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The present study examined the relationships among similarity, interpersonal perception and communicative behaviors in marriage. Sixty-five married couples completed questionnaires and participated in two interactions. It was hypothesized that greater understanding, feelings of being understood, and realization of understanding would be associated with greater self-disclosure, use of more direct person control strategies, and use of less attention control strategies. It was further hypothesized that measuring feelings of being understood and realization of understanding, in addition to measuring understanding, would improve prediction of behavior. Finally, it was hypothesized that the contextual measure of understanding would better predict self-disclosure and interpersonal control than would global measures of understanding. These hypotheses were not supported by the findings of the present study.

Several relationships found in the present study have significant implications for research and practice. First, the importance of cognitive appraisal of communication in
marriage was underscored by the lack of correspondence between participant self-report and rater observation of behavior. Second, global measures commonly used in marital research were found to be more useful in predicting the experiential level of information than in predicting actual behaviors. Third, global reports of open self-disclosure and feeling understood were more closely related to the subjective sense of successful communication in specific interactions than were global measures of similarity and understanding. The findings of the present study also indicate that the person control behavior of asking questions deserves further research attention, due to the close relationship between this behavior and positive overall sentiments about the relationship. Asking open ended questions is the only exception to the finding that observed behaviors were not closely related to feeling understood and satisfied, both in the relationship overall and in specific interactions. Implications of these findings for future research and practice were discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research in Marital Relationships

As marital counseling has become an increasingly common activity of psychologists (Barry, 1970), researchers have sought to determine the factors which underlie optimal marital functioning. Research in this field is in the process of evolving from unsophisticated, atheoretical approaches to methodologically sophisticated, theoretically based approaches. As this development progressed, the emphasis of research shifted from investigation of background and socioeconomic variables as predictors of successful marital functioning to factors such as personality characteristics, role expectations, and congruence of perceptions regarding personality and role expectations. More recent efforts in the investigation of marital relationships have included specific communicative behaviors in the prediction of marital success (Hicks & Platt, 1970).

The work of Terman (1938), though more ambitious than most of the early studies, exemplifies the early research in marital relationships. Using a sample of over 1,000 married
and 100 divorced couples, he correlated several hundred factors with the degree of marital satisfaction. Snyder (1979) notes that such broad, sweeping studies led to the development of global paper and pencil measures of marital satisfaction and attempts to develop measures to predict marital success.

Much of the early research focused on relating global measures of personality factors to these newly developed global measures of marital adjustment. Burgess and Wallin (1953) summarized the findings of this line of research and concluded that happily married spouses are less neurotic and exhibit more companionable qualities such as higher consideration of others, and more emotional dependence than do unhappily married spouses. Interestingly, the husband’s personality characteristics appear to be more strongly related than the wife’s personality characteristics to the couple’s marital adjustment (Barry, 1970).

**Optimal Marital Functioning**

Terms such as stability, happiness, satisfaction, adjustment and relationship quality have been used as descriptors of optimal marital functioning (Spanier & Lewis, 1980). Spanier states that dyadic adjustment is an ongoing process which has a qualitative dimension that can be measured at any given point in time on a continuum from adjusted to maladjusted. Thus, he states that adjustment can be defined as "a process the outcome of which is
determined by the degree of: (1) troublesome dyadic differences; (2) interpersonal tensions and interpersonal anxiety; (3) dyadic satisfaction; (4) dyadic cohesion; and (5) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning." The optimally functioning couple from this point of view would experience few troublesome differences, little anxiety, a high degree of satisfaction, a high level of companionship, and consensus on important matters in the relationship. Spanier's view of optimal marital functioning is employed in the present study.

Global—Historical Versus Situational Measurement of Variables in Marital Research

The initial research on communicative behavior in marital relationships relied on global, self-report measures of past communicative practices to predict scores on global measures of relationship satisfaction (e.g., Navran, 1967). As research in this area progressed, communicative behavior was observed in the laboratory. The majority of these communication studies used global measures of marital satisfaction to classify couples as satisfied or dissatisfied, and examined differences in the communicative behavior of satisfied and dissatisfied couples (Billings, 1979; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; Gottman, Notarius, Markman, Bank, & Yoppi, 1976; Hooley & Hahlweg, 1989; Koren, Carlton, & Shaw, 1980; Margolin & Wampold, 1981; Notarius, Benson,
Researchers on the role of similarity and understanding in marital relationships have also compared global measures of interpersonal needs, personality characteristics, or cognitive factors with global measures of marital satisfaction (Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Newmark, Woody & Ziff, 1977). Similarity in the more immediate sense of the meanings the marital partners attach to their present interaction has not been investigated. Studies investigating the role of understanding in marital relationships have also used prediction of the partners’ responses to global personality measures or ratings of desires in the relationship as global measures of understanding. These measures are then compared with global measures of marital satisfaction (Christensen & Wallace, 1976; Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Murstein & Beck, 1972; Newmark et al., 1977).

The relationship between understanding and observations of communicative behavior has only recently been investigated. Two recent studies used global assessments of understanding in the relationship to predict communicative behaviors and scores on global measures of relationship satisfaction (Loos, 1986; Sillars, Pike, Jones, & Murphy, 1984). Knudson, Sommers, and Golding (1980) conducted a study which examined the relationship between objectively
rated tendencies to avoid or to directly confront conflict and the accuracy of interpersonal perceptions. These researchers found that the tendency to directly confront conflict in the relationship was associated with increased accuracy of interpersonal perception. Knudson et al. (1980) did not investigate the implications of these findings for overall satisfaction with the relationship.

The present study investigates relationships among similarity, interpersonal perception, marital satisfaction, and communicative behaviors. These dimensions of the marital relationship are measured as global attributes and as contextually specific attributes of the relationship. Thus, the present study examines the relative usefulness of global, historical measures versus contextually specific measures in the prediction of communicative behavior. By using both global and specific measures, the question of whether these dimensions of the marital relationship are better conceptualized as stable traits of individuals (or the relationship) or as phenomena embedded in unique interpersonal contexts is addressed.

Communication in the Marital Relationship

The process of communication has increasingly become an important focus of theoreticians and practitioners in marital and family therapy. Numerous studies have found greater levels of self-disclosure between spouses (often measured using self-report measures similar to the Dyadic
Disclosure Inventory used in the present study) to be associated with greater levels of marital adjustment (Burke, Weir, & Harrison, 1976; Hendrick, 1981; Levinger & Senn, 1967; Waring, McElrath, Lefcoe, & Weisz, 1981). Furthermore, marital enrichment programs designed to increase intimate self-disclosure have been associated with increases in marital satisfaction (Guerney, 1977; Jacobson, 1984; Waring, 1981; Waring & Russell, 1981). Resolution of marital conflicts, which are presumed to be inevitable due to the changing needs inherent in marital relationships, has also been identified as crucial to marital satisfaction (Bach & Wyden, 1968; Raush, Hertel, Barry, & Swain, 1974; Satir, 1967).

In a methodological review of the conflict resolution literature, Glick and Gross (1975) offered criticisms applicable to all research in marital communication. They noted that in this body of research the spouses' interpretations of behavior and definitions of the situation are often inferred by the experimenter rather than studied directly. Additionally, attempts to measure communication practices in previous marital conflicts have failed to establish the extent to which the participants' recollections of past behaviors reflect systematic individual distortions and biases in perceptions. In other words, researchers relied on self-report measures regarding conflict behaviors, assuming that such recollections are
without perceptual bias. Also, Glick and Gross note that the operational definitions of interactional style have largely failed to take into account reciprocal influences of spouses' behaviors, i.e., communication-response sequences, and have instead been based on response frequency measures. Finally, the couples' behavior may be artificially constrained by the instructions and requirements of the experimental task.

Glick and Gross (1975) divided the approaches to studying conflict resolution into two types, the questionnaire approach and the simulation approach. In the questionnaire approach, the couples are generally asked to describe their typical communicative behaviors or to rate the relative frequency with which certain types of communications occur while attempting to resolve conflict. According to these authors, the major advantage of this approach is that it taps the partners' perceptions of whether positive or negative behaviors occur during conflict. In other words, it obtains the phenomenological experience of the spouses regarding communication with their partners. Many writers in the area of interpersonal conflict have emphasized the importance of the connotative meaning ascribed to communicative behavior by the recipient of the communication (Bach & Wyden, 1968; Hilyard, 1973).

The primary limitation of the questionnaire approach, according to Glick and Gross, is that in attempting to study
marital interaction via the spouses' perceptions of behavior.
this approach does not relate the spouses' perceptions to a
commonly shared frame of reference. Weiss (1980) theorized
that pre-existing sentiments about the relationship to a
large degree determine the spouses' reports and evaluations
of communicative behaviors. Thus, perhaps perceptual bias
and communicative behavior are confounded in this research
(e.g., one partner may report rejection from the other
whenever there is disagreement between the two). These
perceptual biases, if they exist, may be important in and of
themselves in predicting marital adjustment (e.g., satisfied
couples may have difficulty recalling negative communication
whereas dissatisfied couples may dwell upon it).

At the time of Glick and Gross' review, the simulation
approach usually involved recording the couples' interactions
during an experimentally designed conflict situation. These simulations varied greatly in the degree
to which they resembled or simulated actual marital
conflicts. The primary advantage of this method is that the
communication styles can be more precisely identified in
terms of specific communication sequences. Secondly, the
use of trained raters provides an objective frame of
reference from which reliable comparisons of interaction
styles between couples can be made. However, as mentioned
above, the validity of theoretically derived categories
rests on the assumption that all statements coded alike by
the raters would be similarly interpreted by all spouses (e.g., "supportive" statements, as coded by the raters, would be experienced as reassuring by all participants). In other words, the connotative meaning that different spouses attach to a reliably measured behavior may be quite different. Finally, Glick and Gross caution that one must be careful in making generalizations from simulation studies because the responses of the spouses may differ from their typical interactions as a result of the experimental situation (e.g., the pressure to reach a specific agreement may result in more coercive communications and less tendency to interpret this as hostility).

Clearly, given the strengths and weaknesses of both approaches, Glick and Gross' recommendation that the questionnaire and simulation approaches be combined is a fruitful one. Thus, research should observe and rate communication as well as elicit the participants' subjective perceptions of the interaction. This combination would allow the relationships between objectively observed behaviors and subjectively perceived behaviors to be empirically examined. The authors also recommend that rather than using highly structured tasks which are not relevant to the couple's relationship, researchers should have couples discuss issues which are personally relevant to the two of them and which require minimal guidance from the
experimenter. This allows the behavior in the laboratory to more closely resemble the couple's behavior at home.

A small body of recent research on conflict resolution has developed subsequent to the review by Glick and Gross (1975), using trained raters to code couples' behavior during interaction tasks in which couples discussed issues that were actual areas of conflict in their marriages. Overall, these studies have suggested that distressed couples exhibit more hostile and less supportive and problem solving communication than do nondistressed couples (Billings, 1979; Birchler, Weiss, & Vincent, 1975; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; Gottman et al., 1976; Hooley & Hahlweg, 1989; Koren et al., 1980; Loos, 1986; Margolin & Wampold, 1981; Notarius et al., 1989; Roberts & Krokoff, 1990; Ting-Toomey, 1983; Vanlear & Zeitlow, 1990; Vincent, Weiss, & Birchler, 1975). However, not all research has found these relationships between communicative behaviors and marital satisfaction (Margolin, 1978).

These investigations of aspects of communication such as hostility, supportiveness, and problem solving elucidate the content of what is being exchanges between partners. Yet many theorists (Carson, 1969; Goffman, 1959; Laing, 1961; Satir, 1967; Sullivan, 1953; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967) consider the communicative behaviors by which persons attempt to define their relations with others to be of primary importance. According to these theorists, much
of communicative behavior serves as attempts to exert interpersonal control within the relationship. Mishler and Waxler (1968), in their investigation of the interaction patterns of the families of schizophrenics and normals, identified two basic strategies of exerting influence within familial relationships, attention control, and person control. Person control strategies include interruptions of communication and questions. Attention control strategies include participation rate, length of speech, and who speaks to whom. Person control strategies have a more direct quality whereas attention control strategies have a more indirect quality. These researchers found that healthier families used more direct person control strategies whereas disturbed families used the more indirect attention control strategies. The relationships among interpersonal control strategies, marital satisfaction, understanding and interpersonal perception have not been empirically investigated.

Similarity in the Marital Relationship

As Loos (1986) notes in reviewing the literature on similarity in interpersonal relationships, research has demonstrated that similarities in values, abilities, economic status, and personality traits increase initial attractions to others. Thus, similarity is of primary importance in the initial phase of marital relationships (i.e., choosing potential partners).
Early research identified higher occupational status, income and educational level for husbands as well as husband-wife similarities in socioeconomic status, age, and religion as predictors of marital happiness. However, these variables accounted for less than a third of the variance in marital happiness. Subsequent research attempted to account for more of the variance in marital happiness by examining similarity with regard to variables other than broad demographic factors (Hicks & Platt, 1970).

Rather than focus on similarity in terms of external attributes or personality traits, Kelly (1955) focuses on the ways persons organize their experiencing of the events they encounter. This viewpoint is expressed in Kelly's commonality corollary, which states that "to the extent that one person employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, his psychological processes are similar to those of the other person." The conclusion of several researchers (Byrne, 1971; Clore & Byrne, 1974; Griffitt, 1974) is that similarity of fundamental attitudes or world views underlies these various similarity-attraction findings mentioned above. Commonality seems to increase attraction to the relationship. Kelly (1955) states that persons seek validation of their construct systems. Thus, as a way of maintaining their construct systems, persons choose continued interaction with others whose construals of events are similar to their own.
The importance of validation seeking in interpersonal relationships is supported by the research of Neimeyer and Neimeyer (1982) and Duck (1973) who found that friends have more similar constructs than acquaintances.

Research regarding similarity in marital relationships has found that happily married couples are more similar than dissatisfied couples (Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Neimeyer & Hudson, 1985; Newmark et al., 1977). Yet, as Loos (1986) notes, previous research suggests that other factors, particularly perceived similarity, developmental stage of the relationship, and level of understanding may interact with similarity to influence interpersonal processes. The interaction of similarity and understanding is of particular importance in the marital relationship. As Loos found, couples may perceive similarity where it does not exist and not perceive it where it does exist.

**Interpersonal Perception in the Marital Relationship**

It is commonly assumed that satisfied couples have a greater understanding of each others' needs than do dissatisfied couples and this greater understanding leads to more effective communication. The typical operational definition of understanding is the spouses' accuracy in predicting each others' self ratings on assessment devices. The content of these devices varies from personality inventories to lists of needs and desires within the marital
relationship. Thus, how relevant the measure of understanding is to the marital relationship varies across studies (Tiggle, Peters, Kelley, & Vincent, 1982).

As Sillars et al. (1984) report, many empirical studies have found a positive relationship between measures of understanding and marital satisfaction or marital adjustment (Christensen & Wallace, 1976; Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Laing, Phillipson & Lee, 1966; Murstein & Beck, 1972; Newmark et al., 1977; Stuckert, 1963; Taylor, 1967). However, Chronbach (1955) pointed out that understanding and similarity are often confounded in research on understanding between partners. This criticism applies to the majority of studies in this area. Couples who are more similar to each other in a given domain such as interpersonal needs may score higher on understanding than couples who are less similar. This may take place via projection or assumption of similarity rather than on the basis of empathetically appreciating the spouse’s unique viewpoint (Sillars et al., 1984). In the studies which have controlled for this confound (Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Newmark et al., 1977) the results are mixed regarding the relationship between understanding and marital happiness.

Laing et al. (1966) viewed understanding as one part of the "spiral of reciprocal perspectives" between partners. The three fundamental perspectives identified by Laing et al
are the direct perspective, the metaperspective, and the meta-metaperspective. In relationships, oneself or one’s partner will be the focus of each of these perspectives. One’s direct perspective is thus one’s view of oneself or one’s partner (e.g., "I am an emotionally stable person" or "My wife is an excitable person"). One’s metaperspective is the perception one has of the other’s direct perspective ("My wife thinks I am emotionally stable" or "My wife perceives herself as calm"). One’s meta-metaperspective is one’s view of how the other person sees him or her seeing them, or as Laing et al. put it "how I see you seeing me see you" (e.g., "She thinks I am being unfair in perceiving her as unreasonable" or "She thinks I am being egotistical in thinking that she sees me as attractive").

Interpersonal perception of the dyad is assessed by comparing these various perspectives with each other. Agreement is assessed by comparing direct perspectives (e.g., comparing the husband’s and wife’s viewpoints on the ideal amount of personal space in the relationship). Understanding is assessed by comparing one partner’s metaperspective with the other’s direct perspective (e.g., the husband’s perception of whether or not his wife thinks that he is handsome compared with the wife’s view of whether or not her husband is handsome). The feeling of being understood is measured by comparing one partner’s metaperspective with his or her own direct perspective. In
other words, measures of feelings of being understood are derived from the comparison of one partner’s view of an issue ("I am easy going") with his or her prediction of the other spouse’s view ("She will think I am easy going"). Realization of understanding is assessed by comparing one partner’s meta-metaperspective with the other’s metaperspective. For example, the wife’s metaperspective ("he will think I described myself as introverted") is compared to the husband’s meta-metaperspective ("she will think I predicted her to describe herself as extroverted").

Hypotheses

The present study will extend the work of Loos (1986) in examining relationships among similarity, interpersonal perception, communicative behavior, and relational satisfaction. Loos operationalized sociality (understanding) in terms of global predictive accuracy. However, sociality refers to more than being able to reliably predict how one’s partner will respond. Sociality primarily refers to how meaningful the responses of one partner are to the other. In other words, sociality involves not only being able to predict how one’s partner will respond, but also whether these responses make sense within each partner’s system of meanings. The present study attempts to measure both aspects of sociality. Loos used global measures of similarity and understanding to predict specific verbal content and global relational satisfaction.
The present study uses measures of similarity and interpersonal perception in the current communicative context in addition to global, historical measures of these dimensions to predict both the content and process of communication between spouses. Finally, Loos considered only one level of understanding whereas the present study will investigate several levels of interpersonal perception thought by interpersonal theorists (Laing et al., 1966) to be important to interpersonal communication.

It is expected that couples who have been successful in subsuming each others' construct systems, compared to couples who have been less successful in this endeavor, will be more mutually disclosing and will use more direct means of exerting influence in their communication. Thus, it is hypothesized that couples with higher scores on measures of sociality (understanding) will be more disclosing, use more direct person control strategies, and will experience greater relational satisfaction compared to couples with lower scores on sociality (understanding) measures. Additionally, feelings of being understood and realization of understanding as measured both globally and in specific interactive contexts are expected to be predictive of communicative behavior. It is hypothesized that higher levels of feelings of being understood and realization of understanding will be associated with more disclosive verbal communication and more direct person control strategies of
interpersonal influence. It is also expected that measurement of these facets of the marital relationship will significantly improve prediction of both content and process of communication beyond measurement of understanding only. Finally, it is expected that more contextually based measures of similarity and interpersonal understanding will provide better prediction of communicative behaviors in specific interactions when compared to more global measures of these factors.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Sixty five married couples participated in the study. They were recruited via advertisements in a local newspaper and in the Baylor University Newspaper. The study was described in the advertisement as a "study on marital communication." The advertisement offered 25 dollars for participation in the study. It also stated that participation would require about two and one-half hours. The participants were screened in the initial phone contact on the basis of how long they had known each other and how long they had been married. All couples reported having known each other for at least 2 years and having been married for at least one year.

Regarding the amount of time dated before marriage, 7.69% of the couples reported that they dated less than three months while 15.38% reported that they had dated from three to six months before marriage. The couples who reported dating from six months to one year before marriage made up 24.62% of the sample while 46.15% of the couples reported dating from one to three years before marriage. Couples who dated more than three years before marrying made up 6.15% of the sample.
The range of marriage length was 47 years. Participants had been married from one to 48 years, with a mean length of marriage of 9.6 years. The median length of marriage was five years. The standard deviation of length of marriage was 11.36 years.

The number of children currently living in the home ranged from 0 to 3. Couples with no children in the home made up 46.2% of the participants. Couples with one child in the home made up 18.5% of the participants. Couples with two children made up 24.6% of the participants. Couples with three children in the home made up 10.8% of the participants. The mean number of children living in the home was 0.92 with a standard deviation on this variable of 1.09. The median number of children in the home was one while the modal number of children in the home was zero.

Caucasians made up 89.2% of both the husbands and the wives in the study. Hispanics made up 4.6% of the husbands and 6.2% of the wives. There were 3.1% black husbands and 1.5% black wives. Asians participants made up 3.1% of the husbands and 1.5% of the wives.

The husbands' age had a range of 50. Their ages varied from 19 to 69 years with a mean age of 35.71 years, and a median age of 34 years. The standard deviation of husbands' age was 12.15 years. The wives' age had a range of 47. Their ages varied from 19 to 66 years with a mean age of
34.42 years and a median age of 32 years. The standard deviation of wives' age was 11.43.

The couples' annual income level had a range of $77,000. The lowest income level was $3,000 and the highest was $80,000. The mean income level was $28,148.33. The median income level was $24,000 while the modal income level was $15,000.

The husbands' education level ranged from less than the 11th grade to graduate level degrees. Of the husbands, 1.5% reported that their highest level of education was less than the 11th grade, while 18.5% reported having a high school diploma. The percentage of husbands reporting having some college or technical training beyond high school was 32.3. The percentage of husbands reporting graduation from college was 35.4 while another 12.3% reported having graduate degrees. The wives' education level also ranged from below the 11th grade to graduate level degrees. Of the wives, 4.7% reported the 11th grade as their highest level of education while 28.1% reported having graduated from high school. The percentage of wives who reported having some college or technical training beyond high school was 32.8%. The percentage of the wives reported graduation from college was 29.7 while another 4.7% reported having graduate degrees.
Procedure

This study was conducted in the Psychology Clinic of Baylor University in Waco, Texas. When the participants arrived for the experiment they were given a general introduction to the questionnaires and procedures in which they would be asked to participate (Appendix A). They were instructed that there were no right or wrong responses to any of the questionnaires and were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. Each participant was then asked to read and sign the informed consent form (Appendix B). After checking to see if the participants had any questions, the instructions for the questionnaire packet were given. The participants then completed the questionnaire packet which included a Demographic Information Questionnaire (Appendix C), the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Appendix D), the Partner Communication Questionnaire (Appendix E), the Dyadic Disclosure Inventory (Appendix F), Common Marital Conflicts Rating Form (Appendix G), Conflict Distress Rating Form (Appendix H), and the Role Construct Repertory Test which is typically referred to as the REP Test (Appendices I and J).

Turner (1971) conceptualized communication in marriage as consisting of two basic domains which he termed task oriented and identity oriented communication. Task oriented communication is directed toward a purpose. Conflict resolution is a basic type of task oriented communication.
Identity oriented communication is directed toward maintaining the person's identity within the relationship. Building intimacy through mutual self-disclosure is a basic type of identity oriented communication. The present study investigated communication in both of these contexts by having the participants complete a conflict resolution task and an intimacy building task. The order of tasks was randomly determined prior to the interaction.

Prior to the conflict resolution task the participants were asked to rank order a list of ten potential conflicts in their marriage in terms of their desire for change regarding the issue (Appendix J). The list was derived by Sillars et al. (1984) from research on sources of dissatisfaction in marriage. After rank ordering the list, the participants then rated on a Likert scale the degree of distress they felt about the issue (Appendix H). The three issues which received the highest rankings were used for discussion. Couples were given four minutes to discuss each issue. See Appendix K for the interaction instructions.

Prior to the intimacy building interaction, the participants were asked to choose three bipolar constructs from their REP Grids on which they rated their partner in a positive way. The participants were instructed to share with each other past events and experiences when each of these three constructs fit their experiencing of their partner. Within a series of three four-minute interactions,
each spouse was to describe how they had come to see their partner in terms of the three constructs they had chosen. See Appendix K for the interaction instructions.

Following each interaction the participants completed an Interaction Evaluation Scale (Appendix L). First, the participants rated their experience of themselves and their partners in interaction on several dimensions including satisfaction, level of self disclosure and liking for the partner. Second, the participants predicted how their partners responded to the same items. Third, the participants rated how they thought their partners predicted to respond to the items.

**Variables**

**Demographic Information**

*Demographic Information Questionnaire.* The 11-item questionnaire (Appendix C) designed by Loos (1986) was used in this study. This questionnaire addresses demographic variables that previous research has found to be related to global measures of marital happiness (Hicks & Platt, 1970) such as income, age, number of children, and educational level.

**Global--Historical Measure of Marital Adjustment and Satisfaction**

*Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS).* The DAS (Spanier, 1976) was used as a general measure of marital satisfaction. This frequently used, 32-item questionnaire
assesses relational satisfaction and adjustment along four dimensions: degree of consensus, amount of cohesion, affectional expression, and general relational satisfaction. Many of the items tap dyadic rather than individual response to the relationship. The scoring of all items is computed so that higher scores represent greater relational adjustment. The range of possible scores on each participant's Dyadic Adjustment Scale is 0 to 153. The Couple Dyadic Adjustment score is the summation of both partners' scores. Thus, the total score may vary from 0 to 306.

In investigations of the scale's reliability and validity, the DAS has been shown to have high reliability (Chronbach's Alpha = .96), and good content, criterion related, and construct validity (Spanier, 1976; Spanier & Cole, 1976). The four empirically derived subscales have been substantiated in factor analytic studies (Spanier & Cole, 1976; Spanier & Thompson, 1982). The dyadic consensus subscale is a general measure of the extent of agreement between spouses on a variety of basic issues such as finances, sexual relations, goals, household tasks, etc. The dyadic cohesion subscale is a general measure of the amount of companionate activities in which the couple engages. The dyadic affection subscale is a general measure of the amount of open expression of affection between partners. The degree of overall happiness in the
relationship is assessed by the dyadic satisfaction subscale.

**Marital Satisfaction in the Present Context**

**Couple Contextual Satisfaction Score.** Immediately following each interaction the participants completed an Interaction Evaluation Scale (IES). Among the dimensions assessed by this scale is the amount of satisfaction with the interaction and with the relationship. This scale is the summation of the partners’ responses to item numbers 3 and 7 of the Interaction Evaluation Scale (see Appendix L). Both items are seven-point Likert Scale items. Scores were computed such that higher numerical values were associated with greater feelings of satisfaction. The couples’ responses to both items were added for the couple score. The possible range of the couple score was from 0 to 28.

**Global-Historical Measures of Communicative Behavior**

**Partner Communication Questionnaire (PCQ).** This is a nine-item questionnaire (see Appendix E) which assesses the partners’ subjective perceptions of their communication with each other as well as their perceptions regarding similarity and understanding. The domain of communication assessed is that of interpersonal control strategies. Answers to each item are on a seven-point Likert scale. All scores derived from this questionnaire are based on both spouses’ responses. The following are the five scores derived from this questionnaire.
The Global Self-Report of Attention Control Strategies score is derived from items which require the respondent to rate his or her own (PCQ #1) and the spouse's (PCQ #2) tendency to attempt to control the focus of interaction. The range of possible scores was from 0 to 28. Higher scores reflect greater perception that attention control strategies are used in important conversations.

The Global Self-Report of Direct Person Control—Closed Questions score is derived from responses to items which ask marital partners whether the respondent (PCQ #3) or the spouse (PCQ #4) typically makes direct and specific requests for information from the other during important conversations. The range of possible scores on this measure is from 0 to 28. Higher scores reflect greater perception that this type of control strategy is used in important conversations.

The Global Self-Report of Direct Person Control—Interruptions score is derived from items which ask marital partners to evaluate the extent to which the respondent (PCQ #6) and the spouse (PCQ #7) use interruptions to control important conversations. The range of possible scores is from 0 to 28. Higher scores reflect greater feelings that the interruptions are used as a control strategy.

The Dyadic Disclosure Inventory is a 26-item, self-report measure of the participants' perceptions of self disclosure outside of the laboratory (see Appendix F). Loos
(1986) adapted this scale from Taylor and Altman’s (1966a) compendium on disclosure research. This scale is designed to assess both breadth of disclosure (i.e., the number of topics discussed) and depth of disclosure (i.e., the level of intimacy of the topics discussed) achieved in the relationship. The scale covers 13 topics which Taylor and Altman (1966a, 1966b) scaled as high or low intimacy. The topics assessed are religion, money, politics, feelings, interests, family, sex, body image, work, values, biographical information, and friendship. For each item, the participant is instructed to write "2" if the topic has been discussed openly and freely, "1" if the topic has been discussed somewhat, or "0" if the topic has not been discussed at all (Loos, 1986). The Couple Dyadic Disclosure Score is computed by summing the numerical value of each of the 26 items for both spouses. Higher couples scores reflect greater perceived breadth and depth of disclosure. The possible range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 104.

Observations of Current Communicative Behavior: Content Measure

Disclosure Rating Scale. This measure designed by Doster (1971) is a seven-point descriptively anchored scale on which trained raters measure the participant’s level of self-disclosure from audiotapes or written transcripts (see Appendix M). The reliability estimates using Ebel’s
reliability coefficient range from .98 (Doster, 1972) to .75 (McAllister, 1973). The depth of self-disclosure ratings vary from nondisclosive statements which contain no reference to self at all to disclosures which integrate thoughts, feelings and evaluation of the self. Three raters were initially trained in the rating procedure using audiotaped data gathered for other purposes. By the end of training, the three raters obtained an interrater reliability coefficient of .85 using the Ebel's (1951) intra-class correlation method. The self-disclosure rating for each member of the dyad in each interaction is the sum of the ratings given by the two raters who demonstrated the greatest interrater reliability in the rating of the participant's interaction data. These raters' self-disclosure ratings for the conflict resolution interaction obtained an Ebel's r of .75. The Ebel's r obtained for the ratings of the intimacy building interaction was .80. The couple self-disclosure rating score for each interaction is the sum of the self-disclosure ratings for both members of the dyad. The possible range of the self-disclosure rating score for each interaction is from 0 to 144. Thus, higher couple scores reflect greater observed self-disclosure.

**Measures of task involvement.** Total talk time is a measure of the total length of time for each interaction. It was measured by starting the timing after the last word
of the instructions and ending the timing after the participant's last word. The participants were instructed that they had four minutes to discuss each of three topics per interaction. Participants were not allowed to continue the discussion of any one topic for more than four minutes. Longer total talk time scores represent greater task involvement. The audiotapes of six couples were randomly selected for use in a reliability check. These six couples were timed by the experimenter. Pearson product moment correlations were computed between the experimenter's and rater's timings of these couples. For both interactions a correlation of 1.00, \( p < .01 \) was found between the experimenter's and the rater's timings of the interactions.

The Silence Quotient measure is computed by summing all pauses of two seconds or longer within and between speakers and then dividing this sum by the total talk time. The silence quotient has been found to have a negative correlation with self-disclosure (Doster, 1972). Thus, it is regarded as a measure of self-monitoring and guardedness. Higher silence quotient scores reflect greater guardedness and more self-monitoring during the interaction tasks. The experimenter timed the speech pauses of six couples to check the reliability of the timing of these pauses. The Pearson product moment correlation between the experimenter's and the rater's timing of pauses was \( .92, p < .01 \) in the
conflict resolution interactions and .99, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interactions.

**Interpersonal Control Strategies**

Maximum speech percentage. Percentage of the total speech time taken by a member of a dyad is viewed by Mishler and Waxler (1968) as a measure of attention control. All pauses of two seconds or more are subtracted from each participant’s total speaking time to derive the speech duration for each spouse. The larger of the husband’s or wife’s speech duration is divided by the total talk time for the interaction and is used as the maximum speech percentage score for the couple. Larger scores thus represent greater discrepancy between husband and wife in speech duration and greater use of attention control. Scores can potentially vary from 50% speech time for each spouse (and therefore a score of 50%) to no speech time for one spouse and 100% for the other (and therefore a score of 100%).

The experimenter timed the speech duration of six couples to check the reliability of this measure. The Pearson product moment correlation between the experimenter and rater’s timing of husbands’ speech duration was .96, \( p < .01 \) in the conflict resolution interaction and .99, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interaction. The correlation between the same variables for the wives was .99, \( p < .01 \) in the conflict resolution interaction and 1.00, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interaction. The reliability of total
talk time, the other component of the maximum speech percentage score, has been previously described.

**Interruptions.** This measure is simply the number of times either member of a couple successfully interrupts the other. Mishler and Waxler (1968) classify this as a means of direct person control.

The experimenter randomly selected seven couples and counted their interruptions of each other in both interactions in order to assess the reliability of the rater’s count of interruptions. A Pearson moment correlation of .87, $p < .01$ was found between the experimenter’s and the rater’s count of interruptions in the conflict resolution interactions. A correlation of .93, $p < .01$ was found for the same two variables in the intimacy building interactions.

**Open-ended questions.** This measure is the total number of questions which do not restrict the responder to yes or no answers or request a specific fact. Mishler and Waxler (1968) classified open-ended questions as a means of indirect person control. In order to check the reliability of the count of open-ended questions, the experimenter counted this type of question in both interactions for seven randomly selected couples. The Pearson product moment correlation between the experimenter’s and the rater’s count of interruptions was .80, $p < .05$ in both interactions.
Closed questions. This measure is the total number of questions which request specific facts or a yes or no answer from the respondent. Mishler and Waxler (1968) classified this measure as a direct person control strategy. The Pearson product moment correlation between the experimenter’s and the rater’s count of closed questions on seven randomly selected samples was .85, \( p < .05 \) in the conflict resolution interaction and .88, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interaction.

Participant Perception of Current Communicative Behavior

Perceived depth of self-disclosure. This score is the summation of the wife’s and husband’s responses to the Partner Communication Questionnaire item number one. This item asked the participants to rate the degree to which each spouse revealed his or her thoughts, feelings, and self-perceptions.

Perceived intimacy of self-disclosure. This score is the summation of the wife’s and husband’s responses to the Partner Communication Questionnaire item number two. This item asked the participants to rate the level of intimacy in the information each spouse disclosed.

Perceived occurrence of closed questions. This score is the summation of the wife’s and husband’s responses to the Partner Communication Questionnaire item number four. This item asked the participants to rate how much direct and
specific requests for information occurred during the previous interaction.

**Perceived use of interruptions.** This score is the summation of the wife’s and husband’s responses to the Partner Communication Questionnaire item number five. This item asked the participants to rate the degree to which each partner tried to control the previous discussion through the use of interruptions.

**Perceived use of attention control strategies.** This score is the summation of the wife’s and husband’s responses to the Partner Communication Questionnaire item number six. This item asked the participants to rate the degree to which each spouse focused the discussion on himself or herself.

**Global—Historical Measures of Similarity and Interpersonal Perception**

**Role Construct Repertory Test.** Landfield’s (1971) modification of Kelly’s (1955) Role Construct Repertory Test (REP Test) was used to elicit 10 constructs from each participant (see Appendix L). The REP Test instructions require the participants to list ten persons who have played various roles in the person’s life. Each construct is then elicited by having the participants describe how two preselected persons on their list are similar to each other and how one of the remaining persons on the list is different from the first two. Each bipolar construct then serves as a 13-point rating scale on which the participants
are asked to rate each of the role persons. Thus, all ten persons are rated on all ten bipolar rating scales. Depending on factors such as test-retest time, elements involved, and relationships investigated, the REP Test has been found to have test-retest reliabilities from .60 to .80 in normal populations (Bannister & Mair, 1968).

Global Measures of Similarity and Understanding

REP Test organizational similarity score.

Organizational similarity is a measure of commonality. As Loos (1986) noted, commonality has been measured in terms of content similarity (the similarity of the labels used to describe constructs) and organizational similarity (the degree to which partners actually sort elements, in this case role persons, in the same way regardless of the construct labels). Kelly’s definition of commonality referred to the extent that persons actually employ their constructs in the same way rather than similarity in terms of the words used to describe the constructs. Thus, organizational similarity more closely fits Kelly’s definition of commonality than does the typical content based measure of similarity. For example, if the two partners construe person A and person B as alike and different from person C, then their psychological processes are considered by Kelly to be similar. This is true even if the husband labels persons A and B as "hip" and person C as
"square" and the wife labels persons A and B as "happy" and person C as "sad."

The organizational similarity score is derived from the participants' responses to the first three steps of the Role Construct Repertory Test (see Appendix I). In Step #1, the participants wrote the names of ten persons (e.g., "the happiest person the two of you know"). In Step #2, ten bipolar constructs were elicited. In the elicitation of each construct, the participants were instructed to first find one way in which two preselected persons (e.g., husband's and wife's mother) were alike. Once this similarity was identified, the participants then chose one of the remaining eight persons whom they viewed as different from the two persons first compared. The participants then described how this third person was different from the first two. For Step #3, the bipolar constructs were used as anchors on 13-point rating scales which ranged from -6 to +6. In Step #3 the participants assigned a number between -6 and +6 to all ten persons on each of the ten construct rating scales. On each rating scale the description of similarity between the two preselected persons was on the negatively numbered end of the scale. The description of the third person who was different from the first two persons was on the positively numbered end of the scale. A negatively numbered rating of any person on a given construct rating scale signified that the descriptor on that
end of the scale was the one that best described the person and thus that the participant viewed the person as being similar to the two persons first compared in the elicitation of the construct. A positively numbered rating of any person signified that the descriptor on that end of the scale was the one that best described the person and thus that the participant viewed the person as different from the two persons first compared. A rating of zero signified that the rating scale did not apply to a given person.

The procedure used by Loos (1986) to score organizational similarity was followed in the present study. One point was given when both partners assigned a given person a negatively numbered rating (signifying similarity to the two persons first compared in the elicitation of the construct). Likewise, one point was given when both partners assigned a positively numbered rating to a given person (signifying that the person was different from the two persons first compared in the elicitation of the construct). When both spouses indicated that a given construct did not apply to a particular person (by assigning a rating of zero) one point was awarded. All instances which did not meet one of the three conditions described above were awarded zero points.

The two preselected persons used to elicit the descriptor for the negative side of the 13-point construct rating scale will always have a negative number and thus the
spouses have, as a result of the instructions, agreed on which side of the scale applies to these two persons. On each bipolar rating scale, the persons not used in the initial comparisons, could be assigned a positive or negative number depending on which of the two descriptive anchors best described the person. Thus, the spouses could agree or disagree on eight out of ten ratings per construct rating scale. Therefore, the organizational similarity score will have a possible range from 0 to 80. Since this measure is derived by adding instances of agreement, organizational similarity increases as the numeric value of the score increases.

**REP Test perceived similarity score.** A measure of similarity which Loos (1986) termed content similarity will also be used in the present study. The discrepancy between self ratings and ratings of the partner on both participants' REP Grids are used for this score. As mentioned above, the perceived similarity score more closely resembles the typical measure of similarity used in studies investigating similarity between spouses. This measure is scored by taking the absolute difference between the spouses' rating of self and spouse on their own spouses' constructs (twenty differences scores are computed for each partner). The couple perceived similarity score is computed by adding the husband's and wife's scores together. Thus, the couple score is the sum of these forty discrepancies.
On each of these forty comparisons between self and spouse, the discrepancy can range from 0 to 12. Thus, the range of possible scores is 0 to 480. Increases in the perceived similarity scores are reflective of decreases in perceived similarity between spouses.

**Global self-report similarity.** This score is derived from a Partner Communication Questionnaire item (PCQ #7) which addresses the participants’ perceptions of similarity to the marital partner. It is computed by adding both partners’ responses to this item. The range of possible scores on this measure is from 0 to 14. Higher scores reflect greater sense of similarity between partners.

**REP Test interpersonal meaningfulness score.** As mentioned previously, understanding is typically measured by comparing one partner’s metaperspective with the other’s direct perspective. Kelly’s sociality corollary has to do with the meaningfulness of another’s construct system as well as the ability to predict the other’s responses or viewpoints. Thus, rather than use predictive accuracy on REP Grid responses as the primary global assessment of sociality, this study also used the interpersonal meaningfulness measure recommended by Landfield (1971). Landfield found that persons use more extreme ratings of constructs which are more meaningful to them. The degree to which the participants use more extreme ratings when applying each others’ constructs was used as a measure of
the extent to which they have been able to make each others' construct systems meaningful (sociality). The couple score is computed by adding the absolute value of each rating when using the partner's constructs in completing the rating grid. Since this was a ten by ten grid (ten constructs by ten role persons), each partner contributed 100 of the 200 ratings on which this score is based. The range of absolute values for each rating is from 0 to 6. Thus, the possible range of scores is from 0 to 1,200. Higher couple scores reflect higher levels of interpersonal meaningfulness.

REP Test couple understanding score. Another global assessment of sociality was derived from a comparison of the participants' predictions of their spouses' ratings and their spouses' actual ratings of the ten role persons on both spouses' constructs. Thus, each spouse made 200 predictions of the other spouse for a total of 400 predictions for the couple. The absolute value of the discrepancy between one spouse's rating and the other's prediction of that rating can range from 0 to 12. Thus, the range of scores on this measure can vary from 0 to 480. As the numeric value of this score decreases, the couple's predictive accuracy of each other increases.

Global self-report understanding. This score is derived from a Partner Communication Questionnaire item (PCQ #8) which assesses how well each marital partner feels that he or she understands the other partner. It is computed by
adding both partners' responses to this item. The range of possible scores on this measure is from 0 to 14. Larger scores represent greater perceived understanding.

REP Test feelings of being understood score. A global assessment of the degree to which the participants feel understood by their partners was derived through a comparison of the participants' prediction of how their partners would rate them and how they actually rated themselves. The discrepancies were calculated by taking the absolute difference between self-rating and anticipation of spouse rating for both spouses using self and spouse's constructs. The maximum discrepancy between self rating and anticipated spouse rating was 12. Thus, with 40 comparisons (each spouse making 10 judgments on his or her own constructs and 10 judgments on the partner's constructs), the possible range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 480. As feelings of being understood increase the numeric value of the score decreases.

REP Test realization of understanding score. A global assessment of the realization of understanding in the relationship was derived by calculating the discrepancy between the respondents' predictions of their spouses' predictions of the respondents' initial ratings (of self and partner) and their spouses' actual predictions. In other words, the participants were asked to make the ratings of self and partner (using both sets of constructs) as they
predicted that their partner would predict them to have made the ratings. Since each partner made 40 ratings, this score is based on 80 discrepancy scores. For each rating the range of possible discrepancies was from 0 to 12. Thus, the total score potentially may range from 0 to 480. As realization of understanding increases the REP Test realization of understanding score decreases.

Measures of Similarity and Interpersonal Perception in the Current Communication Context

Overall contextual similarity score. The discrepancies between the partners’ responses (direct perspectives) on each question of the Interaction Evaluation Scale (Appendix L) were summed to assess the extent to which the couple viewed the interaction in similar ways. On each of the eight areas covered by this scale all participants rated themselves and their spouses. Thus, this score is based on the sum of 16 discrepancies. The maximum discrepancy on each of these items is 6. The range of possible values for this score is from 0 to 96. As similarity in perceptions of the interaction increases the overall contextual similarity score decreases.

Similarity in perceived depth of self-disclosure. This score is computed from the Interaction Evaluation Scale Item #1 (Appendix L). It is computed by summing the discrepancies between the husband’s and wife’s responses regarding the level of depth of each spouse’s disclosures.
The range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 12. As the score increases, the agreement between spouses regarding the depth of self-disclosure decreases.

**Similarity in perceived intimacy of self-disclosure.**
This score is computed from the Interaction Evaluation Scale Item #2 (Appendix L). It is computed by summing the discrepancies between the husband’s and wife’s responses regarding the intimacy of each spouse’s disclosures. The range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 12. As the score increases, the agreement between spouses regarding the intimacy of self-disclosure decreases.

**Similarity in satisfaction rating.** This score was computed by summing the discrepancies between the husband’s and wife’s responses to Interaction Evaluation Scale Items #3 and #7 (Appendix L). These items assessed satisfaction with the interaction and with the spouse. The range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 24. As the score increases, the agreement regarding satisfaction decreases.

**Similarity in perceived occurrence of closed questions.**
This score is computed from an item which assesses the extent to which closed questions were asked during the interaction (Interaction Evaluation Scale Item #4, Appendix L). The discrepancies between the husband’s and wife’s evaluation of each spouse’s use of interruptions are summed. The range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 12. As the
score increases, agreement regarding the use of closed
questions decreases.

**Similarity in perceived use of interruptions.** This
score is computed from an item in which the participants
assesses the degree to which interruptions were used as a
control strategy (Interaction Evaluation Scale Item #5,
Appendix L). The discrepancies between the husband’s and
wife’s evaluation of each spouse’s use of interruptions are
summed. The range of scores on this measure is from 0 to
12. As the score increases, agreement regarding the use of
interruptions decreases.

**Similarity in perceived use of attention control.** This
score was computed by summing the discrepancies between the
husband’s and wife’s responses regarding the use of
attention control strategies during the previous interaction
(Interaction Evaluation Scale Item #6, Appendix L). The
range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 12. As the
score increases, the agreement regarding the use of
attention control decreases.

**Contextual understanding score.** The discrepancy
between participants’ predictions of their spouses’
responses to the Interaction Evaluation Scale and their
spouses’ actual responses (metaperspective compared to
direct perspective) were summed to derive this score. Each
participant predicted his or her spouse’s responses to 16
items (each of the 8 items has two parts). This score is
based on the predictions of both the husband and the wife and therefore is the sum of 32 discrepancies. The maximum value for each discrepancy is 6. Thus, the possible range of scores for this measure is from 0 to 192. As understanding (predictive accuracy) increases, the numeric value of the contextual understanding score decreases.

**Contextual feelings of being understood score.** The discrepancy between each partner’s responses on the IES and his or her judgment of how the other person thought he or she would respond (comparison of each person’s own direct and meta-metaperspective) were summed to derive this score. This score is based on the sum of 32 discrepancies, each having a possible range of 6. Therefore, the possible range of scores on this measure is from 0 to 192. As the score on this measure increases, feelings of being understood decrease.

**Contextual realization of understanding score.** Each participant’s answers to the Interaction Evaluation Scale questions which ask the participant to answer the question as "my spouse think I answered?" was contrasted with how the spouse actually predicted the participant to answer. Therefore, this measure is a comparison of one spouse’s meta-metaperspective (prediction of the spouse’s prediction) with the other spouse’s metaperspective (prediction of spouse’s viewpoint). The score is derived from the sum of these meta-metaperspective and metaperspective
discrepancies. The maxim discrepancy on each of these items is 6. Therefore, the minimum score is 0 while the maximum score for the sum of these 32 discrepancies is 192. As realization of understanding in this context increases, the numeric value of the contextual realization of understanding scores decreases.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Test for Effects of Discussion Task on Behavior and Perception

In order to assess the impact of the two different discussion tasks on the participants' behavior and their perceptions of behavior, two Hotellings' $T^2$ were computed. The means and standard deviations for the behavioral measures in each discussion task are presented in Table 1. A significant main effect for discussion task was found on the behavioral measures (see Table 2). Thus, the participants' behavior was significantly different between the two discussion tasks. As behavior was affected by the nature of the discussion, the behavioral variables measured in each task are treated separately rather than collapsed across tasks.

A second Hotellings $T^2$ was computed to investigate whether the participants' interpersonal perception was influenced by the nature of the discussion task. See Table 3 for means and standard deviations. A significant main effect was found for discussion task on interpersonal perception. The nature of the discussion task influenced the participants' interpersonal perceptions. Thus, measures
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Behaviors in Each Discussion Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Intimacy Building Interaction</th>
<th>Conflict Resolution Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Questions</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Questions</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speech Percentage</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Hotellings $T^2$ for Behaviors in Each Discussion Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Dfn</th>
<th>Dfe</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Task</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of interpersonal perception taken in each discussion task are not collapsed across both tasks (see Table 4).

Test for Effects of Interaction Task Order

The order of interaction tasks was counterbalanced across participants through random assignment. One-half of the couples completed the conflict resolution task first.
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Interpersonal Perception Measures in Each Discussion Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Perception</th>
<th>Intimacy Building Interaction</th>
<th>Conflict Resolution Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Similarity</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>38.32</td>
<td>15.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>9.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of Understanding</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Hotellings T² for Measures of Interpersonal Perception in Each Discussion Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Dfn</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Task</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other half completed the intimacy building task first. To insure that the order in which the participants completed these interactions did not influence the behavioral and self-report dependent measures, two Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) procedures were computed. The first MANOVA used the behavioral measures as the dependent
variables. The mean and standard deviation of the behavioral measures in both order conditions are presented in Table 5. The main effect for order on the behavioral measures was nonsignificant (see Table 6). Thus, there is no evidence that the order of interaction tasks affected the behavior of the participants during the interactions. In the absence of order effects the behavioral data of all participants can be pooled.

The second MANOVA used the participants' ratings of the interactions as the dependent variables. See Table 7 for the means and standard deviations of the contextual self-report measures in both order conditions. The main effect for order on the contextual self-report measures was nonsignificant (see Table 7). Thus there is no evidence that the order of interaction tasks affected the participants' perceptions of their behavior during the interactions. Given the lack of order effects, data from all participants can be pooled.

Relationships Among Role Construct Repertory Test (REP Test) Measures

As a preliminary investigation of the relationships among the global measures of similarity, understanding and other global measures of interpersonal perception, a matrix of Pearson product moment coefficients was computed on the
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Behavioral Measures by Interaction Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Order #1*</th>
<th></th>
<th>Order #2**</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure in Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure in Intimacy Building</td>
<td>42.58</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions in Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions in Intimacy Building</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Questions in Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Questions in Intimacy Building</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Questions in Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Questions in Intimacy Building</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Percentage in Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>59.56</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>62.15</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Percentage in Intimacy Building</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>58.05</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These couples completed the Conflict Resolution Task first and the Intimacy Building Task second.

**These couples completed the Intimacy Building Task first and the Conflict Resolution Task second.
Table 6

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Interaction Order with the Behavioral Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Dfn</th>
<th>Dfe</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>.7627</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.6796</td>
<td>0.1096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REP test measures. See Table 9 for the results. The following section will describe the correlations among these measures.

Correlations Between the REP Test Organizational Similarity Score and Other Rep Test Scores

The couple score on the organizational similarity measure was found to correlate with couple scores on perceived similarity, interpersonal meaningfulness, couple understanding and feelings of being understood measures. The finding that higher scores on the organizational similarity measure were associated with greater perceived similarity scores ($r = -.30$, $p < .05$) was consistent with expectations. These measures are quite different methods of assessing similarity. Thus, extremely high correlations were not expected.
Table 7  
Means and Standard Deviations for Contextual Self-Report Measures by Interaction Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Order #1*</th>
<th>Order #2**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy Building</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>14.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy Building</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>16.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>42.58</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy Building</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Couples in the Order #1 condition completed the Conflict Resolution Task first and the Intimacy Building Task second. The order of interactions was reversed for couples in Order #2 condition.*
Table 8
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Interaction Order with the Contextual, Self-Report Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DfN</th>
<th>Dfe</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>0.8806</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.9155</td>
<td>0.5110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Pearson Product Moment Correlations Role Construct Repertory Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Construct</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Similarity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content Similarity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpersonal Meaningfulness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Couple Understanding</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Realization of Understanding</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
The organizational similarity score was correlated with both of the measures of sociality (interpersonal meaningfulness and couple understanding scores). Greater interpersonal meaningfulness of the spouse’s constructs was associated with greater organizational similarity ($r = .47$, $p < .01$). Higher scores on the organizational similarity measure also corresponded with higher scores on the couple understanding measure ($r = -.52$, $p < .01$). Although Kelly (1955) viewed commonality and sociality as incidental to each other, relatively strong correlations were expected between measures of the two dimensions. However, the level of correlation between these two scores supports the assumption that two different processes are being measured.

A moderate degree of association was found between the organizational similarity score and the feelings of being understood score ($r = -.40$, $p < .01$). Higher levels of organizational similarity were associated with greater feelings of being understood. This relationship is consistent with expectations in that similarity is likely to be experienced as validation of one’s constructs (Neimeyer & Hudson, 1985). Yet the level of correlation is low enough to support the assumption that although these two measures are related, they do not measure the same process.
Correlations Among REP Test Measures of Interpersonal Perception

Contrary to expectations, a significant correlation was not found between the two primary measures of sociality, couple understanding and interpersonal meaningfulness. The lack of a significant correlation between these two measures casts doubt upon the assumption that they are measuring different but related aspects of the sociality construct.

The couple understanding score did correlate with the feelings of being understood and realization of understanding scores. Greater understanding was associated with greater feelings of being understood ($r = .37$, $p < .01$). This association is consistent with expectations. It appears reasonable to conclude that the couple understanding score and the feeling of being understood score are not measuring the same phenomenon but rather measuring somewhat related processes. The positive correlation between the realization of understanding score and the couple understanding score ($r = .54$, $p < .01$) was expected, since realization of understanding (accuracy in predicting the spouse's predictions of one's own view) should follow from successfully subsuming the other person's construct system. Although the correlation is sufficiently strong to suggest that understanding and realization of understanding are related processes, it does not lead to the conclusion that they are identical processes.
A positive correlation was found between the feeling of being understood score and the realization of understanding score ($r = .32, p < .01$). Greater feelings of being understood were associated with greater realization of understanding. This level of correlation is consistent with the conclusion that feelings of being understood and realization of understanding are two distinct but related processes.

**Couples' Perceptions of Behaviors and Raters' Observations of Behaviors**

Pearson product moment correlations were computed between the couples' perceptions of their communicative behaviors and trained observers' ratings of these behaviors. This matrix was computed in order to investigate the relationship between the denotative level of behavior (what occurred) and the connotative level of behavior (the meanings the participants gave to those behaviors). See Tables 10 and 11 for results.

No significant correlation was found between the participants' perceived depth of self-disclosure scores and the self-disclosure ratings made by the observers. Likewise, no significant correlation was found between the participants' perceptions of self-disclosure (perceived depth and intimacy of self-disclosure scores) and total talk time. Previous research has found total talk time and level of self-disclosure to be closely related. One correlation
was found between the participants' perceived intimacy of self-disclosure and number of interruptions (a direct person control strategy). Greater perceived intimacy of self-disclosure in the conflict resolution interaction was associated with fewer interruptions in that interaction ($r = -.26, p < .05$).

The perceived use of attention control strategies was not significantly correlated with the behavioral observation of attention control strategies (maximum speech percentage) in either interaction. However, greater perceived use of attention control was associated with greater task involvement in the form of longer total talk times ($r = .26, p < .05$ in the conflict resolution interaction and $r = .26, p < .05$ in the intimacy building interaction).

Four significant correlations were found between couples' perceptions of person control behaviors and raters' observations of control behaviors. In both interactions, greater perceived use of interruptions by the participants was associated with greater number of observed interruptions ($r = .34, p < .01$ in the conflict resolution and $r = .31, p < .05$ in the intimacy building interaction). Additionally, greater perceived use of interruptions was associated with higher numbers of open ended questions in the conflict resolution interaction ($r = .24, p < .05$). No significant
Table 10

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Participants’
Perceptions of Behaviors and Raters’ Observations of
Behavior in the Conflict Resolution Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Perceptions</th>
<th>Perceived Depth of Self-</th>
<th>Perceived Intimacy of Self-</th>
<th>Perceived Use of Interruptions</th>
<th>Perceived Use of Questions</th>
<th>Perceived Use of Attention Control Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure Rating</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interruptions</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Open Ended Questions</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Closed Questions</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence Quotient</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speech Percentage</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
Table 11

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Participants' Perceptions of Behaviors and Raters' Observations of Behavior in the Intimacy Building Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Perceptions</th>
<th>Perceived Depth of Self-</th>
<th>Perceived Intimacy of Self-</th>
<th>Perceived Use of Interruptions</th>
<th>Perceived Use of Closed Questions</th>
<th>Perceived Use of Attention Control Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observed Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure Rating</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interruptions</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Open Ended Questions</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Closed Questions</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence Quotient</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speech Percentage</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
correlations were found between the participants' perceptions of closed questions and behavioral observations of closed questions. However, a positive correlation ($r = .36, p < .01$) was found between the perceived use of closed questions and number of interruptions (a behavioral observation of direct person control) in the intimacy building interaction.

In summary, the correspondence between the participants' perceptions of behavior and the observers' ratings of behavior was relatively low. Direct person control was the only domain in which participants' perceptions corresponded to raters' observations of behaviors. Furthermore, interruptions was the only direct person control behavior in which there was a correspondence between participants' perceptions of a specific behavior and the observers' ratings of that behavior.

Global Historical Measures and Rater's Observations of Behavior

Relationship Between Global Measures of Similarity and Observed Behavior

Although no specific hypotheses were formulated regarding the relationship between similarity and observed communicative behavior, four significant correlations were found (Tables 12 and 13). In the conflict resolution interaction, greater organizational similarity between spouses was associated with less direct person control in
the form of open ended questions ($r = -.28$, $p < .05$) and greater attention control in the form of maximum speech percentage ($r = .28$, $p < .05$). Greater perceived similarity was associated with greater task involvement in the form of longer total talk time in the conflict resolution interaction ($r = .26$, $p < .05$). Finally, greater global self-report of similarity was associated with less direct person control in the form of closed questions during the intimacy building interaction ($r = -.26$, $p < .05$).

Relationship of Global Measures of Understanding and Observed Behavior

The present study follows Laing’s conceptualization of interpersonal perception (Laing et al., 1966) as a series of reciprocal perspectives. However, the majority of interpersonal perception research in marital relationships has focused on only one set of reciprocal perspectives, the comparison of each spouse’s metaperspective (prediction of spouse’s viewpoint) to the other’s direct perspective (spouse’s viewpoint). The term "understanding" is typically used for this form of predictive accuracy, which is addressed by the Sociality Corollary of Personal Construct Theory (Kelly, 1955). Thus, the first set of hypotheses in the present study addressed the relationship between couple understanding and self-disclosure. It was predicted that couples who demonstrated greater ability to subsume each
others' construct systems (understanding) would be more mutually disclosive.

No significant correlations were found in either interactive context between the primary global measures of understanding (REP Test interpersonal meaningfulness score and REP Test couple understanding score) and self-disclosure ratings (see Tables 12 and 13). Thus, the expectation that couples who demonstrated greater ability to subsume each other's construct systems would be more mutually disclosive was not supported by the findings of this study. Only one significant correlation was found between either of the primary global measures of understanding and a measure of guardedness or task involvement. Greater interpersonal meaningfulness scores were associated with lower silence quotient scores in the conflict resolution interaction ($r = -0.24$, $p < .05$).

The second set of hypotheses in the present study addressed the relationship between understanding and the dimension of interpersonal control. The domain of interpersonal control was divided by Mischler and Waxler (1968) into the general strategies of person control, which can be either direct or indirect, and attention control. It was hypothesized that couples who demonstrated higher levels of understanding would use more direct person control strategies and less attention control strategies than would couples who demonstrated lower levels of understanding. No
Table 12

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Global Historical Measures and Raters' Observations of Behavior in the Conflict Resolution Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Historical Measures</th>
<th>Self-Disclosure Rating</th>
<th>Number of Interruptions</th>
<th>Number of Open Ended Questions</th>
<th>Number of Closed Ended Questions</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>Silence Quotient</th>
<th>Maximum Speech Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Organizational</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Perceived Similarity</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Similarity</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Interpersonal</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Couple Understanding</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Understanding</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Feelings of Being</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Feelings of</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Realization of</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Adjustment Scale</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Disclosure Inventory</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Interruptions</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Questions</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Attention</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
Table 13

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Global Historical Measures and Raters' Observations of Behavior in the Intimacy Building Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Historical Measures</th>
<th>Self-Disclosure Rating</th>
<th>Number of Interruptions</th>
<th>Number of Open Ended Questions</th>
<th>Number of Closed Ended Questions</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>Silence Quotient</th>
<th>Maximum Speech Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Organizational Similarity</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Perceived Similarity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Similarity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Interpersonal Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Couple Understanding</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Understanding</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Realization of Understanding</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Adjustment Scale</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Disclosure Inventory</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Interruptions</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Closed Questions</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Attention Control</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
significant correlations were found in either interaction between the primary global measures of understanding (REP Test interpersonal meaningfulness and couple understanding score) and measures of interpersonal control (use of interruptions, closed questions, open ended questions and maximum speech percentage). See Tables 12 and 13 for correlation coefficients. However, greater global self-report understanding (of spouse) was associated with less attention control in the form of lower maximum speech percentage scores during the intimacy building interaction ($r = -.27, p < .05$).

In summary, it was predicted that couples who demonstrated greater mutual understanding would be more disclosive, use more direct person control strategies, and use less attention control strategies than would couples who demonstrated less understanding of each other. Some support was found for the expectation that couples who experienced more understanding would use less attention control than would couples experiencing less understanding. However, no support was found for the expectation that couples who experienced greater understanding would be more disclosive or use more direct person control.

**Relationship of Global Measures of Feelings of Being Understood to Observations of Behavior**

In the third set of hypotheses, it was predicted that couples who experienced more feelings of being understood
would be more mutually disclosive in both conflictual and intimacy building interactions. No significant correlations were found between the global measures of feeling understood (REP Test feelings of being understood score and global self-report of being understood) and observed self-disclosure in either interaction (see Tables 12 and 13). This hypothesis was therefore not supported by the findings of this study. Furthermore, no significant correlations were found in either communicative context between measures of feeling of being understood and the measure of guardedness (silence quotient) or the measure of task involvement (total talk time). Thus, increased feelings of being understood during communication were not associated with less guardedness or greater task involvement.

In the fourth set of hypotheses, it was predicted that couples who experienced more feelings of being understood would use more direct person control strategies and less attention control strategies than would couples who felt less understood. No significant correlations were found between global feelings of being understood and behavioral observations of direct person control (number of interruptions and closed questions). In both interactive contexts, the correlations between the measures of feelings of being understood and the measure of attention control (maximum speech percentage), were nonsignificant.
Therefore, the fourth set of predictions was not supported by the findings of this study.

No specific hypotheses were formulated regarding the relationship between feelings of being understood and the indirect person control strategies of open ended questions. Yet a significant correlation was found between the REP Test feelings of being understood score and the number of open ended questions observed in both interactions ($r = .36, p < .01$ in the intimacy building interaction and $r = .50, p < .01$ in the conflict resolution interaction). Couples who experienced more feelings of being understood asked fewer open ended questions. Additionally, higher scores on the global self-report measure of feelings of being understood were associated with fewer observed open ended questions in the intimacy building interaction. However, these findings should be considered cautiously due to the fact that in both interactions the mean number of open ended questions was relatively low ($M = 2.85, SD = 3.4$ in the conflict resolution interaction and $M = 2.17, SD = 3.03$ in the intimacy building interaction).

In summary, the following communication characteristics were predicted for couples experiencing greater feelings of being understood: more mutual self-disclosure, more use of person control and less use of attention control. These predictions were not supported by the findings of this study. A consistent relationship was found between feelings
of being understood and indirect person control. Greater feelings of being understood were associated with the use of fewer open ended questions (an indirect person control strategy).

Relationship of Global Measures of Realization of Understanding to Observed Behavior

The fifth and sixth set of hypotheses in this study addressed the relationship between realization of understanding and communication. It was hypothesized that greater realization of understanding would be associated with greater self-disclosure, use of more direct person control strategies and use of less attention control strategies. No significant correlations were found between the global measure of realization of understanding and observations of communicative behavior in either interactive context. These sets of hypotheses were therefore not supported by the findings of this study.

Relationship Between Global Marital Satisfaction/Adjustment and Observations of Communicative Behavior

No specific hypotheses were stated regarding the relationship between global adjustment and satisfaction in marriage and observations of communicative behavior. Yet, much of the previous research in marriage has examined the relationships between these dimensions (Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Thus, correlations were computed to examine these relationships. No significant correlations
were found between the global measure of relationship adjustment and satisfaction, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and the observers' self-disclosure ratings in either interaction. Thus, greater overall self-reported adjustment and satisfaction in their marriage was not associated with more mutually discloseive communication between partners.

The relationship between globally measured marital adjustment/satisfaction and use of attention and person control strategies was also investigated. No significant correlations were found between the couples' Dyadic Adjustment Scale scores and the observation of attention control strategies (maximum speech percentage) in either interaction. In the conflict resolution interaction, no significant correlations were found between the couples' Dyadic Adjustment Scale score and measures of person control (interruptions, open ended questions and closed questions). However, in the intimacy building interaction a significant correlation was found between the couples' Dyadic Adjustment Scale score and the number of open ended questions ($r = -.42, p < .01$). Higher scores on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale were associated with asking fewer open ended questions in the intimacy building interaction.

In summary, globally measured marital adjustment and satisfaction was generally not found to be associated with self-disclosure, guardedness, task involvement or use of either person or attention control strategies during marital
interaction. One notable exception to this trend was the association between higher global marital satisfaction/adjustment and the use of fewer open ended questions (an indirect person control strategy) during an intimacy building discussion.

Relationship Between Global Impressions of Communicative Behavior and Observations of Communicative Behavior

Pearson product moment correlations were computed in order to investigate the relationship between the participants' global self-reports of communicative behavior during previous important discussions and raters' observations of present communicative behavior (see Tables 12 and 13). The Dyadic Disclosure Inventory (global, historical assessment of breadth and depth of self-disclosure) did not correlate with observer self-disclosure ratings. Additionally, no significant correlations were found in either interaction between global self-reports of person or attention control strategies and behavioral observations of these control strategies. Thus, no direct correspondence was found between the participants' global, historical impressions of a specific communicative behavior and trained observers' ratings of that behavior during present communication.

Three relationships were found between the participants' global impressions of their own past behavior and raters' observations of other behaviors in the present
context. Higher scores on the Dyadic Disclosure Inventory were associated with using less direct person control in the form of closed questions (\( r = -0.30, p < 0.05 \)) during the conflict resolution interaction. Additionally, higher scores on the Dyadic Disclosure Inventory were associated with less guardedness in the form of silence quotient (\( r = -0.28, p < 0.05 \)) in the conflict resolution interaction. One significant correlation was found between global self-reported use of closed questions and silence quotient in the intimacy building interaction (\( r = 0.26, p < 0.05 \)). Reports of greater use of direct person control in the form of closed questions were associated with greater guardedness as measured by silence quotient in the context of building intimacy between spouses.

Measurement of Additional Levels of Interpersonal Perception Beyond the Measurement of Understanding

The seventh set of hypotheses concerned the inclusion of measures of feelings of being understood and realization of understanding in addition to measures of understanding when attempting to predict communicative behavior. The REP Test feelings of being understood score did not significantly correlate with measures of self-disclosure, guardedness, task involvement, direct person control or attention control. As mentioned above, significant correlations were found in both interactions between the feelings of being understood scores and the measure of
indirect person control, number of open ended questions (Tables 12 and 13). No significant correlations were found between realization of understanding and any measure of communicative behavior.

In summary, measures of feelings of being understood were found to be more useful predictors of indirect person control than were typical measures of understanding. Otherwise, no significant correlations were found between measures of either feelings of being understood or realization of understanding and communicative behavior. Thus, in the present study, measuring these two additional levels of interpersonal perception did not offer significant advantages over merely measuring understanding when attempting to predict communicative behavior.

Contextual Measures and Observations of Behavior

The eighth set of hypotheses had to do with the relative efficacy of predicting communicative behavior from global versus contextual measures of understanding. Relatively few correlations were found in either interaction between the global measures of understanding (REP Test interpersonal meaningfulness, REP Test couple understanding, global self-report understanding) and any of the communicative behaviors under investigation (see Tables 12 and 13). No correlations were found between the contextual understanding scores and communicative behaviors (Tables 14 and 15). Thus, the findings of this study did not provide
support for the contention that contextually based measures of understanding will provide better predication of communicative behaviors than global measures of understanding.

The use of contextually based measures of feelings of being understood, realization of understanding and adjustment/satisfaction in the attempt to predict communicative behaviors was also investigated. Pearson product moment correlations were computed between contextual measures of these dimensions and behavioral observations of self-disclosure, task involvement, guardedness, person control and attention control.

Two significant correlations were found between contextual measures of feelings of being understood and raters' observations of control behaviors in the conflict resolution interaction. Higher scores on the contextual feelings of being understood measure were associated with asking fewer open ended questions \( r = .46, p < .01 \) and asking fewer closed questions \( r = .32, p < .05 \). Greater contextual satisfaction in the conflict resolution interaction was also associates with asking fewer open ended questions \( r = -.28, p < .05 \). One significant correlation was also found between the contextual feelings of being understood score and the number of closed questions in the intimacy building interaction \( r = .25, p < .05 \). Greater levels of feelings of being
understood were associated with asking fewer closed questions. No significant correlations were found between contextual realization of understanding and observations of communicative behavior.

In summary, contextual measures of feelings of being understood and satisfaction were related to person control behaviors. Greater levels of satisfaction and feelings of being understood were associated with use of fewer closed and open ended questions. Otherwise, no significant correlations were found between the contextual measures and raters' observations of communicative behavior.

**Relationships Between Global Measures and Contextual Measures**

Thus far, the present study has investigated the relationship between the connotative level (subjective experience) and denotative level (what actually occurs) of the marital relationship. The connotative dimension of communication is considered by many researchers to be both important and often independent of the denotative level. Pearson product moment correlations were computed between the global and contextual measures (see Tables 12 and 13). These correlations were computed in order to investigate the connections between couples' global connotative experience of the relationship as a whole and their connotative experience of present interactions with each other.
Table 14

Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction with Raters' Observations of Behavior in the Conflict Resolution Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Measures</th>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Contextual Feelings of Realization</th>
<th>Contextual Satisfaction Being Understood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Int.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Open</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ended Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Closed</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence Quotient</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speech</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
Table 15

Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction with Raters' Observations of Behavior in the Intimacy Building Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Measures</th>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Feelings of Realization</th>
<th>Satisfaction Being Understood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure Rating</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interruptions</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Open Ended Questions</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Closed Questions</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence Quotient</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speech Percentage</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
Correlations of Global Measures of Similarity with Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

The global self-report similarity score was significantly correlated with the contextual understanding score ($r = -0.33$, $p < .01$) and the contextual realization of understanding score ($r = -0.27$, $p < .05$) in the conflict resolution interaction. Thus, greater overall impression of similarity to spouse was associated with greater accuracy in predicting the spouse's direct and metaperspectives regarding the conflict resolution interaction. Higher scores on the global self-report similarity measure were also associated with higher levels of contextual satisfaction in the conflict resolution interaction ($r = .29$, $p < .05$). A significant correlation was found between the organizational similarity score and the contextual realization of understanding score ($r = -0.28$, $p < .05$) in the intimacy building interaction. Greater similarity in organizing interpersonal experience was associated with greater accuracy in predicting the spouse's metaperspective. A significant correlation was also found between global self-report similarity and feelings of being understood ($r = -0.27$, $p < .05$). Greater perception of overall similarity to the spouse was associated with greater sense of being understood in the context of building intimacy.
Correlations of Global Measures of Understanding with Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Global self-report of understanding one’s partner was significantly correlated with contextual measures of feelings of being understood as well as with contextual satisfaction (see Tables 12 and 13). Higher scores on the global self-report understanding measure were associated with greater feelings of being understood in the intimacy building interaction ($r = -.31, p < .05$). The correlation between global self-report of understanding score and the contextual satisfaction score was $.33, p < .01$ in the intimacy building interaction and $.35, p < .01$ in the conflict resolution interaction. Thus, in both interactions, greater self-reported understanding of one’s partner was associated with higher couple ratings of satisfaction.

Globally measured feelings of being understood were associated with contextually measured feelings of being understood, satisfaction, and realization of understanding. Higher scores on the REP Test feelings of being understood measure were associated with higher scores on the contextual feelings of being understood measures ($r = .47, p < .01$ in the intimacy building interaction and $r = .58, p < .01$ in the conflict resolution interaction). Thus, greater global
Table 16

**Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Global Measures of Similarity, Interpersonal Perception, Satisfaction and Communicative Behavior with Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction in the Conflict Resolution Interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Measures</th>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Contextual Feelings of Realization</th>
<th>Contextual Satisfaction</th>
<th>Contextual Being Understood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Organizational Similarity</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Perceived Similarity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Similarity</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Interpersonal Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Couple Understanding</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Understanding</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continues
### Contextual Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Contextual Feelings of Realization</th>
<th>Contextual Satisfaction Being Understood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Realization of Understanding</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Adjustment-Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Disclosure Inventory</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Interruptions</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Closed Question</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Attention Control</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
Table 17  
Pearson Product Moment Correlations of Global Measures of Similarity, Interpersonal Perception, Satisfaction and Communicative Behavior with Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction in the Intimacy Resolution Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Measures</th>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Contextual Feelings of Realization</th>
<th>Contextual Satisfaction</th>
<th>Contextual Being Understood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Organizational Similarity</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Perceived Similarity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Similarity</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Interpersonal Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Couple Understanding</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Understanding</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Feelings of Being Understood</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continues
## Contextual Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Measures</th>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Contextual Feelings of Realization</th>
<th>Contextual Satisfaction</th>
<th>Contextual Being</th>
<th>Contextual Understanding</th>
<th>Contextual Understood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Feelings of Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP Test Realization of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Adjustment-Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Disclosure Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Interruptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Closed Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Report Attention Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
sense of being understood in one’s viewpoints of others was associated with a sense of being understood in both types of discussion tasks.

Globally measured feelings of being understood were related to satisfaction with both interactions. Higher scores on the REP Test feelings of being understood measure were associated with higher scores on the contextual satisfaction measures ($r = -.41, p < .01$ in the conflict resolution interaction and $r = -.28, p < .05$ in the intimacy building interaction). Greater global self-report of being understood was associated with higher levels of contextual satisfaction ($r = .36, p < .01$ in the conflict resolution interaction and $r = .31, p < .05$ in the intimacy building interaction).

Higher scores on the Role Construct Repertory Test feeling of being understood measure were associated with higher scores on the contextual realization of understanding measure ($r = .31, p < .05$ in the conflict resolution interaction and $r = .29, p < .05$ in the intimacy building interaction). Thus, the global sense that one is understood by one’s partner is also associated with greater accuracy in predicting the spouse’s meta-perceptions.
The REP Test realization of understanding measure and the contextual realization of understanding scores were significantly correlated ($r = .37, p < .01$ in the intimacy building interaction and $r = .27, p < .05$ in the conflict resolution interaction). Greater accuracy in predicting one’s spouse’s meta-perceptions (i.e., the spouse’s predictions of one’s views) at the global level was associated with greater accuracy in predicting the spouse’s meta-perceptions in both discussion tasks. Higher scores on the REP Test realization of understanding measure were also associated with higher scores on the contextual understanding measures ($r = .31, p < .05$ in the discussion of conflictual issues and $r = .28, p < .05$ in the intimacy building interaction). Thus, greater global accuracy in predicting the partner’s metaperspective was associated with greater accuracy in predicting the partner’s direct perspective in both interactive contexts.

Global marital satisfaction and adjustment as measured by the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) was associated with contextual satisfaction and feelings of being understood in
both interactions. The correlation between the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and contextual satisfaction score was .49, \( p < .01 \) in the conflict resolution interaction and .44, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interaction. Higher levels of global adjustment/satisfaction were associated with greater levels of contextual satisfaction in both interactions. Greater satisfaction/adjustment as measured by the Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale was also associated with greater feelings of being understood in both interactions. The correlation between the couple’s Dyadic Adjustment Scale score and the REP Test feelings of being understood score was -.38, \( p < .01 \) in the conflict resolution interaction and -.47, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interaction.

Correlations of the Global Measure of Self-Disclosure with Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

The Couple Dyadic Disclosure Inventory score and the contextual satisfaction score were found to have a correlation of .46, \( p < .01 \) in the conflict resolution interaction and .49, \( p < .01 \) in the intimacy building interaction. Thus, self-reports of greater breadth and depth of self-disclosure in the marriage were associated with greater satisfaction in both interactions. Higher scores on Dyadic Disclosure Inventory were also associated with greater feelings of being understood in both interactions. The correlation between the Dyadic Disclosure
Inventory and the feeling of being understood score was \(-.45, p < .01\) in the intimacy building interaction and \(-.35, p < .01\) in the conflict resolution interaction.

In the conflict resolution interaction, higher couple scores on the Dyadic Disclosure Inventory were associated with higher scores on both the contextual understanding score \((r = -.34, p < .01)\) and the context realization of understanding score \((r = -.38, p < .01)\). Thus, global self-report of greater breadth and depth of self-disclosure was associated with greater accuracy in predicting the spouse’s direct perspective and with greater accuracy in predicting the spouse’s metaperspective regarding a discussion of conflictual issues.

Correlations of Global Self Reports of Control Strategies with Contextual Measures of Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Global self-reports of more direct person control through the use of interruptions were associated with lower levels of feelings of being understood, lower realization of understanding and less satisfaction in the conflict resolution interaction. A correlation of \(.33, p < .01\) was found between global self-report of use of interruptions and contextual feelings of being understood. A correlation of \(.28, p < .05\) was found between global self-report of use of interruptions and contextual realization of understanding.

The correlation between global self-report of use of
interruptions and contextual satisfaction score was \(-.35, p < .01\). Greater global self-reports of direct person control through the use of interruptions was associated with lower levels of feelings of being understood in the intimacy building interaction \((r = .26, p < .05)\). Otherwise, no significant correlations were found between global self-reports of control strategies and contextual measures of interpersonal perception or satisfaction in the intimacy building interaction.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present study employed several measurement strategies to investigate the relationships among similarity, interpersonal perception and communicative behavior in marriage. The first issue discussed will be the relationship of spouse self-reports to trained raters' observations of communicative behaviors. The second issue addressed is the relationship between global characteristics of the marital relationship such as the degree of understanding between spouses and communicative behaviors. The third issue addressed is the relationship of interpersonal perception and interactional satisfaction in the immediate communicative context to observed communicative behaviors. Finally, the relationship between global assessments of relationship functioning and issues such as the interpersonal perception and satisfaction within the context of current marital interactions will be addressed.

Spouse Self-Report Compared to Rater Observation of Communicative Behavior

Much of the early observational research in marital communication failed to consider the subjective experience
of the participants (Glick & Gross, 1975). Yet, exclusive reliance on self-report data from the spouses regarding their communicative behaviors can introduce bias into the study of marital interaction (Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Therefore, the present study in addition to raters' observations of behavior included participants' perceptions of current communicative behavior and participants' assessment of previous behavior. The collection of these three types of data allows an examination of the consensual validity of spouses' self-reports of communicative behaviors.

Although no hypotheses were stated in the present study regarding the correspondence between spouse appraisal and rater observation of current communication, this relationship was explored to better understand the nature of spouse self-reports of communication within marriage (see Tables 6 and 7). The spouses' perceptions of their own self-disclosure (in terms of both intimacy and depth), their perceptions of the direct person control strategies of closed questions and interruptions, and their perceptions of attention control strategies were compared to raters' observations of these behaviors. The overall degree of agreement between the spouses and raters is best characterized as low. The only behavior in which there was a direct correspondence between participants' and raters' perceptions was the direct person control strategy of
interruptions (see Tables 6 and 7). Other correspondences were found between different behaviors within the group of behaviors classified as direct person control strategies (Mishler & Waxler, 1968). For example, the participants' perceptions of one direct person control behavior such as closed questions were found to be associated with the raters' observations of other direct person control behaviors such as interruptions. Thus, direct person control strategies such as questioning and interrupting the spouse appear to be more readily identifiable behaviors to married partners than level of self-disclosure, or attention control behaviors. Information which is salient has been found to exert a strong influence on our social perception (Tversky & Khaneman, 1982). Due to their salience direct person control behaviors such as interruptions may have an important role in spouses' judgments about their communication. Thus, identifying the conditions under which these behaviors are experienced as positive or negative events may be a clinically relevant research goal. Furthermore, to the extent that these behaviors are easier to reliably observe than other behaviors, they may be good targets for initial intervention in communication skills training.

The correspondence between the spouses' global self-reports of past communicative behaviors and raters' observations of behaviors in the current communicative
context was also investigated. No associations were found between the participants' self-report regarding a specific type of behavior such as interruptions or self-disclosure and raters' current observations of the same behavior in current communication. However, greater global sense of open communication (breadth and depth of self-disclosure) in the past was associated with less use of direct person control in the form of closed questions and with less guardedness in the form of less silence during a discussion of conflictual issues. Thus, greater global sense of open communication within the marital relationship, although not related to actual process of current self-disclosure, may be related to the amount of open and noncontrolling communication when dealing with conflictual issues. Overall, as with spouse perception of current communication, spouses' perception of communicative behaviors in their relationship as a whole generally did not correspond to observed communicative behavior in the laboratory.

The lack of correspondence between spouses' perceptions of their communicative behaviors and raters' observations relates to the issue of convergent validity rather than to the issue of reliability. According to Campbell and Fiske (1959), "reliability is the amount of agreement between two maximally similar attempts to measure the same construct" whereas validity "is represented in the agreement between two attempts to measure the same trait through maximally
different methods." Thus, in Campbell and Fiske's (1959) view, the lack of correspondence between spouse self-reports of communication and raters' observations of communication represents a failure to achieve convergent validity. Therefore, these findings do not necessarily invalidate the importance of spouses' perceptions of their own communication. This lack of correspondence does demonstrate that the commonly used strategy of gathering information about communication in marriage via self-report instruments and the strategy of observing communicative behavior in the laboratory generally are not measuring the same phenomena.

The finding in the present study of low correspondence between spouse self-report and observer ratings is consistent with other research in this area (Christensen & Nies, 1980; Christensen, Sullaway & King, 1983; Elwood & Jacobson, 1988; Epstein, Pretzer, & Fleming, 1987; Floyd & Markman, 1983; Jacobson & Moore, 1981; Margolin, Hattem, John, & Yost, 1985; Robinson & Price, 1980). It should be noted, however, that training the spouses in observation procedures has been found to increase their agreement with each other and with outside coders (Elwood & Jacobson, 1988). Thus, training spouses in self-observation techniques may be a useful tool in gaining better information about problem behaviors in natural environments. Furthermore, training spouses in self-observation techniques may be a powerful tool in improving their communication.
Self-observation may lead to greater awareness of the behaviors involved in unsuccessful communication and thus more rapid change in these behaviors. Self observation may also lead to reductions in perceptual biases which can contribute to unsuccessful communication.

The majority of the research in this area has compared spouse observation of communicative behavior in the home to laboratory observation. Two of the studies compared spouses' observations of current communication in the laboratory to outside observers' ratings of the same interactions (Floyd & Markman, 1983; Margolin et al., 1985). In both of these investigations it was concluded that the lack of correspondence between the observers' ratings and the spouses' self-reports of behavior were due to biases existing in the spouses' self-reports. For example, Margolin et al. (1985) found that couples and raters reached much more agreement when rating another couple's discussion than when rating the couple's own interaction.

In spite of lack of correspondence with outside observers, spouse observations of one another's communicative behaviors have been found to reliably discriminate between satisfied and dissatisfied marriages (e.g., Gottman, 1979; Birchler, Weiss, & Vincent, 1975; Margolin & Wampold, 1981). Furthermore, spouses' self-reports of communicative behavior have been found to change
during the process of behavioral marital therapy in which communicative behavior was targeted (Jacobson, 1984).

On the basis of the above mentioned findings, some researchers have concluded that unless spouses are trained in behavioral observation, self-reports of behavior should not be considered behavioral observations but rather perceptions of behavior which are in and of themselves an important ingredient in understanding marital satisfaction and distress (e.g., Christensen et al., 1983; Floyd & Markman, 1983). Furthermore, the importance of understanding cognitive factors in self-appraisals of communication within marriage is evident when considering the two sets of findings described above. (Finding number one is the established association between self-reports of communicative behavior and marital satisfaction. Finding number two is the lack of correspondence between self appraisal of communication and rater observation of communication.) In an early contribution to this endeavor, Weiss (1980) theorized that preexisting sentiments about the relationship to a large degree determine the spouses' reports and evaluations of communicative behaviors. If, as Weiss (1984) argues, these sentiments are independent of communication exchanges, future research needs to clarify the processes by which these sentiments develop and are modified.
Methodological refinements may also aid in understanding the relationship between spouses' perceptions of their own communicative behavior (either in the form of global, historical self-reports or in the form of immediate appraisal of current communication) and observed behaviors. Future researchers should attempt to maximize the similarity in method of rating used by the spouses and outside observers. The present study asked spouses to make evaluative judgement of communication behaviors and strategies without supplying concrete referents for the poles of the Likert scale items (e.g., using anchors such as "very much" to the item "I made direct and specific requests for information"). The trained raters were typically counting behaviors or looking for more specific occurrences (e.g., disclosure of thoughts about self).

Global Historical Measures of Interpersonal Perceptions and Observed Behavior

In order to investigate the relationship between the basic levels of interpersonal perception identified by Laing et al. (1966) and communicative behavior, global measures of interpersonal perception were compared to raters' observations of communicative behavior. Hypotheses were formulated regarding the relationship of understanding, feelings of being understood, and realization of understanding to communicative behaviors (self-disclosure and interpersonal control strategies). No specific
hypotheses were formed regarding the relationship between similarity and rater observations behavior.

Global Similarity and Observed Behavior (Self-Disclosure and Interpersonal Control Strategies)

Although no hypotheses were formulated in the present study, the relationship between similarity to spouse and communicative behaviors was explored. That similarity between spouses is an important factor in marital happiness is well established (Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Neimeyer & Hudson, 1985; Newmark, Woody et al., 1977). One of the possible means by which similarity influences marital satisfaction is through increased communication openness resulting from expected validation of constructs by spouse. However, the influence of similarity on actual communicative behavior has not been widely investigated. Loos (1986), in the first investigation of the role of similarity on observed communicative behaviors in marriage, did not find similarity and communicative behavior to be closely related.

The findings of the present study do not indicate that global similarity between spouses is closely related to the process of self-disclosure or the process of controlling the direction of interactions with the spouse. Four associations (out of a possible 42) were found between global measures of similarity and observations of communicative behavior (see Tables 8 and 9). A greater
degree of global similarity between spouses was found to be associated with fewer open ended question (indirect person control), greater task involvement in the form of longer talk time and larger differences between husband and wife speech time (attention control) in the conflict resolution interaction. In the intimacy building interaction, greater self-reported similarity was associated with fewer closed questions (direct person control). All of the four relationships found were low in magnitude. Thus, to the extent that global measures of similarity are useful in predicting communicative behavior, they are more useful in predicting behavior during discussion of conflictual issues than in predicting behaviors during intimacy building conversations. Furthermore, global similarity may be most relevant in predicting the person control strategy of question asking.

The absence of a strong influence of similarity between marital partners on communicative behaviors is consistent with a personal construct view of personal relationships (Kelly, 1955). How differences and similarities between spouse and self are construed (and as Loos observed, if they are construed at all) is dependent on the individual construct system of each spouse. It is the understanding of the similarities and differences between self and partner that is expected to influence whether differences are experienced as irrelevant, as threats, or as opportunities
for growth. Thus, from both an applied and theoretical viewpoint, the important assessment issue is not whether global similarity exists or not, but rather how couple construes its similarities and differences.

**Interpersonal Perception and Observed Behavior (Self-Disclosure)**

It was hypothesized that greater feelings of being understood and greater accuracy of spouses in predicting the spouse's direct and metaperspectives (understanding and realization of understanding) would be associated with greater levels of self-disclosure. Differences between couples in any of these three levels of interpersonal perception were not found to be associated with self-disclosure (see Tables 10 and 11). Therefore, these hypotheses were not supported by the findings of the study.

The lack of relationship between self-disclosure and understanding of spouse is surprising given the previous empirical findings regarding the importance of both understanding (Laing et al., 1966; Sillars et al., 1984) and self-disclosure in marriage (Burke et al., 1976; Hendrick, 1981; Levinger & Senn, 1967; Waring et al., 1981). Numerous studies have found greater levels of self-disclosure between spouses (often measured using self report measures similar to the Dyadic Disclosure Inventory used in the present study) to be associated with greater levels of marital adjustment (Burke et al., 1976; Hendrick, 1981;
Levinger & Senn, 1967; Waring et al., 1981). Furthermore, marital enrichment programs designed to increase intimate self-disclosure have been associated with increases in marital satisfaction (Guerney, 1977; Jacobson, 1984; Waring, 1981; Waring & Russell, 1981). Although a relationship between self-disclosure and marital happiness is considered to be firmly established in the empirical literature, the exact nature of the relationship is unclear (Chelune, Rosenfeld, & Waring, 1985). Among the postulated functions of self-disclosure in marriage is the clarification of the intentions of underlying behaviors and the revelations of the needs of participants (Derlega, 1984). To the extent that these assertions are true, it seems reasonable to assume that self-disclosure would function by facilitating greater understanding between spouses regarding one another's needs and intentions.

However, the Loos (1986) study was the first investigation of the relationship between observed self-disclosure (as opposed to self-reported self-disclosure) and understanding in the marital relationship. Loos (1986) found that couples with greater mutual understanding of one another were more disclosing only when role-playing a conflict "as it typically occurs at home." No relationship was found between understanding and self-disclosure in the contexts of casual conversations or decision making. Thus, the lack of correspondence between global understanding and
self-disclosure in the present study during the intimacy
building interaction may be seen as partially replicating
Loos' findings. The failure to replicate Loos' findings in
the conflict resolution tasks may stem in part from the
differences in the instructions for this task in the two
studies. In the present study the participants were
instructed to discuss (rather than role play) a broad area
of conflict in their relationship (e.g., discipline of the
children). In the Loos study, the participants were
instructed to role play a very discrete conflict (such as
disagreement about where to go out to eat). Thus, self-
disclosure may be more relevant to interpersonal perception
in marriage when more concrete issues (involving subordinate
constructs) rather than more abstract issues (involving more
superordinate constructs) are the focus of discussion.

The lack of correspondence between interpersonal
perceptions and self-disclosure in both interactions may
also be due to the relatively low levels of self-disclosure
as judged by outside observers in these interactions
(participants experienced their level of disclosure as both
intimate and in-depth). In both interactions the
participants' average level of self-disclosure approached a
score of two on a zero to six rating scale (1.88 in intimacy
building and 1.75 in the conflict resolution task). The
participants generally did not go beyond description of
events or sharing thoughts and opinions. Higher levels of
self-disclosure involving the disclosure of intimate feelings or self evaluations may be the type of communicative events which occur infrequently or only under special circumstances. Perhaps greater self-disclosure is more likely to occur during critical phases of the marital relationship such as the formation of an identity as a couple or when encountering unmet needs in the marital relationship. Alternatively, self-disclosure may be most relevant to accuracy of interpersonal perception on particular issues in which couples do not feel well understood by one another, greater self-disclosure may reduce misunderstandings or merely lead to increased feelings of being understood. Overall, the couples in the present study, however, felt understood by their partners (independently of the degree of understanding as measured in the study).

It may be productive for future research to train spouses in spouse and self-observation procedures in order to assess the frequency of in-depth self-disclosure and conditions under which it naturally occurs. Training in these observation procedures would also be a useful intervention in helping couples identify and build on constructive communication. Future research may also productively focus on the discrepancy between the raters' observations that self-disclosures occurred only at relatively low levels and the spouses' perceptions of having
disclosed their thoughts and feelings in-depth. Better understanding of marital partners' views of what constitutes in-depth self-disclosure may be a first step towards further clarification of the relationship between interpersonal perception and self-disclosure.

**Interpersonal Perception and Observed Behaviors (Control Strategies)**

It was hypothesized that couples who demonstrated greater global understanding, greater feelings of being understood or greater realization of understanding would use more direct person control strategies (closed questions and interruptions) in discussions of both conflictual and intimate issues. Yet, no relationship was found between these behaviors and globally measured interpersonal perception. Greater global feelings of being understood by one another were associated with asking fewer open ended questions (indirect person control). However, due to the relatively low number of open ended questions this finding should be considered cautiously.

It was also hypothesized that increased understanding, feelings of being understood, and realization of understanding would be associated with less use of attention control strategies. Overall, these hypotheses were not supported. Greater global self-report understanding was associated with more even distribution of speech time between husband and wife (less use of attention control
strategies) during the intimacy building interaction. This finding suggests that at least the sense of understanding the spouse, if not actual understanding the spouse, is associated with less use of attention control in discussion of intimate issues.

Thus, with the two exceptions described above, the evidence from the present study does not support the hypothesized relationship between the directness with which the flow of conversation between spouses is controlled (person versus attention control strategies) and the degree of felt or actual interpersonal accuracy. This lack of correspondence may underscore the conclusion of Sillars, Weisberg, Burggraf, & Zetlow (1990) that the relationship between communicative behavior and interpersonal perception in close enduring relationships such as marriages is a complex one. As these authors note, the very wealth of information upon which marital partners have to draw upon in the task of understanding each other may lead to failure to revise understandings of the other as new information becomes available. Furthermore, marriage may be the relationship in which partners are the most knowledgeable and least objective observers of each other. These authors point out that given these conditions, perceptions of the partner can take on a peculiar independence from communication.
Sillars et al. (1990) found that the more relational and abstract as opposed to concrete the referent perceptual judgment task (e.g., Bill is an accepting person versus Bill likes Chinese food), the less it was affected by communication between partners. The constructs elicited from the REP Test as it was administered in the present study are very likely to represent the participants' interpersonal and psychological constructs. Informal observations by the author of the constructs elicited in the study confirmed this expectation. Thus, the participants were attempting to judge their spouses' responses on abstract and relational dimensions.

As Sillars et al. (1990) note, when the ambiguity judgment task increases, couples begin to use other cues besides those offered by the verbal communications of their spouses (e.g., predictions based on stereotypical knowledge such as since Betty is a female he will see her as a more interested in people than in things). Thus, whether couples are more direct or indirect in their attempts to control their interactions may be more closely related to their interpersonal perceptions regarding the more concrete daily interactions in marriage, rather than the broader and more abstract issues. For example, direct person control strategies may lead to better understanding relative to attention control strategies on the issue of a spouse's preference to stay home rather than go out in the evening.
However, in discussions of broader issues such as whether the spouse is generally "open to the other's ideas," which type of control behaviors are used may not greatly affect interpersonal perception.

Marital Satisfaction and Observed Behavior (Self-Disclosure and Interpersonal Control Strategies)

As noted in Noller and Fitzpatrick's (1990) review of the empirical literature on communication and marriage, the relationship between global marital satisfaction and communicative behavior has been of primary interest to many marital researchers. Thus, although no hypotheses were stated, the relationship between globally measured marital satisfaction and communicative behaviors was investigated. Globally measured satisfaction was not associated with observations of self-disclosure, direct person control, and attention control. However, increased global satisfaction was associated with less use of indirect person control (open ended questions) during the intimacy building interaction.

As mentioned above, previous research has found a variety of communicative behaviors to be related to marital satisfaction. Several methodological differences between the present study and previous research on the relationship of communication to marital satisfaction may be responsible for the relative lack of connection found between communication and satisfaction in the present study. First,
much of the research in this area has compared high and low adjustment couples, thus having a much larger range of satisfaction scores within the sample. As a group, the participants in the present study met the typical criteria used in most of the previous research for high adjustment. Thus, a more narrow range of satisfaction scores was represented in the sample. Communicative behaviors which may have been useful in predicting satisfaction versus dissatisfaction would not necessarily be expected to discriminate between couples who are satisfied with the marriage. Second, many of the behaviors studied in previous research (e.g., complaint and criticisms) are generally considered negative behaviors while the behaviors in the present study do not have strong positive or negative connotations. Third, previous research has primarily been focused on the types of behaviors exchanged, while the present study has focused more on the processes by which interactions between spouses are regulated.

**Measurement of Additional Levels of Interpersonal Perception**

The hypothesis that measuring feelings of being understood and realization of understanding, in addition to measuring understanding, would improve prediction of self-disclosure and interpersonal control strategies was not generally supported by the findings of this study. Whether couples felt understood in a global sense was not related to observed self-disclosure, task involvement, or guardedness.
Nor was the extent to which couples felt understood related to the more direct control strategies of closed questions and interruptions or to the attention control strategy of holding the floor longer than the partner. No expectations were stated regarding the relationship of open ended questions and interpersonal perceptions. However, greater feelings of being understood in a global sense were associated with asking fewer open ended questions (indirect person control) in discussions of intimate and conflictual topics. Realization of understanding was not related to any of the observed communicative behaviors in either interaction.

Although only related to one behavior in the present investigation, feeling understood by one's spouse, as will be discussed in subsequent sections, is an important element in determining how communication is perceived. The relationship between feeling understood and open ended questions was the strongest association of any of the measures of interpersonal perception to observed behavior. Given the strongly negative relationship between the overall sense that one is understood by one's spouse and the occurrence of open ended questions in discussions of both intimate and conflictual issues, future research could profitably explore how these types of questions are perceived. Open ended questions from one's spouse may disconfirm the assumption that the spouse understands or
agrees with one's point of view. Alternatively, open ended questions may be perceived as positive attempts to improve unsuccessful communication. Regardless of how open ended questions and feelings of being understood are related, clinicians might profitably instruct clients to self-disclose their own reactions to their partners' statements rather than follow their spouses' statements with this type of question.

Contextually Measured Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction with Observed Behavior

As mentioned previously, the majority of research on interpersonal perception in marriage has focused on understanding (comparison of one spouse's direct perspective to the other's metaperspective). Although greater understanding has frequently been related to overall marital satisfaction (Christensen & Wallace, 1976; Corsini, 1956; Dymond, 1954; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Laing et al., 1966; Murstein & Beck, 1972; Newmark et al., 1977; Stuckert, 1963; Taylor, 1967), studies of marital interaction have not found the expected relationship between measures of understanding and communicative behaviors (Loos, 1986; Sillars et al., 1984; Sillars & Scott, 1983). These studies which have failed to find the expected relationship between communication and understanding have used global measures of understanding in the marriage to predict actual communicative behavior (Loos, 1986; Sillars et al., 1984).
In the present investigation, it was hypothesized that understanding the spouse's perspective on a specific interaction would not merely be a function of the amount of global understanding in the marriage, but rather would be more closely tied to the communicative behaviors which occurred during the interaction. Thus, it was hypothesized that contextually based measures of understanding would demonstrate a closer relationship with observed behaviors than would global measures of understanding. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings of the study. Only two relatively weak relationships were found between global measures of understanding and observed behaviors. No relationships were found between the contextual measure of understanding and observed behaviors.

As discussed previously regarding global understanding and communicative behavior, the relationship between understanding in the present context and communicative behavior is likely a complex one. In instances in which the referent for the judgment task is more abstract or relational (e.g., "the information I revealed was intimate") factors other than communicative behaviors may also influence the degree of understanding (Sillars et al., 1990). Thus, future research on understanding and communication needs to consider using more concrete referents for judgment tasks or include other possible
predictors in addition to communicative behavior when the judgment task is more abstract.

In addition to understanding, feelings of being understood, realization of understanding, and satisfaction were also measured in the current communicative context. Although no specific hypotheses were stated regarding the relationships of these variables measured in the current communicative context to observed communicative behaviors, these relationships were also investigated. Greater feelings of being understood while discussing conflictual issues were associated with fewer closed and open ended questions (direct and indirect person control strategies). In an intimacy building discussion, greater feelings of being understood were associated with asking fewer closed questions (direct person control strategy). The negative impact of question asking (person control strategy) on the immediate sense of communication success is consistent with the previously mentioned finding that greater global feelings of being understood were associated with fewer open ended questions during both intimate and conflictual discussions.

Greater satisfaction in both types of discussions was also associated with fewer open ended questions (indirect person control strategy). This finding is consistent with the previously mentioned finding that overall relationship satisfaction was associated with fewer open ended questions
in the intimacy building interaction. The consistent relationship between open ended questions and both feelings of being understood and satisfaction (measured both globally and contextually) demonstrates the importance of interpersonal control strategies to couple's feelings about their marriage and in their feelings about communication in their marriage.

Asking questions of one's spouse is thought of as positive communication skill by some clinicians and researchers (Beck, 1988; Ting-Toomey, 1983), as a neutral behavior by others (Weiss, Hops & Patterson, 1973), and as a negative behavior by others (Filsinger & Thoma, 1988). Some models of marital therapy and enrichment recommend that therapists instruct clients to reword questions into self-disclosive statements (Guerney, 1977). The importance of this instruction is strongly supported by the findings of the present study. However, longitudinal research may be useful in determining which school of thought is correct regarding the role of questions in communication. If questions, particularly open ended questions, lead to feeling less understood and less satisfied with an immediate interaction, then they may serve a useful role in identifying and correcting misunderstandings, or in identifying and adjusting to differences between spouses. Thus, open ended questions may be a communicative behavior which leads to short term dissatisfaction but which
facilitates changes leading to enhanced satisfaction over the long term.

An alternate possibility regarding open ended questions is that they are not experienced as especially negative behaviors, but rather are more likely to occur in communication which is less successful and therefore less satisfying. It may be that communication which is more indirect or vague leads to feeling less understood, which in turn leads to more question asking. A third possibility is that, question asking may be experienced as a controlling or distancing maneuver and therefore contribute to spouses feeling less understood both in the short and long term marital relationship. Thus, of particular importance in future research is clarification if open ended questions are in and of themselves experienced negatively and if so, why they are experienced negatively by spouses.

Global Measures of Marital Functioning and Contextual Measures

In examining the overall patterns of associations among global measures of marital functioning, contextual measures of interpersonal perception and satisfaction, and observations of behaviors, it is apparent that the greatest number and strength of associations were between global measures and contextual measures. Thus, although no specific hypotheses were formulated, the relationship of
global attributes of marriage to interpersonal perception and satisfaction in specific interactions was investigated.

Globally Measured Similarity and Contextually Measured Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Three methods were used to assess global similarity between partners in the present study. The two primary measures of similarity derived from the REP Test, organizational and perceived similarity, were not generally related to interpersonal perception or satisfaction during specific interactions (one out of a possible eight significant correlations). The third measure, global self-report similarity, was more relevant to interpersonal perception and satisfaction with current interactions (see Tables 12 and 13). Yet, these relationships did not indicate a strong association between the global self-report of similarity and feelings about communication or accuracy of understanding the spouse’s view of the interaction.

The relationships that were found between the global self-report of similarity and contextual measures of interpersonal perception and satisfaction suggests that the overall impression of similarity to spouse may be more relevant in discussions of conflictual issues than in intimacy building discussions. Couples who reported more overall similarity to one another tended to report greater satisfaction and to demonstrate more understanding and realization of understanding when of discussing conflictual
issues than did couples reporting less overall similarity. Self-report of more overall similarity to the spouse was also associated with greater feelings of being understood in the intimacy building interaction. In this context, couples who demonstrated greater similarity in organization of psychological experience (organizational similarity) were more accurate in predicting each other's metaperspectives (realization of understanding).

That the primary measures of similarity were generally not related to accuracy of interpersonal perception or satisfaction in current communicative context is consistent with the theoretical position (Kelly, 1955) and recent findings (Loos, 1986) that similarity is often independent of understanding. As noted earlier, whether couples recognize and how they construe their similarities and differences are more important clinical issues than the mere existence of similarities and differences. Furthermore, the findings of this study suggest that global impressions of similarity may also be more important to marital functioning than actual similarity. Thus, even when using measures designed to assess agreement or actual similarity between spouses, practitioners working with couples would do well to also investigate the couples' subjective sense of being similar to each other.
Globally Measured Understanding and Contextually Measured Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Understanding between spouses measured by three different methods was not related to understanding or realization of understanding in the context of interactions between spouses. Couples who reported greater global understanding of each other (Global Self-Report Understanding) did report greater feelings of being understood in an intimate discussion and greater satisfaction with both intimate and conflictual discussions. However, couples' impressions that they generally understand the other spouse may not be a reliable index of their actual understanding. These global impressions of understanding were not related to other measures of understanding used in this study. Perhaps impressions of understanding one's spouse represent perceived relationship and communication success. Thus, satisfied couples seeking to further develop their relationship in a marital enrichment program may, due to a global sense of understanding the partner, feel that it is unnecessary to focus on how well they understand each other. Yet, it is advisable that clinicians investigate the ability of spouses to truly appreciate each others' perspectives even with couples in which lack of understanding is not experienced as a particular difficulty.
The finding that contextual and global understanding were not associated is at least consistent with the assertion that global understanding of the partner does not necessarily translate into appreciation of the partner's perspective in specific interactions. Yet, a low level relationship between global and contextual understanding would be expected. Communication patterns are often thought to influence the degree of understandings between spouses (Knudson et al., 1980; Sillars et al., 1984). Some researchers feel that dispositional empathy is responsible for the degree of understanding in a marital relationship (Davis & Oathout, 1987). Whatever processes or traits are responsible for degree of global understanding, it might be expected that the same process or trait would also influence the degree of understanding in specific interactions. However, present research findings are consistent with the alternate view that two entirely different processes are being measured by global and contextually specific measures of understanding.

One possible explanation of these findings stems from Social Psychological theories of interpersonal understanding. Social psychologists (Baron & Byrne, 1991) divide the efforts to understand others into two basic tasks. The first task is that of determining immediate causes of behavior such as mood. The second task is that of making decisions about long term traits which might cause
the behaviors of others. Global measures of understanding may assess how well each spouse understands the typical trait based explanations (superordinate constructs) the other spouse uses to explain behavior. An example of this kind of global understanding would be knowing how one's partner applies to the bipolar construct of "conservative" versus "liberal" to other people. Contextually specific understanding may be more related to judging the immediate causes of each others' behaviors such as current moods.

Globally Measured Feelings of Being Understood and Contextually Measured Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Whereas global understanding was not found to predict contextual understanding, global feelings of being understood were found to be a good predictor of feeling understood and satisfied in specific interactions. Furthermore, couples who experienced more globally measured feelings of being understood demonstrated greater realization of understanding (more accurately predicted each other's metaperspective) in specific interactions. The relationship between global feelings of being understood and communication satisfaction has several implications for both clinicians and researchers.

The strength of the association between feeling understood by one another in marriage and the sense of successful and satisfactory communication during specific
interactions underscores the need for further research on the determinants of feeling understood by one's spouse. Weiss (1980, 1984) theorized that satisfied couples possess a "positive sentiment" which arises from general expectations of receiving unconditional positive regard from the spouse. This general sentiment about the relationship takes precedence over actual behavior in determining the self-reports of communicative behavior (a process which he termed "sentiment override"). Thus, negative behaviors are construed and responded to differently in couples who possess this generalized positive sentiment about each other than in distressed couples. Feelings of being understood is likely an important component of positive sentiment as discussed by Weiss.

In the present study, feeling that discussions of both intimate and conflictual issues were satisfying and successful was more closely related to global feelings of being understood than to observed behaviors during current communication. The person control strategy of asking open ended questions was the only observed behavior related to feeling understood and satisfied with discussions of intimate and conflictual issues. Identifying other communicative behaviors which are associated with greater feelings of being understood by one's marital partner would be a clinically useful research goal. Communication skill training programs could then target those behaviors in order
to increase feelings of being understood. Irrespective of eventual research findings, clinical interventions which help couples to identify instances in which they have felt more or less understood by the other spouse may be very useful in identifying target behaviors on which to focus in communication skills training.

Feeling understood by one’s spouse may not be a product of typical communicative behaviors, but rather may be a product of the general expectation that one is loved and accepted. To the extent that this assertion is true, focusing directly how spouses come to believe that they are loved and valued by their partners could be a useful clinical strategy. Interventions which directly target feelings of being understood rather than first targeting communicative behaviors may in turn improve communication between spouses. Feeling more understood may reduce the tendency of a distressed spouse to interpret the other spouse’s behavior negatively and consequently reciprocate this perceived negativity.

Globally Measured Realization of Understanding and Contextually Measured Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Greater realization of understanding on a global level was associated with greater understanding and greater realization of understanding in discussions of both conflictual and intimate issues. However, realization of
understanding was not related to greater sense of communication success (feeling more understood and satisfied with interactions).

That greater global realization of understanding was associated with greater accuracy of interpersonal perception and not with greater sense of current communication success (feelings of being understood and satisfaction) suggests that greater accuracy of interpersonal perception will not necessarily lead to immediately gratifying experiences in marriage. This finding is similar to findings in other areas of psychology. More accurate perception of reinforcement contingencies has been found to be associated with mild depression rather than mental health (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). Similarly, it has been found in the marriage communication literature that behaviors which are experienced as more negative events in the short term may be associated with greater adjustment in the long term (Gottman & Krokoff, 1989). Thus, it may be reasonable to expect that although greater global realization of understanding is not associated with a short term sense of communication success (or failure), it may be associated with greater long term adjustment. Couples who recognize that there are differences between each others’ meta-meta and metaperspectives may engage in more communication to reduce misunderstandings.
Globally Measured Marital Adjustment/Satisfaction and Contextually Measured Interpersonal Perception and Satisfaction

Although no hypotheses were previously formulated regarding the role of overall marital satisfaction in couples' reactions to current communication, greater global satisfaction was found to be an important predictor of greater sense of communication success (feeling understood and satisfied with the discussion). It is important to note that global satisfaction generally demonstrated a larger influence on the sense of communication success than did observed behaviors (only one behavior, number of open ended questions, demonstrated a strong relationship with communication success). Thus, once again (see similar findings of above regarding global feelings of being understood) general sentiments regarding the nature of the relationship as a whole may exert a powerful influence of how communication with the spouse is experienced. Alternatively, couples' judgments of achieving communication success based on their own definitions of effective communication may be an important component of self-reported overall relationship adjustment.

Global Self-Reports of Communicative Behavior and Contextual Measures of Satisfaction and Interpersonal Perception

Participants reported on their global perceptions of self-disclosure and interpersonal control strategies in
their marital communication. The relationship of these global perceptions to satisfaction and interpersonal perception in the context of specific interactions was investigated. Although no specific hypotheses were formed, it was expected that global perceptions of communicative behavior would be related to how specific interactions are experienced.

As expected, global self-report of breadth and depth of self-disclosure in the marital relationship (Dyadic Disclosure Inventory) was found to be a useful predictor of feeling understood and satisfied in both intimacy building and conflict resolution discussions. Couples who reported more self-disclosure in the relationship as a whole had a greater sense of satisfaction and being understood in current discussions than couples who reported less self-disclosure in their marriage. Global self-report of greater self-disclosure was also found to be a useful predictor of greater actual understanding and realization of understanding in the context of a discussion of conflictual issues.

The importance of perceived self-disclosure in the marital relationship was supported by the consistent and relatively strong relationship between the couples' assessment of breadth and depth of self-disclosure in the relationship as a whole and their experience of current interactions. The positive relationship between the
couples' report of breadth and depth of self-disclosure and sense of immediate communicative success (feeling understood and satisfied) may be another manifestation of positive sentiments about the relationship influencing judgments about current communicative processes. Alternatively, global self-reports of breadth and depth of self-disclosure may reflect more communication openness in the relationship as a whole which leads to greater appreciation of each others' perspectives. The latter assertion is supported by the finding that in the discussion of conflictual issues, this greater global self-report of breadth and depth of self-disclosure was related to greater accuracy of interpersonal perception.

The relationship between global self-reports of interpersonal control strategies and contextual measures of interpersonal perception and satisfaction were also investigated. Couples' global reports of closed questions and reports of attempts to control the focus of attention in their important interactions were not related to satisfaction or interpersonal perception in current communication. The perception that attempts at interpersonal control through the use of interruptions (direct person control) occur during important discussions was however, a useful barometer of successful communication, especially in the process of resolving conflicts. Self-reports of greater overall use of interruptions to
control important discussions were related to less feelings of being understood, less realization of understanding, and less satisfaction in the conflict resolution interaction. Global self-reports of interruptions were related to less feelings of being understood in the intimacy building interaction.

As mentioned above, the global perception that one or both marital partners attempts to control the direction of discussions through interruptions is especially relevant to conflictual discussions. Those couples who believe that one or both partners attempts to control these interactions may have negative feelings about their ability to solve conflicts. This global negative feeling in turn may influence the judgments regarding success of particular interactions. That perceived use of interruptions rather than actual use of interruptions rather than actual use of interruptions was related to sense of communication success again suggest that the meanings that partners apply to behaviors are more important, at least in some instances, than the actual behaviors which occur. Thus, in both research and therapy it is important to gather "insider" perspectives as well as "outsider" perspectives on behaviors of interest.
Implications of Major Findings for Future Research and Practice

Although initial predictions regarding the relationship between interpersonal perception and communication were not confirmed, several findings of the present study have significant implications for research and practice. The relationship between spouse self-report and rater observation of communicative behavior is the first finding of interest to clinicians and researchers. Neither reports of past communicative behavior nor appraisal of current communication by spouses corresponded to raters' observations of current communication. Thus, the connotative experience of communication in marriage appears to be influenced by factors other than present communicative behaviors. Researchers should therefore not assume that gathering information about communication in marriage through self-reports of communicative behaviors and through observations of current behavior are measuring the same phenomena. Clinicians should also be aware that spouse self-reports of communicative behavior may be influenced by overall sentiments about the relationship, which may not reflect actual communicative behaviors. Thus, clinicians attempting to help couples improve their communication should not rely solely on spouse self-reports of communicative behavior as an assessment of actual
communicative practices unless couples are well trained in self-observation.

Further, present data suggest that even "successful" attempts to help couples change their actual communicative practices may not impact overall relationship adjustment unless behavior changes are accompanied by a subjective perception of communication success. In the present study, global measures of marital functioning were much more closely related to contextually measured interpersonal perception and level of satisfaction than to observed behaviors. Traditional communication training focused on helping couples to change observable communicative behavior in marriage. Cognitive and personal construct theory approaches to marital therapy (Beck, 1988; Neimeyer & Hudson, 1985) emphasize how behaviors are perceived or construed, rather than just what behaviors are exchanged. The emphases of personal construct and cognitive therapists are supported by the findings of the present study. Furthermore, researchers should be aware that the global measures commonly used in marital research are more useful for predicting the experiential level of interaction than in predicting actual behaviors.

The relationships found between global and contextual measures in the present study contribute to understanding the experiential level of the marital relationship. Global reports of open self-disclosure and feelings understood were
more closely related to the subjective sense of successful communication than were global measures of similarity and understanding. Although self-reports of self-disclosure, and feelings of being understood have been related to overall marital adjustment (Burke et al., 1976; Cahn, 1990; Hendrick, 1981; Levinger & Senn, 1967; Navran, 1967; Waring et al., 1981), the present study is the first to investigate the relationship of these variables to subjective sense of current communication success. These global feelings about the relationship may function as a pre-existing set of expectations which determine how communication in the relationship is perceived. Repeated experiences of success or failure in communicating may also lead to more positive overall feelings about the marital relationship. In either case, findings regarding the relationship between global and contextual measures in the present study once again underscore the importance of understanding the process of cognitive appraisals in marriage.

The findings of the present study also indicate that the person control behavior of asking questions deserves further research attention due to the close relationship between this behavior and positive overall sentiments about the relationship. Asking open ended questions is the only exception to the finding that observed behaviors were not closely related to feeling understood and satisfied, both in the relationship overall and in specific interactions. The
correlational nature of the data does allow several interpretations regarding the role of open ended questions in marriage. These questions may be experienced as constructive attempts to improve ineffective or dissatisfying communication, or they may be experienced as a negative, controlling or distancing behavior leading to greater dissatisfaction with the marriage and the communication in the relationship. A worthwhile direction for future research would be to explore how these questions are experienced from the "insider" perspective of married couples or perhaps longitudinal research could assess the role of these questions in communication success and failure. Given the possibility that open ended questions may contribute to marital distress, training couples to replace open ended questions with self-disclosure or at least in more skillful use of questions is a valuable clinical strategy.
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INTRODUCTION TO THE EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

THANK YOU FOR VOLUNTEERING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY ON MARITAL INTERACTION. THE FIRST PART OF THIS STUDY WILL INVOLVE ANSWERING SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF, AND THE WAYS YOU HAVE OF UNDERSTANDING OTHER IMPORTANT PEOPLE IN YOUR LIFE. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG RESPONSES TO THESE QUESTIONS. THUS AS RESEARCHERS WE ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR RESPONSES AS A COUPLE RATHER THAN WHAT MAY SEEM TO BE THE RIGHT OR DESIRABLE RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION.

THE SECOND PART OF THE STUDY WILL INVOLVE PARTICIPATING IN TWO BRIEF SETS OF INTERACTIONS WITH YOUR PARTNER. ALL OF THE INFORMATION GATHERED WILL BE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. YOUR RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES WILL BE IDENTIFIED ONLY BY A SUBJECT NUMBER. ALTHOUGH THE INTERACTIONS WILL BE AUDIOTAPED, ONLY MYSELF AND SELECTED ASSISTANTS WILL HEAR YOUR RESPONSES. YOU WILL NEVER BE IDENTIFIED BY NAME AND THE TAPES WILL BE ERASED AFTER THE NECESSARY INFORMATION HAS BEEN GATHERED. YOU ARE FREE TO WITHDRAW YOUR PARTICIPATION AT ANY TIME. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS BEFORE WE BEGIN?
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PARTICIPANT’S NAME: _____________________________

Date: _____________________________

1. I authorize Bruce Allen of the University of North Texas (currently Visiting Lecturer, Baylor University) and any research assistants designated by him, to gather information from me on marital interaction. I have freely volunteered to participate in this study with no coercion, psychological or otherwise. I understand that my participation will involve answering several questionnaires and participating in two brief discussions which will be audiotaped. The entire procedure will take between two and two and a half hours.

2. I understand that there is no physical and minimal psychological risk from participation in this study.
   A. I am aware that I may choose not to answer any questions I find embarrassing or offensive.
   B. I understand that I may terminate my participation in this study at any time.

3. I understand that all information in this study is completely confidential. When the research is finished, my written responses will not be identified by name. The responses will be identified by a code number only. The audiotape will not identify names. These tapes will not be used for classroom instruction or for any reason other than analysis of the interaction by members of the research team. After the coding procedures are completed the tapes will be erased.

4. I also understand that if I experience any anxiety or stress related to my participation, Bruce Allen will be available for immediate consultation and if needed will provide referral to the appropriate agency or marital counselor. Although marital counseling is not a part of the current study, it is available from two non-profit agencies and numerous counselors in private practice settings in Waco. A list of the agencies and several private practice counselors is available from Bruce
Allen upon request. The fees for counseling received from an agency vary from two to seventy dollars per session (with an average of fifteen dollars per session) depending on the income and the number of dependents in the home. The fees from private practitioners included on the list vary from forty to ninety five dollars per session. The number of sessions needed is determined by the counselor and the couple. Typically, the length of marital counseling will range from two to twenty-five sessions (an average of ten to twelve)

5. I am aware that a written summary of the findings is available when this project is completed. I understand that this will be sent to me at my request, provided I supply a long term address below.

6. Please direct all inquiries about this study to Bruce Allen, Visiting Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Baylor University, B.U. Box 7334, Waco, Tx. 76798-7334 or call Mr. Allen at (817) 755-2961.

7. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant in this study feel free to contact the Baylor University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research, Baylor University, Waco, Tx. 76798. The Chairperson of this committee is William D. Hillis, Vice President of Student Affairs, B.U. Box 7016, Baylor University, Waco, Tx. 76798 Phone (817) 755-1314.

6. The procedures of the investigation have been explained to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Signature</th>
<th>Witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address (if wish to receive summary)
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Background Information

(card 1)
(col 1)
(1-2) Subject Number ______

(3) 1. Sex ______ 1. Male
____ 2. Female

(4-5) 2. Age ______

(6) 3. Race ______ 1. Hispanic
____ 2. Black
____ 3. Oriental
____ 4. Caucasian
____ 5. Other ______

(7-8) 4. How long have you been married? ______ years

(9) 5. How long did you date before you got married?
____ 1. Less than 3 months
____ 2. 3 months to 6 months
____ 3. 6 months to 1 year
____ 4. 1 year to 3 years
____ 5. more than 3 years

(10-11) 6. How many children do you have from the current marriage? ______

(12-13) 7. How many children do you currently have living at home ______

(14-18) 8. What is your average combined yearly income? ______

(19) 9. Which of the following is your highest level of education?
____ 1. 8th grade
____ 2. 11th grade
____ 3. 12th grade
____ 4. 1 or 2 years of college
____ 5. college degree
____ 6. graduate degree
____ 7. other

(20-21) 10. What is your occupation? ______

(22) 11. Are you currently facing any major stress, such as financial difficulties, job change, death in the family, moving, pregnancy, etc.
____ 1. No
____ 2. Yes (if yes, specify: ________________________)
APPENDIX D

DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE
Appendix D

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Most persons have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your spouse for each item on the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Always Agree</th>
<th>4 Almost Always Agree</th>
<th>3 Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>2 Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>1 Almost Always Disagree</th>
<th>0 Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(col) (23-37)

1. Handling family finances
2. Recreational activities
3. Religious matters
4. Demonstrations of affection
5. Friends
6. Sexual relations
7. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)
8. Philosophy of life
9. Ways of dealing with parents or in laws
10. Aims, goals, and things believed important
11. Amount of time spent together
12. Making major decisions
13. Household tasks
14. Leisure time activities and interests
15. Career decisions
(38) 16. Do you kiss your partner?  
   _____ 0 -- Never  
   _____ 1 -- Rarely  
   _____ 2 -- Occasionally  
   _____ 3 -- Almost every day  
   _____ 4 -- Every day

(39-45)  
   _____ 17. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?  
   _____ 18. How often do you and your mate leave the house after a fight?  
   _____ 19. In general, how often do you think things between you and your partner are going well?  
   _____ 20. Do you confide in your mate?  
   _____ 21. Do you ever regret that you married?  
   _____ 22. How often do you and your partner quarrel?  
   _____ 23. How often do you and your partner "get on each other's nerves?"  

(46) 24. Of the interests you are involved in outside of work, how many of them do you and your partner engage in together?  
   _____ 0 -- None of them  
   _____ 1 -- Very few of them  
   _____ 2 -- Some of them  
   _____ 3 -- Most of them  
   _____ 4 -- All of them
These are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or were problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Check yes or no).

(47-48) 25. Being too tired for sex  ____  (1) Yes  ____ (2) No
       26. Not showing love  ____  (1) Yes  ____ (2) No

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your mate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>Once or twice a month</td>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>Once a day</td>
<td>More than once a day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(49-52) 27. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas
       28. Laugh together
       29. Calmly discuss something
       30. Work together on a project

(53) 31. The dots on the following lines represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unhappy</td>
<td>Fairly Unhappy</td>
<td>A little Unhappy</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Very Happy</td>
<td>Extremely Perfect</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(54) 32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship?

       5 -- I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.

       4 -- I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all that I can to see that it does.

(continued on the next page)
3 -- I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.

2 -- It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.

1 -- It would be nice if it succeeded, but I refuse to do anything more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.

0 -- My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.
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Partner Communication Questionnaire

(card 2)
(col)
(1-2) Subject No. ___
(3) ____ (Husband = 1, Wife = 2)

On each item circle the number which best represents your answer.

(4) 1. When the two of us are having an important conversation, I try to focus the interaction on my thoughts, feelings and behaviors.

Very       1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Not At Much
All

(5) 2. When the two of us are having an important conversation, my partner tries to focus the interaction on his/her thoughts, feelings and behaviors.

Very       1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Not At Much
All

(6) 3. When the two of us are having an important conversation, I make direct and specific requests for information from my partner.

Not At 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Much
All

(7) 4. When the two of us are having an important conversation, my partner makes direct and specific requests for information from me.

Not At 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Much
All

(8) 5. When the two of us are having an important conversation, I actively try to move the discussion in the direction I want it to go by interrupting my partner.

Very       1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Not At Much
All
(9) 6. When the two of us are having an important conversation, my partner actively tries to move the discussion in the direction he/she wants it to go by interrupting me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(10) 7. All things considered, how similar do you think you and your spouse are overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Similar</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Dissimilar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(11) 8. Overall, how well do you think you understand your spouse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Understand</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Understand Him/Her Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(12) 9. Overall, how well do you think your spouse understands you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He/She Does Not Understand</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>He/She Understands Me Very Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Me At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix F

Dyadic Disclosure Inventory

Please indicate the degree to which you have discussed the following items with your spouse. Write in the number from "0" to "2" that most accurately describes your interaction with your spouse on each item.

0 -- Have not discussed this at all
1 -- Have discussed this somewhat
2 -- Have discussed this openly and freely

(13-26)

1. The religious denomination to which I belong.

2. What kind of furniture I would like to have in the living room.

3. What I find attractive in people of the opposite sex.

4. Where my parents and grandparents came from.

5. What foods I feel are best for my health.

6. The amount of money I received for my allowance when I was a child.

7. My feeling about how good a job the President is doing.

8. How I might feel or actually felt if I saw my father hit my mother.

9. What I believe about God.

10. What animals make me nervous.

11. How satisfied I am with different parts of my body.

12. My favorite pet.

13. What sports I am good at and which I am poor at.

(27-38)

____ 15. Times I have felt lonely.

____ 16. The kinds of group activities I usually enjoy.

____ 17. Things which would cause me to break up a friendship.

____ 18. How I feel about mixed marriages (i.e., people of two different races or cultures marrying).

____ 19. My special strong points and qualifications for my work.

____ 20. What I daydream about.


____ 23. Whether or not I would ever steal money if I had to have it.

____ 24. My favorite subjects in school.

____ 25. My favorite color.

____ 26. Something about my life as a child or adolescent I don't want anybody to know about.
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Common Marital Conflicts Rating Form

The following are conflicts which are commonly experienced in marriage. Rank the conflicts from 1 to 10 regarding your desire for change related to this issue with 1 representing the issue on which you most would like to see change and 10 representing the issue on which you feel the least need for change. Use each number only once so that you have ordered the conflicts from 1 to 10 in terms of your desire for change.

(39-48)

_____ 1. Pressures or problems at work that have affected your relationship.

_____ 2. Criticisms of one another's lifestyle, beliefs, ideas, or activities.

_____ 3. Taking care of household responsibilities, such as cleaning, yard work, home repairs, shopping, etc.

_____ 4. Lack of affection or attention paid by one or both of you to the other person.

_____ 5. Disagreements about spending money.

_____ 6. One or both of you have been irritable, depressed, bossy, or otherwise hard to get along with.

_____ 7. Disagreements about how to spend your leisure time, such as what to do on weekends or vacations, what television programs or movies to watch, what parties to attend etc.

_____ 8. Lack of communication between the two of you.

_____ 9. Disagreements about how to discipline or raise the children.

_____ 10. One of you feels that the two of you do not do enough things together.
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Conflict Distress Rating Form

On each item use the following scale to describe the amount of distress you feel about the issue.

1 -- Extremely Distressed
2 -- Moderately Distressed
3 -- Mildly Distressed
4 -- Not At All Distressed

(49-58)

1. Pressures or problems at work that have affected your relationship.

2. Criticisms of one another's lifestyle, beliefs, ideas, or activities.

3. Taking care of household responsibilities, such as cleaning, yardwork, home repairs, shopping, etc.

4. Lack of affection or attention paid by one or both of you to the other person.

5. Disagreements about spending money.

6. One or both of you have been irritable, depressed, bossy, or otherwise hard to get along with.

7. Disagreements about how to spend your leisure time, such as what to do on weekends or vacations, what television programs or movies to watch, what parties to attend etc.

8. Lack of communication between the two of you.

9. Disagreements about how to discipline or raise the children.

10. One of you feels that the two of you do not do enough things together.
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INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ROLE CONSTRUCT REPERTORY GRID-W
(Wife)

STEP #1:

Find the slanted lines in the upper left-hand corner of the RESPONSE SHEET.

1. Write the first name of your mother or the person who has played the part of your mother in column #1.

2. Write the first name of your father or the person has played the part of your father in column #2.

3. Write the first name of your spouse's mother (mother-in-law) in column #3.

4. Write the first name of your spouse's father (father-in-law) in column #4.

5. Write your own name in column #5.

6. Write the name of your spouse in column #6.

7. Write the name of someone the two of you would like to get to know better in column #7. Confer with your spouse so that both of you write in the same name.

8. Write the name of someone the two of you dislike and would not like to associate with in column #8. Confer with your spouse so that both of you write in the same name.

9. Write the name of the happiest person the two of you know in column #9. Confer with your spouse so that both of you write in the same name. Do not use any previously used name.

10. Write the name of the unhappiest person the two of you know in column #10. Confer with your spouse so that both of you write in the same name. Do not use any previously used name.
**STEP #2:**
Below your list of names, find Row A. Notice that Row A has two circles. Look at the names above these circles.

**ARE THE TWO PEOPLE ALIKE IN SOME ONE WAY?**

If they seem alike to you in some one way, write the way in which these two people are alike in the blank space under the heading "Column #1."

For instance in the following example Bob and Ted are alike in that they are "honest."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOB</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>TED</th>
<th>BEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;honest&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now look across your list of acquaintances. Find a person who is different from the two who are alike. In the blank space under the heading "Column #2" write the way in which this person is different from the other two.

For instance, in the following example, Bev is different from Bob and Ted in that she is seen as "shady."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOB</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>TED</th>
<th>BEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;honest&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;shady&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After you finish Row A, complete Row B, Row C, etc., following the same instructions.
If you cannot find a way in which the two circled people in a given row are alike, go to the next page; otherwise, skip to page 4.
If you cannot find a way in which the two people are alike, think about them again. If they are not alike in some one way, perhaps the two are different in some one way. If you see that the two people are different in some way, write the description "Column #1" which fits the person whose name is above the left circle. In "Column #2", write the description which fits the person whose name is above the right circle.

For instance, in the following example, Bob and Ted are different from each other in that Bob is seen as "warm" and Ted is seen as "silly."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOB</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>TED</th>
<th>BEY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;warm&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;silly&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP #3:
For Row A, look over the description you wrote under Column #1 and the description you wrote under Column #2. Notice that between your two descriptions is a set of numbers ranging from "-6" to "+6." You have developed your own rating scale or (dimension), using these descriptors and the rating numbers.

Use your rating scale (Dimension) for Row A to give your impression of "your mother" in Row A. Then rate each person in Row A until all the spaces in Row A are filled. Then rate each of the people in Row B using the scale for Row B. do the same for Row C, Row D, etc.

ZERO RATINGS (0):
Use a zero when neither description fits the person you are trying to rate.

For instance, in the following example, on Row A, Mother is seen as very "formal" (-6) but Mother-in-law is seen as quite "humorous" (+4). On Row B, both Mother and Father are seen as "honest", but Father is more honest (-6) than Mother (-3).

Note that the "-" or "+" before the numbers merely refers to which side of the scale you are using, and does not refer to "good" or "bad".
STEP #4
Use the rating scale developed by your husband for Row A to rate all ten persons. Repeat this procedure for Rows B through J.

STEP #5
Using your own rating scale for Row A, predict how your husband rated persons 1-10. Repeat this procedure for Rows B through J.

STEP #6
Using your husband's rating scale for Row A, predict how he rated persons 1-10. Repeat this procedure for Rows B through J.

STEP #7
Using your own rating scale for Row A, rate how you think your husband predicted you to rate yourself and him. Repeat this procedure for Rows B through J.

STEP #8
Using your husband's scale for Row A, rate how you think he predicted you to rate yourself and him. Repeat this procedure for Rows B through J.
APPENDIX J

WIFE'S RATING SCALES
# Appendix J

## Wife's Rating Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column #1</th>
<th>Column #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-5-4-3-2-1</td>
<td>+1+2+3+4+5+6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Make the ratings using your own scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj. No.</th>
<th>H=1, W=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(card #4) (34-73)  

Make the ratings using your husband's scales.

(card #5)  (dup. 1-3)  (4-63)  

Subj. No.

H=1, W=2
Use your own scales to predict your husband's ratings.

(1-2) Subj. No.

(3) H=1, W=2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>card*6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| card*7 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| dup. 1-3 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| (4-33) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
Use your husband's scales to predict his ratings.

(1-2) Subj. No.
(3) H=1, W=2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using your own scales, how do you think your husband predicted you to rate yourself and him.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1-2) Subj. No.
(3) H=1, W=2
On his rating scales, how do you think your husband predicted you to rate yourself and him.
APPENDIX K

INTERACTION INSTRUCTIONS
Appendix K

Instructions for CR Interactions
For this set of interactions I have selected the three issues from the list of common marital conflicts, on which the two of you expressed the strongest desire for change. You will notice on the sheet that I have numbered these issues 1st, 2nd and 3rd. You will have four minutes to discuss the 1st of these issues. What you are to do is discuss the issue of (read item from conflict list) as would normally do in your own home. When four minutes are up I will knock on the door. Do not discuss the 2nd or 3rd topics in the first four minutes. Any questions? OK then, begin discussing topic one.

Instructions for the SD Interactions
Each of you have chosen three rating scales on which you evaluated your partner in a positive way. For the 1st interaction, I would like you each to tell your spouse about how you have come to experience him or her as _________ or ________(fill in each spouse's first construct) by describing a time or times when you have experienced him or her in this way. When four minutes is up I will knock on the door Do not discuss more than one topic each in this four minutes. Any questions? OK you may begin.
APPENDIX L

INTERACTION EVALUATION SCALE - WIFE
Interaction Evaluation Scale-Wife

Each of the following questions about the discussion you just had has three parts: A, B, and C.

On Part A, give your impression of your own and your spouse's behavior.
On Part B, predict your spouse's responses to the questions about his and your behavior.
On Part C, predict what your spouse will think your responses were to the questions about his and your behavior.

A) Circle the number which best represents your impression regarding the discussion you just had.
I revealed my personal thoughts, feelings, behaviors and self perceptions
In Great Depth Not At All
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

He revealed his personal thoughts, feelings, behaviors and self perceptions
In Great Depth Not At All
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?
I revealed my personal thoughts, feelings, behaviors and self perceptions
In Great Depth Not At All
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

She revealed her personal thoughts, feelings, behaviors and self perceptions
In Great Depth Not At All
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C) What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?
I revealed my personal thoughts, feelings, behaviors and self perceptions
In Great Depth Not At All
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
He revealed his personal thoughts, feelings, behaviors and self perceptions
In Great Depth Not At All
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. A) Circle the number which best represents your impression
The information I revealed was
Very Intimate Not At All Intimate
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
The information he revealed was
Very Intimate Not At All Intimate
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?
The information I revealed was
Very Intimate Not At All Intimate
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
The information she revealed was
Very Intimate Not At All Intimate
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

C) What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?
The information I revealed was
Very Intimate Not At All Intimate
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
The information he revealed was
Very Intimate Not At All Intimate
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. A) Circle the number which best represents your impression.
Right now, how would you rate your feelings for your partner?
Very Negative Very Positive
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Right now, how would your partner rate his feelings for you?
Very Negative Very Positive
1  2  3  4  5  6  7
(18-25)

B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?
   Right now, how would you rate your feelings for your partner?
   Very Negative  Very Positive
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   Right now, how would your partner rate her feelings for you?
   Very Negative  Very Positive
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
C) What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?
   Right now, how would you rate your feelings for your partner?
   Very Negative  Very Positive
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   Right now, how would your partner rate his feelings for you?
   Very Negative  Very Positive
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
4.A) Circle the number which best represents your impression.
   I made direct and specific requests for information from my partner
   Not At All  Very Much
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   My partner made direct and specific requests for information from me
   Not At All  Very Much
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?
   I made direct and specific requests for information from my partner
   Not At All  Very Much
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   
   My partner made direct and specific requests for information from me
   Not At All  Very Much
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
(26-32)

**C)** What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?

| I made direct and specific requests for information from my partner |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Not At All | Very Much |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| My partner made direct and specific requests for information from me |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Not At All | Very Much |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5.A) Circle the number which best represents your impression.

| I actively tried to move the discussion in the direction I wanted it to go by interrupting my partner |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Very Much | Not At All |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| My partner actively tried to move the discussion in the direction she wanted it to go by interrupting me |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Very Much | Not At All |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**B)** What would he circle in response to the following statements?

| I actively tried to move the discussion in the direction I wanted it to go by interrupting my partner |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Very Much | Not At All |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| My partner actively tried to move the discussion in the direction she wanted it to go by interrupting me |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Very Much | Not At All |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**C)** What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?

| I actively tried to move the discussion in the direction I wanted it to go by interrupting my partner |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Very Much | Not At All |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
My partner actively tried to move the discussion in the direction he wanted it to go by interrupting me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.A) Circle the number which best represents your impression.

I focused the discussion on myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

My partner focused the discussion on himself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?

I focused the discussion on myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

My partner focused the discussion on herself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C) What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?

I focused the discussion on myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

My partner focused the discussion on himself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.A) Circle the number which best represents your impression.

Regarding the interaction I just had with my partner I am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Regarding the interaction he and I just had my partner is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?
Regarding interaction I just had with my partner I am
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the interaction her and I just had my partner is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) What will he think you circled in response to the following statements?
Regarding the interaction I just had with my partner I am
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the interaction he and I just had my partner is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.A) Circle the number which best represents your impression.
Compared to our usual interactions on this or similar issues, my behavior was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Typical</th>
<th>Not At All Typical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to our usual interactions on this or similar issues, my husband's behavior was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Typical</th>
<th>Not At All Typical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) What would he circle in response to the following statements?
Compared to our usual interactions on this or similar issues, my behavior was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Typical</th>
<th>Not At All Typical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to our usual interactions on this or similar issues, my wife's behavior was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Typical</th>
<th>Not At All Typical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(50-51)
C) What will he think you circled in response to the following statements? Compared to our usual interactions on this or similar issues, my behavior was
Very Typical Not At All Typical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Compared to our usual interactions on this or similar issues, my husband's behavior was
Very Typical Not At All Typical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Appendix M

Summary of Doster's Disclosure Rating Scale*

0. Absence of personal involvement. The topic has been explored in an entirely impersonal or superficial manner. Focus is wholly on people, objects, and events (or experiences) not including this person. Self-references are notably lacking or few in number. Information may be an attempt to define, clarify, or discuss the topic without reference to self. His response may represent an inability or refusal to deal with the topic in terms of his personal frame of reference.

1. This person has dealt with the topic almost entirely on a nonpersonal or superficial level. An attempt has been made to bring oneself into the picture, but this is mostly incidental to the content presented. Identification of self usually serves to acknowledge where the thoughts originate (e.g., "It seems to me . . .", "I believe that . . .") but the central focus is on people, objects, and events surrounding the person. Inclusion of self can also be implied through membership in a larger group (e.g., "Everyone is . . .", "Our fraternity sent . . .", "People in the South are . . ."), but inclusion or standing in the group requires interpretation. The information does allow for an understanding about what he thinks or how he sees events external to himself in terms of attitudes, opinions, or beliefs about them. However, his interaction with the events or their impact on him are clearly unexplored.

2. There is noticeably more material involving aspects of the speaker but the tendency to deal with the topic on a superficial level clearly predominates. Involvement of self is not incidental and requires no interpretation, but reflects an attempt to reveal information about self. The person has placed himself within the context of his experiences as opposed to an observer of experiences. This person is primarily at a cognitive level, clearly owning his attitudes, opinions and beliefs. However, his elaboration of an experience is shallow or not profound in content. Reference can be made to emotions or behaviors, but their generality, scope, or breadth is such as to not allow for discrimination among his experiences or to distinguish them from other people.
3. Equal attention is given to both superficial and personal aspects regarding this topic. The person clearly places himself within the context of his experiences, but information about self is oriented more to event description or clarification rather than exploration of self. The content of his descriptions clearly place events as aspects of his personal experience. Aspects of the event are described, feelings labeled or behavior indicated. But his orientation is one of having you understand various aspects of the event rather than exploration and understanding of this event. Labeling of feelings or behavioral descriptions enhances a picture of the event but provides mostly a general overview of him and not an appreciation of integral relationships. Evaluations of self (comparisons, impressions, judgments) are either absent from topical treatment or explored at a general and/or impersonal level.

4. This person has dealt with this topic mostly on a personal level. He clearly places himself within the context of his experience and the information provided allows for a good understanding of his personal frame of reference. Cognitions and emotions are well explored at a specific situational level and tied into aspects of these events. Elaboration of cognitions and emotions go beyond simply labeling, and are explored in terms of an integrated internal experience of himself. However, the impact of his cognitions and emotions on his responses to (operations on or interactions with) the external remains vague and unclear. Aspects of self including behaviors and evaluations (comparisons, impressions, judgments) are either absent from topical treatment or explored at a general and/or impersonal level.

5. This person has dealt with this topic almost entirely on a personal level. Cognitions and emotions are well explored within the context of his experiences and the information provided allows for a good understanding of his personal frame of reference. Exploration in terms of his internal experience of himself is more fully understood through his efforts to integrate these aspects with his responses to (operations on or interactions with) the external. Evaluations (comparisons, impressions, judgments) are either absent from topical treatment or explored at a general and/or impersonal level.
6. This person has focused entirely on himself, providing an intimate picture of various aspects of himself as they relate to the topics. Cognitions and emotions are well explored within the context of his experience and the information provides a good understanding of his personal frame of reference. His internal experience of himself is more fully understood through his responses to (operations on or interactions with) the external. He reflects on himself in an evaluative manner, offering comparisons of self with others, impressions of self and others, and judgments about self and others. At this level he places his understanding of self in perspective with where he wants to be (or doesn’t want to be) and where others are.

*Taken from the training manual provided for Doster’s Disclosure Rating Scale.*
REFERENCES


Margolin, G., Hattem, D., John, R. S., & Yost, K. (1985). Perceptual agreement between spouses and outside
observers when coding themselves and a stranger dyad.  


Behavior change: Methodology, concepts, and practice.

Champaign, IL: Research Press.