNTER" CATEGORY

"Frequency of Encounter" Variables	MALE					FEMALE				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
1. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.		.830					.695			
2. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.		.729					.850			
3. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.		.675					.768			
4. I try to have other people do things I want done.		.404					.628			
5. I take charge of things when I am with people.		.872					.895			
6. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.		.764					.813			

TABLE 3 (Continued)

"Frequency of Encounter" Variables	MALE					FEMALE				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
7. I try to have close relationships with people.			.608					.765		
8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.			.866					.815		
9. I try to get close and personal with people.			.799					.799		
10. I like people to invite me to things.	.787					.932				
11. I like people to invite me to things.	.867					.856				
12. I like people to invite me to join their activities.	.899					.903				
13. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.	.883					.931				
14. I let other people decide what to do.				.523						
15. I let other people strongly influence my actions.									.872	

TABLE 3 (Continued)

"Frequency of Encounter" Variables	MALE					FEMALE				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
16. I let other people control my actions.				.630					.707	
17. I am easily led by people.				.787					.711	
18. I like people to act distant toward me.					.785					.792
19. I like people to act distant toward me.					.733					.800
20. I like people to act close and personal with me.	.605					.608				
21. I like people to act close toward me.	.531		.529			.596				
% of total variance	43.3	24.4	12.9	10.9	8.5	37.8	31.5	13.4	9.0	8.4

NOTE: only loadings  $\geq .50$  are given

TABLE 4

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX AFTER ROTATION WITH KAISER NORMALIZATION FOR  
 "NUMBER OF PEOPLE ENGAGED IN THE ENCOUNTER" CATEGORY

"Number of People Engaged in the Encounter	PRETEST												
	MALE						FEMALE						
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
1. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.					.884							.645	
2. I try to influ- ence strongly other people's actions.												.724	
3. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done					.536							.793	
4. I try to be friendly to people.							.738						.528
5. My personal rela- tions with people are cool and distant.				.764									

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

"Frequency of Encounter" Items	PRETEST												
	MALE						FEMALE						
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
6. I act cool and distant with people.				.814					.648				
7. I try to have close relationships with people.	.790								.747	.824			
8. I try to get close and personal with people.	.841									.893			
9. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.	.839									.711			
10. I like people to invite me to things.	.543							.843					
11. I like people to invite me to join in their activities.		.750						.892					

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

		PRETEST													
		MALE							FEMALE						
"Frequency of Encounter" Items		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	
12.	I like people to include me in their activities	.746							.895						
13.	I like people to ask me to participate in their discus- sions.														
14.	I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.									.555					
15.	I let other people decide what to do.			.676						.879					
16.	I let other people			.740						.827					
17.	I let other people strongly influences my actions.	.562	.679						.521	.573					
18.	I am easily led by people.		.747						.587		.573				

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

"Frequency of Encounter" Items	PRETEST													
	MALE							FEMALE						
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	
19. I let other people control my actions.			.673											
20. I like people to act friendly toward me.		.626									.829			
21. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.											.784			
22. I like people to act distant toward me.						.932					.758			
23. I like people to act close toward me.	.612										.607			
24. I like people to act close and personal with me.	.626							.894						
% of total variance	38.6	18.1	13.0	10.3	8.5	6.9	4.5	42.9	19.2	15.7	10.8	6.9	4.6	

Note: Only loadings  $\geq .50$  are given

## 2. Factors Generated

- a. Males at pretest. The varimax rotated factor matrix after rotation with Kaiser normalization for the number of people engaged in the encounter category is depicted in Table 5. Seven factors met the minimum eigenvalue criterion ( $\geq 1.0$ ). Six of the items (7,8,9,10,23, 24) had high loadings on Factor 1. Based on the content of the items, this factor describes someone who tries to have close and personal relationships with people, and in turn, likes to be treated in the same manner, therefore this factor is termed the RECIPROCALLY CLOSE PERSON. Factor 2 includes four items that portray someone who wants others to include him/herself in their activities and is also strongly influenced by others. This factor is termed WANT CLOSENESS. Factor 3 represents a person who lets others take complete charge of things and lets others decide what to do. This factor is identified as the PASSIVE PERSON. Factor 4 contains only two items that describe someone who has cool and distant relationships with others, and is therefore designated as a COOL PERSON. Factor 5 is represented with high loadings ( $\geq .50$ ) on items one and three. This is a person who takes charge and tries to have others do things according to their wishes. This factor is termed the person who is IN CONTROL.

Factor 6 describes someone who likes others to act distant towards his person. This factor is identified as someone who WANTS DISTANCE. Finally, Factor 7 describes an individual who tries to be friendly towards people, and is termed the FRIENDLY PERSON.

- B. Females at Pretest. Table 5 outlines the factor loadings of the rotated factor matrix for the females at pretest. Six factors were derived. The first factor includes six items that refer to someone who wants to be invited to activities, and wants others to act close and personal, hence, this factor is labeled INCLUDE ME. The second factor is unique in that it describes someone who wants cool and distant relationships with others, but at the same time wants others to act both distant and friendly towards her. This factor is termed the AMBIVALENT PERSON. The third factor is equivalent in item content to the males' Factor 1, and will again be termed the RECIPROCALLY CLOSE person. The fourth factor is equivalent to the males' Factor 3 minus one item, and therefore will be designated as the PASSIVE PERSON. The fifth factor represents someone who takes charge of things, and is identical to the males' Factor 5 plus one item, and is therefore labeled the person who is IN CONTROL. The last factor involves one item, identical to the males' Factor 7, and is termed the FRIENDLY PERSON.

### 3. Analysis of Derived Factors

- a. Males (Frequency of Encounter Category). In order to assess the effect of treatment (RE, LD) analysis of covariance was performed for all the new derived variables which are depicted in Table 6. Based on the analysis of covariance for the "noninitiator", results indicated a significant effect for treatment  $F(1,54) = 5.043, p < .029$ . The effect for treatment indicated that the relationship enhancement group, relative to the lecture/discussion group significantly increased on initiating behavior (adjusted means, experimental group = 30.54, control group = 25.31). Results for the "Controller" almost approached statistical significance for treatment  $F(1,54) = 3.526, p < .066$ . Analysis indicated that the RE group mean increased relative to the LD group from pretest to posttest (adjusted means, experimental group = 26.66, control group = 20.87). Further, the analysis of covariance for the "Personal Person" also indicated a significant effect for treatment  $F(1,54) = 5.915, p < .018$ . In this instance, the RE group showed a significant increase relative to the LD group on the personal dimension (adjusted means, experimental group = 19.48, control group = 16.67)

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF THE DERIVED FACTORS FOR "FREQUENCY OF ENCOUNTER"  
AND "NUMBER OF PEOPLE ENGAGED IN THE ENCOUNTER" CATEGORIES

<u>Frequency of encounter category</u>	<u>% of total variance at pretest</u>
Males	
Noninitiator	43.3
Controller	24.4
Personal Person	12.9
Non in Control	10.9
Wants Distance	8.5
Females	
Noninitiator	37.8
Controller	31.5
Personal Person	13.4
Not in Control	9.0
Wants Distance	8.4

TABLE 5 (Continued)

---

<u>Number of people engaged in the encounter</u>	<u>% of total variance</u>
Males	
Reciprocally Close	38.6
Want Closeness	18.1
Passive Person	13.0
Cool Person	10.3
In Control	8.5
Want Distance	6.9
Friendly Person	4.5
Females	
Include me	42.9
Ambivalent Person	19.2
Reciprocally Close	15.7
Passive Person	10.8
In Control	6.9
Friendly Person	4.6

---

- b. Females (Frequency of Encounter Category). In order to assess the effect of treatment (RE, LD) analysis of covariance was performed for all the new derived variables (i.e., Noninitiator, Controller, Personal Person, Not in Control, and Wants Distance). Results indicated no significant differences between the RE and LD groups on these dimensions.
- c. Males (Number of People Engaged in the Encounter Category). Analysis of covariance was used for all new derived variables (see Table 7) in order to evaluate the effect of treatment (RE, LD). Based on the analysis of covariance for the "Reciprocally Close" males, results indicated a significant effect for the RE group relative to the LD group for treatment  $F(1,54) = 11.265, p < .001$ . The effect of treatment indicates that the RE group mean increased relative to the LD group (adjusted means, experimental group = 28.76, contact control group = 22.22).
- d. Females (number of People Engaged in the Encounter. Based on the analysis of covariance for the "Include me" dimension, results revealed a significant effect for treatment  $(1,54) = 3.832, p < .055$ . The effect for treatment indicated that the RE group mean relative to the LD group mean increased from pretest to posttest (adjusted means, experimental group = 30.08, contact

control group = 27.29). Furthermore, results of the analysis of covariance for the "Reciprocally close" females indicated a significant effect for treatment  $F(1,54) = 7.803, p < .007$ . The effect for treatment indicated that the RE group mean relative to the LD group mean increased significantly (adjusted means, experimental group = 23.27, contact control group = 20.26). Finally, the analysis of covariance performed on the "Passive Person" showed a significant effect for treatment  $(1,54) = 5.619, p < .021$ . Results signified a substantial increase for the LD group mean relative to the RE group mean (adjusted means, experimental group = 9.24, contact control group = 12.38).

TABLE 6

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ALL DERIVED FACTORS FOR  
"FREQUENCY OF ENCOUNTER" CATEGORY

	PRETEST		POSTTEST	
	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)
<u>MALES</u>				
Noninitiator:				
Mean	28.43	28.63	26.53	29.19
S.D.	5.68	4.72	5.29	4.22
Controller:				
Mean	23.63	24.37	22.13	25.26
S.D.	4.91	4.80	5.55	6.67
Personal Person:				
Mean	17.87	17.89	15.57	18.48
S.D.	3.27	2.89	3.44	2.67
Out of Control:				
Mean	8.43	7.93	8.87	8.37
S.D.	2.30	2.15	2.35	2.26
Wants Distance:				
Mean	4.57	4.74	4.90	5.56
S.D.	2.13	2.64	2.16	2.58

TABLE 6 (CONTINUED)

	PRETEST		POSTTEST	
	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)
<u>FEMALES</u>				
Noninitiator:				
Mean	29.33	31.37	29.59	28.97
S.D.	5.08	4.37	4.20	5.02
Controller:				
Mean	20.26	20.83	19.22	20.90
S.D.	4.05	4.73	4.90	5.00
Personal Person:				
Mean	12.30	13.90	12.07	12.77
S.D.	3.00	2.58	2.59	2.42
Out of Control:				
Mean	9.70	10.00	9.22	9.90
S.D.	2.33	2.52	2.29	2.63
Wants Distance:				
Mean	3.63	3.40	3.41	3.83
S.D.	1.88	2.13	1.55	2.18

---

TABLE 7

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ALL DERIVED FACTORS FOR  
"NUMBER OF PEOPLE ENGAGED IN THE ENCOUNTER" CATEGORY

	PRETEST		POSTTEST	
	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)
<u>MALES</u>				
Reciprocally Close:				
Mean	26.93	25.73	27.11	23.70
S.D.	3.99	5.21	3.40	3.82
Want Closeness:				
Mean	17.41	17.40	17.74	16.73
S.D.	2.34	2.58	2.26	2.89
Passive Person:				
Mean	13.04	13.27	13.89	13.47
S.D.	4.01	3.78	5.03	3.66
Cool Person:				
Mean	7.30	6.33	6.67	7.07
S.D.	2.09	1.73	1.75	2.30
In Control:				
Mean	8.37	7.60	8.41	7.30
S.D.	2.13	2.06	2.01	2.02
Want Distance:				
Mean	2.22	2.70	2.52	2.50
S.D.	1.31	1.42	1.25	1.14
Friendly Person:				
Mean	5.44	5.63	5.41	5.30
S.D.	1.01	.72	.84	.92

TABLE 7 (CONTINUED)

	PRETEST		POSTTEST	
	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)	RE (N=30)	LD (N=27)
<u>FEMALES</u>				
Include Me:				
Mean	28.30	30.77	28.96	28.30
S.D.	5.09	4.71	4.64	5.13
Ambivalent Person:				
Mean	15.41	14.30	16.00	14.93
S.D.	3.31	3.63	4.02	3.64
Reciprocally Close:				
Mean	20.70	23.80	21.93	21.47
S.D.	4.55	4.25	4.71	4.01
Passive Person:				
Mean	11.59	10.10	10.30	11.43
S.D.	3.25	3.44	2.96	4.17
In Control:				
Mean	10.33	9.57	10.48	10.37
S.D.	3.23	2.94	3.47	3.45
Friendly Person:				
Mean	5.52	5.87	5.67	5.77
S.D.	.70	.51	.73	.50

In order to assess the effects of treatment (RE,LD) on the derived reciprocal compatibility (RC) scores, a one-way analysis of covariance was performed using the pre-test as the covariate and the posttest as the dependent variable. Wanted and expressed needs were treated independently with respect to the RC scores (see Table 8). Based on the analysis of covariance for all the RC scores, results indicated no significant differences between the RE and LD groups.

TABLE 8  
 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF DERIVED  
 RECIPROCAL COMPATIBILITY (RC) SCORES

		RE (N=27)			
		PRETEST		POSTTEST	
		WANTED	EXPRESSED	WANTED	EXPRESSED
RC:	Mean	17.93	13.33	16.74	12.41
	S.D.	11.86	11.52	11.96	10.43
RC (Inclusiveness):	Mean	8.15	8.07	6.96	7.52
	S.D.	6.41	5.17	5.06	5.59
RC (Control):	Mean	7.15	5.59	5.41	7.44
	S.D.	5.83	4.01	5.35	4.53
RC (Affection):	Mean	5.67	24.19	4.78	5.07
	S.D.	3.99	5.80	4.74	3.52
LD (N=30)					
		PRETEST		POSTTEST	
		WANTED	EXPRESSED	WANTED	EXPRESSED
RC:	Mean	16.30	10.47	15.27	16.23
	S.D.	10.22	9.37	14.83	13.41
RC (Inclusiveness):	Mean	7.17	7.20	8.77	7.07
	S.D.	6.17	5.86	5.68	5.85
RC (Control):	Mean	5.57	6.07	6.50	6.17
	S.D.	5.50	3.92	6.21	4.68
RC (Affection):	Mean	3.33	27.23	5.70	4.97
	S.D.	2.89	5.30	4.04	4.12

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to assess the effects of Guerney's Relationship Enhancement (RE) skills training program on premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility as compared to a lecture/discussion (LD) group. Specifically, it was hypothesized that those premarital couples that participated in RE would evidence greater reciprocal compatibility than the LD group. Thus, in order to assess the findings of this study, it is important initially to establish whether or not the premarital couples actually acquired the skills (i.e. empathy and self-disclosure) presented in the training program. Avery et al. (1980) have analyzed the behavioral data from the Relationship Enhancement Program, which indicated that the RE group compared to a lecture/discussion group, significantly increased in both self-disclosure and empathy skill levels from pretest to posttest, and from pretest to follow-up thereby demonstrating skill maintenance.

Relative to changes in reciprocal compatibility (RC), it is important to note that, following treatment, there were no significant differences between the RE and LD

groups. Two procedures were used to analyze the premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility from pretest to posttest (follow-up results were not available). In the first procedure, Schutz' (1958) standard formula for reciprocal compatibility was used; in the second procedure two reciprocal compatibility scores were actually computed, an expressed and wanted RC score. It was believed that treating expressed and wanted RC scores independently would shed more light on the premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility, in fear of neglecting these two components if treated in one formula. However, neither procedures showed significant results. Nevertheless, it is interesting to observe the overall movement of the RE and LD group means from pretest to posttest. Using Schutz' (1958) interpretation of reciprocal compatibility the RE and LD group started out on fairly similar terms regarding the amount of incompatibility evidenced prior to treatment, although the LD group was somewhat higher. At posttest, the reciprocal compatibility score for the RE went down, thereby indicating more compatibility. However, the LD group showed a higher RC score at posttest indicative of greater incompatibility. Furthermore, the results for the separate RC scores on inclusiveness, control, and affection also failed to exhibit any significant differences between the RE and LD groups.

Utilizing the authors' interpretation of RC, the RE and LD group means showed similarities and dissimilarities with reference to the direction of the RC scores. The wanted reciprocal compatibility score for both RE and LD groups evidenced movement toward greater compatibility from pretest to posttest, however, the expressed reciprocal compatibility score for the RE group demonstrated greater compatibility at posttest, whereas, the LD group revealed a shift towards incompatibility. Again, the results for the separate scores on inclusiveness, control, and affection were not significant.

A possible explanation of these results concerning reciprocal compatibility is that once the couples recognized the reality of their differences in the eight-week period, they may have been at a low point in their relationship, with possible movement toward significant increases in compatibility occurring at a later time. Another alternative is to look at the unit of analysis per se. If indeed the relationship did not change from pretest to posttest, it may be useful to examine what occurred to the individuals in the relationship enhancement group as compared to the individuals participating in the lecture/discussion group.

Examination of the results using the individual as the unit of analysis revealed interesting findings, particularly in relation to the purpose of the relationship

enhancement training program. The RE group evidenced a greater need for wanted inclusiveness than the LD group. In line with Guerney's assumption that clients use their expressive skills to facilitate receptivity to his/her own emotions, needs, conflicts and the like, it can be speculated that the person would want to be included to a greater extent in the other partner's activities. Likewise, the acquisition of self-disclosure and empathy skills would seem to enhance both wanted and expressed affection toward one's partner. In the present study, this was the case for the RE group. Results indicated both treatment and sex effects on the affection dimension, with RE females evidencing an increased need for affection at posttest. The LD group, on the other hand, showed a significant increase in wanted control. A possible explanation for this finding is that some individuals may find it threatening to discuss relationship development issues, and therefore experience a loss of control, which precipitates a need for more control at posttest. Thus, without the benefit of empathy and self-disclosure skill training, these individuals may view relationship issues with more defensiveness, guilt, and blame than individuals with RE training.

In an attempt to further investigate the effects of RE relative to the LD group, it was decided to use a factor analytic technique on the FIRO-B scales. This resolution

was made after a careful examination of Schutz (1958) coding system. In effect, Schutz coding system is not inferior to the author's, but only different. The data was factor analyzed in an endeavor to explore the possibility of deriving new, meaningful hypothetical variables which would enhance the available information on both the RE and LD groups. Furthermore, upon reflection it was resolved to treat the two response categories (i.e., "frequency of encounter" and "number of people engaged in the encounter") independently, the rationale being that a difference may exist between how frequently a behavior occurs relative to the number of people one would want to direct the behavior towards, or have others reciprocate that behavior. Essentially, two different dimensions were examined.

Results of the factor analysis revealed several interesting variables which were then analyzed using a two-way analysis of covariance for the effects of treatment (RE, LD), sex (male, female), and treatment by sex interaction. Based on the foregoing analysis, results indicated two factors that were significant for males in the "frequency of encounter" category. Findings showed that the males in the RE group moved towards more initiating behavior than the males in the LD group. In conformity with the ultimate goal of RE which is to produce a behavioral change in terms of empathy and self-disclosure skills, it can be

speculated that a person trained in these skills would want to initiate activities. The LD group conversely, showed movement towards being non-initiators. Thus, the LD group significantly differed from the RE group on this variable

Furthermore, the RE group and LD group males differed significantly on "personability." The RE males can be described as individuals who like to have personal and close relationships with others, to a greater degree than the LD males, who evidenced a decline on this dimension at post-test. A possible reason for this finding is that the LD treatment made these males more defensive and consequently less likely to engage in more close and personal relationships. Perhaps the absence of empathy and self-disclosure skills makes it more difficult to work through some of the defensiveness produced by the discussions in the group.

Females in the "frequency of encounter" category exhibited five different factors (i.e. non-initiator, controller, personal person, out of control, and wants distance), however, none of the factors reached statistical significance from pretest to posttest. The findings indicate that irrespective of RE or LD treatment, that little progress occurs on the variables listed above. Perhaps females do not readily fit into this categorization, in other words, that the frequency of a behavior is not that salient for females.

Next, the items contained in the "number of people engaged in the encounter" category were factor analyzed, and thereafter a two-way analysis of covariance was performed on the derived factors. Among the seven derived factors for the males (i.e., reciprocally close, want closeness, passive person, cool person, in control, want distance, and the friendly person) only the "reciprocally close" factor obtained significance. The RE males relative to the LD group males showed an increase in reciprocal closeness. This person can be described as someone who tries to have close, personal relationships with people, and in turn, likes to be treated in the same manner. In addition, an increase on this variable signifies a dimensionality of closeness towards more people, and wanting the behavior reciprocated. The males in the RE group increased in their need to be close to others, as compared to the LD group males who actually declined in reciprocal closeness. Relationship enhancement skills may serve to facilitate not only closeness in dyadic pairs, but extend beyond such a relationship. In other words, these individuals want to reach out towards more people and establish significant relationships. The ability to express oneself to others, and in turn, understand other's feelings can lead to the enhancement of meaningful relationships. Without these skills, individual's may be more inclined to trust or get close to

only a selected number of individuals, or perhaps only one person. At the extreme end of this continuum would be a person who forms no close, personal relationships with others.

The females in the "number of people engaged in the encounter" category evidenced six derived factors (i.e., include me, ambivalent person, reciprocally close, passive person, in control, and the friendly person), three of these showing significant differences between the RE and LD group females. The first variable that differentiated between RE and LD group females was the inclusion dimension. This variable typifies a female who wants to be invited to activities, and wants others to act close and personal. Thus, two features are present here, one is that this female wants to be invited to activities by more people, and in addition, wants more people to act close and personal towards her. The females in the RE group showed a significant increase relative to the LD group on the "include me" dimension. Possibly, RE at this juncture, promotes the awareness of more people on a more personal level. Beyond this awareness, may lie the realization that communicating with more people is important - not yet reacting to these needs. Moreover, analysis of the reciprocal closeness dimension, again reveals a significant increase for the females in the relationship enhancement group compared to

the lecture/discussion group females. Consequently, it can be conjectured that the need for inclusiveness and person-ability from others broadens or sets off a reciprocal reaction, whereby the need to act towards others in the same close and personal way is realized. The LD group females decreased on the reciprocal closeness dimension from pretest to posttest; interestingly the LD group mean was higher at pretest than the RE group mean. Therefore, as a function of the LD treatment, the reciprocal need for closeness declined. In association with the previous finding, it is not surprising that the LD group females increased significantly on the passivity dimension relative to the RE females. The lecture/discussion group did not seem to encourage or facilitate reactive behavior, indeed it may have suppressed the expression of personal needs.

#### Limitations and Future Research Directions

The focus of the present study was to assess the effects of Guerney's Relationship Enhancement Program compared to a lecture/discussion group on premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility. Given that this is a unexplored area of empirical investigation, there is a need then to further examine possible changes in premarital couples' reciprocal compatibility due to relationship enhancement skill training. The need for more research follows from the

results of the present study, wherein the individuals in RE perceived themselves as reciprocally close and personable, however, in terms of the relationship no significant changes occurred. Assuming for a moment, that this is not a measurement issue, it can be speculated that the individuals perceived themselves as moving closer toward their partner, but did not reach the expression of these feelings at the relationship level. Further research needs to examine why this transference (i.e. from the individual to the relationship level) did not take place.

An alternative explanation for the lack of transference from the individual to the relationship level, is that it may be a measurement issue. Reciprocal compatibility is extremely complex, both at the operational and conceptual level. Given the changes at the individual level one must wonder as to how reciprocal compatibility has been operationalized using the FIRO-B scales. Future research should work on specific reciprocal compatibility formulations in connection with the appropriate use of the FIRO-B scales. Conceptually, there is a prevalent concern regarding the use of the FIRO-B in the present study, in that the content of the FIRO-B scales move toward the direction of being more general in it's orientation to other people,

therefore it may be inappropriate to use this instrument to determine if relationship enhancement training effects compatibility at the relationship level - which is very partner-specific.

A final limitation of this study was that no follow-up data were reported. This information would provide further clarification if indeed the RE couples relative to the LD couples, experienced a transference from an individual to a couple level in reciprocal compatibility.

APPENDIX A:  
 ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTIVE DATA ABOUT SUBJECTS

TABLE 9  
 ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Major in College	Percentage of Subjects
Agriculture	2.7
Arts and Sciences	41.8
Business Administration	23.6
Education	8.2
Engineering	6.3
Home Economics	14.6
No Answer	1.8

TABLE 10  
 SOCIOECONOMIC INFORMATION

Parent's Income	Percentage of Subjects
Less than 5,999	3.6
6,000 to 7,999	3.6
8,000 to 9,999	2.7
10,000 to 13,999	4.5
14,000 to 19,999	15.5
20,000 to 25,999	24.5
26,000 to 31,999	13.7
Over 32,000	31.8

TABLE 11  
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

"Home"	Percentage of Subjects
Large suburb in metropolitan area	9.1
Medium Suburb in metropolitan area	12.7
Small Suburb	2.7
Large City	8.2
Medium City	32.7
Small City	12.8
Town	18.2
Farm, ranch, or other open country	3.6

## APPENDIX B

## FIRO-B QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to explore the typical ways you interact with people. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers, each person has his own ways of behaving.

Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think a person should do. This is not what is wanted here. We would like to know how you actually behave.

Some items may seem similar to others. However, each item is different so please answer each one without regard to the others. There is no time limit, but do not debate long over any item.

For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you. Place the number of the answer on your answer sheet. Please be honest as you can.

- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| 1 - usually   | 4 - occasionally |
| 2 - often     | 5 - rarely       |
| 3 - sometimes | 6 - never        |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. I try to be with people.  | 9. I try to include other people in my plans.                  |
| 2. I let other people decide what to do.                           | 10. I let other people control my actions.                     |
| 3. I join social groups.   | 11. I try to have people around me.                            |
| 4. I try to have close relationships with people.                  | 12. I try to get close and personal with people.               |
| 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity. | 13. When people are doing things together I tend to join them. |
| 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions.               | 14. I am easily led by people.                                 |
| 7. I try to be included in informal social activities.             | 15. I try to avoid being alone.                                |
| 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.        | 16. I try to participate in group activities.                  |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

- |                 |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 - most people | 4 - a few people      |
| 2 - many people | 5 - one or two people |
| 3 - some people | 6 - nobody            |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 17. I try to be friendly to people.                         | 23. I try to get close and personal with people.             |
| 18. I let other people decide what to do.                   | 24. I let other people control my actions.                   |
| 19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant. | 25. I act cool and distant with people.                      |
| 20. I let other people take charge of things.               | 26. I am easily led by people.                               |
| 21. I try to have close relationships with people.          | 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. |
| 22. I let other people strongly influence my actions.       |  |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

- |                 |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 - most people | 4 - a few people      |
| 2 - many people | 5 - one or two people |
| 3 - some people | 6 - nobody            |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 28. I like people to invite me to things.                   | 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.               |
| 29. I like people to act close and personal with me.        | 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| 30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.     | 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.   |
| 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. | 38. I like people to act friendly toward me.                       |
| 32. I like people to act close toward me.                   | 39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities  |
| 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.   | 40. I like people to act distant toward me.                        |
| 34. I like people to include me in their activities.        |  |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| 1 - usually   | 4 - occasionally |
| 2 - often     | 5 - rarely       |
| 3 - sometimes | 6 - never        |

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people. | 48. I like people to include me in their activities.              |
| 42. I like people to invite me to things.                  | 49. I like people to act close and personal with me.              |
| 43. I like people to act close toward me.                  | 50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.          |
| 44. I try to have other people to do things I want done.   | 51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities |
| 45. I like people to invite me to join thjeir activities.  | 52. I like people to act distant toward me.                       |
| 46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.       | 53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done |
| 47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.    | 54. I take charge of things when I'm with people.                 |

## APPENDIX C

## SCORING PROCEDURES FOR THE FIRO-B QUESTIONNAIRE

Schutz (1958) scoring procedure

The six scales depicted below constitute the FIRO-B. Further, the scale scores (the number of items accepted for each scale) ranges from 0 to 9. Those response categories in bold face are the responses that are accepted as a correct response and therefore coded as a one, all other responses are coded as a zero.

## THE FIRO-B SCALES

## Expressed Behavior of the Self in the Inclusion Area

Item Number	Percent Accpeting	Scale Score	Percent Receiving Scale Score
1	95	0	01
2	89	1	03
3	84	2	04
4	85	3	07
5	65	4	18
6	56	5	16
7	44	6	20
8	13	7	19
9	16	8	10
		9	03

N=1,615

1. I try to be with other people  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
2. I join social groups.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
3. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
4. I try to be included in informal activities.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
5. I try to include other people in my plans.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
6. I try to have people around me.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
7. When people are doing things together I tend to join them.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
8. I try to avoid being alone.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
9. I try to participate in group activities.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never

## Expressed Behavior of the Self in the Inclusion Area

Item Number	Percent Accpeting	Scale Score	Percent Receiving Scale Score
1	71	0	15
2	75	1	06
3	70	2	04
4	70	3	05
5	67	4	06
6	64	5	05
7	62	6	08
8	36	7	19
9	31	8	15
		9	19

N=1,582

1. I like people to include me in their activities.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
2. I like people to invite me to things.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
3. I like people to invite me to join their activities.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
4. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
5. I like people to invite me to things.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
6. I like people to invite me to join their activities.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
7. I like people to include me in their activities.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
8. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
9. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody

## Expressed Behavior of the Self in Control Area

Item Number	Percent Accpeting	Scale Score	Percent Receiving Scale Score	
1	79	0	11	
2	69	1	12	
3	61	2	11	
4	52	3	12	
5	55	4	12	
6	21	5	17	
7	24	6	08	
8	16	7	06	
9	13	8	05	
		9	06	N=1,554

1. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
2. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
3. I try to have other people do things I want done.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
4. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
5. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
6. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
7. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
8. I take charge of things when I'm with people.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
9. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never

## Behavior Wanted from Others Toward Self in Control Area

Item Number	Percent Accpeting	Scale Score	Percent Receiving Scale Score
1	93	0	02
2	85	1	04
3	84	2	08
4	63	3	16
5	65	4	18
6	19	5	23
7	22	6	11
8	12	7	09
9	16	8	04
		9	05

N=1,574

1. I let other people decide what to do.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
2. I let other people decide what to do.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
3. I let other people take charge of things.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
4. I let other people srongly influence my actions.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
5. I let other people strongly influence my actions.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
6. I let other people control my actions.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
7. I am easily led by people.  
usually often sometimes occasionally rarely never
8. I let people control my actions.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody
9. I am easily led by people.  
most people many people some people a few people  
one or two people nobody

## Expressed Behavior of the Self in the Affection Area

Item Number	Percent Accpeting	Scale Score	Percent Receiving Scale Score
1	95	0	01
2	64	1	13
3	72	2	11
4	52	3	27
5	44	4	10
6	29	5	12
7	21	6	06
8	24	7	05
9	11	8	09
		9	06

N=1,467

1. I try to be friendly to people.  
 most people    many people    some people    a few people  
 one or two people    nobody
2. My personal relations with people are cool and distant.  
 most people    many people    some people    a few people  
 one or two people    nobody
3. I act cool and distant with people.  
 most people    many people    some people    a few people  
 one or two people    nobody
4. I try to have close relationships with people.  
 usually    often    sometimes    occasionally    rarely    never
5. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.  
 usually    often    sometimes    occasionally    rarely    never
6. I try to have close relationships with people.  
 most people    many people    some people    a few people  
 one or two people    nobody
7. I try to get close and personal with people.  
 most people    many people    some people    a few people  
 one or two people    nobody
8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.  
 most people    many people    some people    a few people  
 one or two people    nobody
9. I try to get close and personal with people.  
 usually    often    sometimes    a few people    one or two people  
 nobody

## Behavior Wanted from Others toward Self in Affection Area.

Item Number	Percent Accpeting	Scale Score	Percent Receiving Scale Score
1	90	0	05
2	72	1	11
3	72	2	05
4	64	3	07
5	64	4	08
6	34	5	28
7	35	6	08
8	34	7	07
9	17	8	09
		9	11

N=1,467

1. I like people to act friendly toward me.  
most people    many people    some people    a few people  
one or two people    nobody
2. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.  
usually    often    sometimes    occasionally    rarely    never
3. I like people to act distant toward me.  
usually    often    sometimes    occasionally    rarely    never
4. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.  
most people    many people    some people    a few people  
one or two people    nobody
5. I like people to act distant toward me.  
most people    many people    some people    a few people  
one or two people    nobody
6. I like people to act close toward me.  
most people    many people    some people    a few people  
one or two people    nobody
7. I like people to act close and personal with me.  
usually    often    sometimes    occasionally    rarely    never
8. I like people to act close and personal with me.  
most people    many people    some people    a few people  
one or two people    nobody
9. I like people to act close toward me.  
usually    often    sometimes    occasionally    rarely    never

Sladeczek's Scoring Procedure

The two response categories "frequency of encounter" and "number of people engaged in the encounter" were treated independently and coded in the following manner:

Frequency of Encounter		Number of People Engaged in the Encounter	
Usually	= 6	Most people	= 6
Often	= 5	Many people	= 5
Sometimes	= 4	Some people	= 4
Occasionally	= 3	A few people	= 3
Rarely	= 2	One or two people	= 2
Never	= 1	Nobody	= 1

All responses were accepted.

The expressed Reciprocal compatibility score = Expressed Male - Expressed female for all categories (i.e., overall expressed RC score, expressed inclusiveness RC, expressed control RC, and expressed affection RC).

The Wanted Reciprocal Compatibility Score = Wanted male - wanted female for all categories (i.e., overall wanted RC score, wanted inclusiveness RC, wanted control RC, and wanted affection RC).

## REFERENCE NOTES

Brown, N.W., C. Baker, P. Cobb, and M. Finch. Interpersonal Skills Development with Special Education. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children, Atlanta, April 11-15, 1977.

Vargo, R.A. Pupil/Science Teacher Interpersonal Compatibility and Science Attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Chicago, April 1974.

## REFERENCES

- Ard, B.N. and C.E. Ard. (Eds). Handbook of Marriage Counseling. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1969.
- Avery, A.W., C.A. Ridley, L.A. Leslie, and T. Milolland, Relationship enhancement with premarital dyads: A six-month follow-up. American Journal of Family Therapy, 8, 23-30, 1980.
- Berne, E. Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- Bienvenu, M.J., Sr. A measurement of premarital communication. The Family Coordinator, 65-68, 1975.
- Bloom, R.B. Teacher-pupil compatibility and teachers' ratings of children's behavior. Psychology in the Schools, 13:2, 142-145, 1976.
- Bolte, G.L. A communications approach to marital counseling. The Family Coordinator, 32-40, 1970.
- Boscoe, A. Marriage Encounter: The Rediscovery of Love. St. Meinrad, IN: Abbey Press, 1972.
- Bugen, L.A. Composition and orientation effects on group cohesion. Psychological Reports, 40, 175-181, 1977.
- Carkhuff, R.R. Helping and Human Relations (Vol. 1). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Coufal, J.D. Preventive - Therapeutic programs for mothers and adolescent daughters: Relationship enhancement versus discussion methods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1975.
- D'Augelli, A.R., C.S. Deyss, B.G. Guerney, Jr., B. Herschenberg and S. Sborofsky. Interpersonal skill training for dating couples: An evaluation of an educational mental health service. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21:5, 385-389.
- Ely, A.L., B.G. Guerney, Jr. and L. Stover. Efficacy of the training phase of conjugal therapy. Psychotherapy Theory, Research and Practice, 10, 201-207, 1973.

- Fitzpatrick, M.A. and J. Indvik. The instrumental and expressive domains of marital communication. Human Communication Research, 8, 195-213, 1982.
- Froehle, T.C. Construct validity of the FIRO-B questionnaire: A failure to replicate? Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 34, 146-148, 1970.
- Ginsberg, B. Parent-adolescent relationship development: A therapeutic and preventive mental health program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.
- Ginsberg B. and E.L. Vogelsong. Premarital relationship improvement by maximizing empathy and self-disclosure. The PRIMES Program. In B.G. Buerney, Jr. (Ed.), Relationship Enhancement: Skill-Training Programs for Therapy, Problem Prevention, and Enrichment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Gluck, G.A. The Kramer-Froehle controversy: A contribution to construct validity of the FIRO-B questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 43:5, 541-543, 1979.
- Goodman, N. and R. Ofshe. Empathy, communication efficiency and marital status. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, 597-603, 1968.
- Greenberg, E.F., and R.W. Nay. The intergenerational transmission of marital instability reconsidered. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44:2, 335-347, 1982.
- Guerney, B.G., Jr. Relationship Enhancement: Skill Training Programs for Therapy, Problem Prevention, and Enrichment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977(a).
- Haley, J. Strategies of Psychotherapy. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1963.
- Indvik, J. and M.A. Fitzpatrick. If you could read my mind love. . . , Understanding and misunderstanding in the marital dyad. Family Relations, 31:1m 43-51m 1982.
- Kim, J. and C.W. Mueller. Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and How to do it. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1978.
- Kitson, G.C. and M.B. Sussman. Marital complaints, demographic characteristics, and symptoms of mental distress in divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44:1, 87-101, 1982.

- Kramer, E.A. A contribution toward validation of the FIRO-B questionnaire. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 31, 80-81, 1967.
- Locke, H., G. Sabagh, and M. Thomas. Correlates of primary communication and empathy. Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 1956, 24, 116-124.
- Mace, D.R. The outlook for marriage: New needs and opportunities. Foundation News, 36-42, 1975.
- Mace, D.R. and V. Mace. Marriage enrichment - a preventive group approach for couples. In D.H.L. Olson (Ed.), Treating Relationships. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic, 1976.
- Miller, G.A. Psychology as a means of promoting human welfare. American Journal of Psychology, 24, 1063-1075, 1975.
- Miller, S., E.W. Nunnally and D.B. Wackman. Alive and Aware: Improving Communication in Relationships. Minneapolis: Interpersonal Communication Program, 1975.
- Most, R.K. An exploratory program to train lay couples to conduct a marriage preparation intervention based on relationship enhancement skills. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1980.
- Murstein, B.J. Stimulus-Value-Role: A theory of marital choice. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 465-481, 1970.
- Rappaport, A.F. Conjugal relationship enhancement program. In D.H.L. Olson (Ed.), Treating Relationships. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic, 1976.
- Ridley, C.A., S.R. Jorgensen, A.C. Morgan and A.W. Avery. Relationship enhancement with premarital couples: An assessment of effects on relationship adjustment. Unpublished manuscript.
- Robbins, G., and J.E. Toomer. Innovative uses of the FIRO-B in couple counseling. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 277-282, 1976.
- Rutledge, A. Premarital Counseling. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1966.

- Satir, V.M. Conjoint family therapy. In Bernard L. Greene (Ed.), The Psychotherapies of Marital Disharmony. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Schlein, S.P. Training premarital dating couples in empathic and open communication: An experimental evaluation of a potential preventive mental health program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
- Schouble, P.G. and C.G. Hill. A laboratory approach to treatment in marriage counseling: Training in communication skills. The Family Coordinator, 277-284, 1976.
- Schutz, W.C. FIRO: A Three Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.
- Shannon, C.E. and W. Weaver. The Mathematical Theory of Communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- Shapiro, J., H. Krauss and C. Truax. Therapeutic conditions and disclosure beyond the therapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 2990-294, 1969.
- Stinnet, N. Readiness for marital competency and family, dating and prsonality factors. Journal of Home Economics, 61, 683-687, 1969.
- Travis, R.P. and P.Y. Travis. Self-actualization in marriage enrichment. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 2, 73-80, 1976.
- Vogelsong, E.L. Preventive - therapeutic programs for mothers and adolescent daughters: A follow-up of relationship enhancement versus discussion and booster versus o-booster methods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
- Watzlawick, P., J.H. Beavin and D.D. Jackson. Pragmatics of Human Communication. New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.
- Wells, R.A. and J.A. Figuerel. Techniques of structured communication training. Family Coordinator, 8, 273-281, 1979.