

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-20,358

SCHROEER, Ruediger S., 1942-
INTIMACY IN YOUNG DATING COUPLES, AS A FUNCTION
OF SELF-ESTEEM.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1974
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

INTIMACY IN YOUNG DATING COUPLES, AS A FUNCTION OF SELF-ESTEEM

by

RUEDIGER S. SCHROEER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University
of New York

1974

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Psychology

May 13, 1974
date

Mary Engel Ph.D
Chairman of Examining Committee

May 14, 1974
date

Florence L. Denmark
Executive Officer

L. J. Gould - City College

Douglas Kimmel - City College

David F. Ricks - City College
Supervisory Committee

INTIMACY IN YOUNG DATING COUPLES, AS A FUNCTION OF SELF-ESTEEM

by

Ruediger S. Schroeer

Adviser: Professor Mary Engel

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether patterns of intimacy within dating relationships were related to the self-esteem of the partners. Specific predictions concerning differences between high self-esteem and low self-esteem couples were made with regard to five variables in the intimacy domain: empathy, role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect.

Subjects consisted of two groups of dating couples, each group containing 15 couples. In one set of couples both partners had relatively high self-esteem, and in the other set both partners had relatively low self-esteem. The relative self-esteem standings were determined on the basis of median scores for males and females separately. Subjects were recruited from undergraduate classes at various colleges and universities in the New York City area.

The independent variable of self-esteem and the dependent variable of empathy were both assessed from a self-report questionnaire, consisting of a modified version of Laing, Phillipson & Lee's (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method. Self-esteem was measured by responses to 18 self-referent statements with four response choices. Empathy was measured by comparing partners' responses to 92 questions. The dependent variables of role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect were assessed from tape recorded joint interviews with each couple. Scores for each variable were determined by averaging two

judges' ratings made on a five point scale. Interjudge reliability had been established first. These four variables were also assessed via six process recordings taken from the taped interviews, in order to determine whether the processes, taken as raw data, were related to the judges' ratings.

The results indicated that high self-esteem partners were significantly more empathic and mutually validating than low self-esteem partners. The two groups of couples did not differ significantly on the variables of role-flexibility, mutuality and affect. With regard to the process recordings, role-flexibility was found to be positively related to equality in the quantity of speaking done by the partners, and mutual validation of personal worth was positively related to the proportion of agreements voiced by the partners. In general, however, the process recordings were not found to be adequate indicators of the raw data that judges used to make their ratings.

Additional analyses suggested that both empathy and mutual validation of personal worth were significantly related to the four variables of self-esteem, role-flexibility, mutuality and affect, while the four variables were related only to empathy and mutual validation of personal worth. Tentative explanations and implications of the findings were discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is indebted to many people, whose help has made the completion of this study possible. I wish to mention the late Dr. Max Hertzman whose guidance during the early phases of this research helped me maintain a sense of proportion and helped me remember that people, not objects were the focus of this study. Dr. Mary Engel, the chairperson of my committee, has my gratitude for her patience, the freedom as well as the guidance she gave me, and the innumerable hours she freely made available for conferences. Her research expertise and knowledge were invaluable.

To my wife, Susan, who was the catalyst for this study and who became my collaborator and critic, I can only say thank you. Thanks also goes to my fellow students who gave of their time during the pilot efforts of this study, while they were busy with their own research.

Finally, I wish to thank all the couples who allowed me a glimpse into their very personal lives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	4
Review of Related Theory	4
Definitions of Intimacy	4
Purposes Served by Intimacy	8
Concepts Related to Intimacy	10
Review of Related Research	27
Self-Esteem Research	29
Empathy Research	33
Conflict Resolution Research	40
Process Recordings Research	43
Research on Types of Marriage and Dating Relationships	44
Choice of Variables and Hypotheses Tested	46
III. METHOD	49
Subject Recruitment and Data Collection	49
Procedure for the Selection of the Final Thirty Couples	51
Description of Subjects	52
Description of Instruments	53
Modified Interpersonal Perception Method	53
The Self-Esteem Scale	60
The Empathy Scale	62
The Interview	67
Mutuality	68
Role-Flexibility	69
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	71

Table of Contents contd.

Chapter	Page
Affect	72
Process Recordings	77
IV. RESULTS	83
Hypotheses Restated	83
Process Recordings	94
Additional Analyses	95
Intercorrelations	97
Levels of Involvement	99
Length of Time Dating	100
V. DISCUSSION	103
Limitations of Study	116
Conclusions	119
Suggestions for Further Research	120
VI. SUMMARY	122
* * * * *	
Appendix A Material Given to Instructors who Asked for Volunteers	125
Appendix B General Introduction Given to Subjects	129
Appendix C Personal Information Sheet	130
Appendix D Instructions for Filling out Interpersonal Perception Method, Sample Answer Form and Sample Questions	131
Appendix E Summary of Number of Forms Handed out by Instructors to Student Volunteers and Frequency of Various Types of Returns	147
Appendix F Self-Esteem Items and the Ratings that Seven Judges Gave Each Item	148
Appendix G Items used for Self-Esteem and Empathy Scales	149

Table of Contents contd.

Chapter	Page
Appendix H Complete Set of Responses Given to Interpersonal Perception Questionnaire by a Low Self-Esteem Couple	150
Appendix I Interview Outline	155
Appendix J Ratings Assigned by Six Judges to Eight Pilot Couples on Four Intimacy Variables; Used to Determine Reliability of Rating System	158
Appendix K Statistical Analyses Performed to Demonstrate Reliability of Judges' Ratings	159
Appendix L Analyses Performed to Demonstrate Efficacy and Reliability of Process Recordings	162
Appendix M Couples' Scores on Each Variable	165
* * * * *	
REFERENCES	167

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Description of Subjects: Two Groups of Dating Couples, Distinguished by the Relative Self-Esteem of the Partners	54
2 Sample Questions and Hypothetical Responses to Help Demonstrate How Empathy is Determined	64
3 Assignment of Judges to Intimacy Variables that They Were to Rate for Each of Eight Pilot Couples to Determine Reliability of Rating System	76
4 Summary of Variables Explored in Study and Methods Used to Assess Each	82
5 Summary of and Comparison between Scores for High and Low Self-Esteem Couples on Each Intimacy Variable	84
6 Summary of Process Recordings Analyses: Correlations with Intimacy Variables and Comparisons between High and Low Self-Esteem Couples	96
7 Correlations among Variables Studied, Based upon 30 Couples' Scores	98
8 Mean Scores on Each Intimacy Variable, Self-Esteem and Dating Length for Four Levels of Dating Involvement	101
9 Correlations between Dating Length (Months) and Measures of Self-Esteem and Intimacy	102

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Loving is like perceiving, thinking and dying. Each of us does it in his own unique way. While dating, every couple develops unique ways of loving and being together. These unique ways of relating to each other and relating to ourselves are the topics of this study.

While dating, my wife and I became aware, in a very personal, non-textbook way, that an intimate relationship is more than perpetual passion, more than floating on a cloud looking on a hazy beautiful world, and more than a constant static state. The longer we were together, the more we learned, not only about our own relationship, but also about the relationships of our friends.

Some couples seemed to make us uncomfortable, while others we sought out, and others tried to exclude as much of the world outside their relationship as possible, and so, of course, us. These three are just some of the types of relationships that we compared and contrasted with our own, and through our friendships with these couples this study had its beginnings.

Those couples who excluded us did not do so necessarily as a rejection of us personally, but did so because any meaningful friendship with them seemed like an imposition upon the island-like relationship that they had. Cuber & Harroff (1965) described this unique and self-sufficient relationship as one in which everything outside the relationship is subordinate to the private life of the couple.

Those couples who made us uncomfortable did so because of their seemingly constant public humiliation and contradiction of each other, though when each partner was seen separately he/she was often quite

pleasant. Kaiser (1965) described an example of this type of couple and concluded that, "What makes them so intolerable to others is probably the very thing which makes them indispensable to each other (p. 146)." Cuber & Haroff (1965) described this type of relationships as the "conflict habituated."

Those couples with whom we were most comfortable seemed to present at least some sort of unity and still some sort of separation, i.e., a couple that was made up of two separate beings, who also had room for relationships outside their own partnership. They seemed to support each other, at least in public, and had some sort of empathic understanding.

As my wife and I developed into a unit, with two distinct parts, we noticed that many of our myths and preconceptions of intimate relationships were just that--myths. In the process of doing together and learning to resolve conflicts, we learned more about each other's "psychological belt lines" (Bach & Wyden, 1969), that is those areas that were most hurtful to each other, and we became more aware of those areas that gave greatest pleasure. We were growing in the most literal self-actualizing sense of the word, both as a unit and as individuals. Our relationships is not presented as being any closer to an ideal of intimacy than any other couple's attempt to approximate an ideal. It did, however, serve to help the author focus upon differences among types of interpersonal relationships.

What were the differences among the various relationships? What were the differences among the people making up the various relationships? These questions became the center of the present study. This study, therefore, tried to determine whether or not styles of interrelating

or types of intimacy are related to personality differences. Intimacy will be presented as a theoretical ideal, which couples approximate in various forms and degrees.

Of the many personality variables that could have been explored, self-esteem was chosen because of its theoretical importance to intimacy. Specific predictions were made concerning differences in intimacy between dating relationships in which both partners had relatively high self-esteem and dating relationships in which both partners had relatively low self-esteem. The predictions were made about five variables in the intimacy domain: empathy, role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect.

High self-esteem partners were hypothesized to be more empathic or understanding of each other, to have greater flexibility in the roles that they adopted, to be more balanced in terms of how much they share in each other's lives (at neither extreme of complete sharing or complete separation), to demonstrate more mutually respectful and trusting behavior and to have a different type of feeling tone to their relationship than low self-esteem partners.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of literature is divided into two main sections in order to present some of the material that led to the hypotheses tested in this study. The first section reviews theoretical contributions to the understanding of intimacy. A variety of definitions of intimacy are presented. Then a number of reasons are offered as to why man may seek to relate to others. Finally related concepts, many of which became the focus of specific hypotheses, are discussed.

The second section reviews empirical explorations concerning the concepts discussed in the theory section. Support or lack of support for some of the theory will be presented. This section is designed to help the reader understand why the author used the methods of assessment that he did, and why he chose to state his hypotheses as he did. A third section presents the hypotheses tested.

Review of Related Theory

Intimacy and human relations in general have been looked at in a variety of ways, ranging from a very philosophical viewpoint (Buber, 1958) to a very concrete analysis (Cuber & Haroff, 1965). In order to give the reader some idea of the many ways that intimate relationships (ideals and approximations of ideals) can be looked at, the writer will present a wide ranging, but not complete, review, and a necessarily limited discussion of some authors.

Definitions of Intimacy

Arriving at any one definition of intimacy that is acceptable to all, as with any concept, is a difficult task. The author's own definition will be presented first. This is the definition which was used as the

basis for the variables explored. It is a relatively limited definition in that it attempts to describe only dyadic intimacy, and it describes an ideal which may not really exist. Then a number of other definitions which led to the author's own will be presented. Some concepts used in the descriptions will be elaborated upon later in the paper.

The author's definition of intimacy is: Intimacy is a dyadic process characterized by autonomous, self-directed behavior that is guided to a large extent by each person's awareness of their own and the other's needs and want, as well as by what each person feels they should do. It is a process in which mutual concern for self and the other minimizes the anxiety of being understood too well and of being judged, and maximizes mutual validation of personal worth or mutual respect and trust. Intimacy is a process which results in a synthesis of fusion and separation; the achievement of a balance between a totally symbiotic union and a total separation of the two people involved.

Sullivan (1953, p. 246) defined intimacy as, ". . . that type of situation involving two people which permits validation of all components of personal worth. Validation of personal worth requires a type of relationships which I call collaboration, by which I mean clearly formulated adjustments of one's behavior to the express needs of the other person in the pursuit of increasingly identical--that is, more and more nearly mutual-satisfaction, and in the maintenance of increasingly similar security operations." His definition suggests that when he speaks of intimacy, he speaks of something which is greater than the sum of two parts. Collaboration produces something which can be called a "We," whereas, cooperation would only produce something like "I" and "the other." In order for cooperation to succeed, appraisal and judgement of positions is

needed. Buber (1958) suggested that this sort of relationships could only be on an I-It level rather than on an I-Thou level. That is to say, someone in the relationships is treated as an object rather than as an entity worthy in and of himself, regardless of the appraised value or position.

Bach & Wyden (1969) defined intimacy as a basic outlook. "It is a couple's orientation toward mutuality and their acceptance of the proposition that shared experiences are generally preferable to solo experiences. It is based on a desire to remain 'in love' and to maintain a place in the center of the partner's heart (p. 344)." This definition, though a fine one, lacks theoretical explicitness. The questions of "What is love?" and "What is the center of one's heart?" remain unanswered. Bach & Wyden (1969), however, did posit a list of conditions necessary to achieve intimacy and if these conditions are used to define the term, they have a great deal to offer operationally. They offered the following conditions without elaboration: information about the partner, a constantly shifting process, trust, a shifting of authority, ego independence, loyalty, realism, aggression and humor.

Erikson (1959) defined intimacy as a balance between individual autonomy and mutuality, mediating one another's needs, and integrating modes of communication. He used such words as spontaneity, that is, freedom from stereotyped and rigid patterns of behavior, warmth and an exchange of fellowship. Fromm (1956) also stressed a balance between autonomy and mutuality, and defined intimacy as a union between two people under the condition of preserving one's integrity and one's individuality.

Psychoanalytic theory helps to clarify differences among types of

love, and based upon the definition of intimacy offered by this author, only "mature love" would qualify as intimacy. Modell (1968), for example, wrote, "Psychoanalysis would state that to love maturely one must accept the separateness of the object (p. 61)." That is, one must see the object as it really is, not as we wish to see it. Yet, ". . . the process of loving consists of the mingling and sharing of psychic substances; what the lover attributes to the beloved he takes back into himself by means of an identification. Despite the acceptance of separateness of his beloved, the process of loving always contains an element of connectedness (Modell, 1968, p. 62)."

A further distinction between mature love or intimacy and other forms of love was made by Freud (1910) and Bak (1973). Freud (1910) explained that being in love, an immature form of intimacy, in contrast to loving, is a function of the subject yielding up his whole personality in favor of the object. Bak (1973, p. 6) said that mature love or intimacy follows desexualization of ego functions and results in ". . . mutual acceptance of dependence and separation for securing stable gratifications."

As can be seen from the above definitions, total agreement is lacking, but all shared the basic element that intimacy consists of a "oneness" of two people, while each maintains a separate identity. This commonality became the concluding sentence in this writer's definition of intimacy.

Now that intimacy has been defined, it is necessary to briefly discuss why two persons would choose to become involved with each other. The study proper attempted to determine whether self-esteem was related to the type of involvement chosen.

Purposes Served by Intimacy

Three possible purposes for intimacy are presented: 1. to combat loneliness, 2. to complete a developmental phase, and 3. to recreate childhood symbiotic ties. According to Fromm (1956), May (1953) and Sullivan (1953), one of man's basic struggles in life is to combat loneliness. Present day man, according to May (1953), is lonely because he has lost touch with himself as a person. "The chief problem of people in the middle decade of the twentieth century is emptiness (p. 14)." By that he meant that people often do not know what they want or what they feel. "The complaint which leads them to come for [psychological] help may be, for example, that their love relationships always break up or that they cannot go through with marriage plans or are dissatisfied with the marriage partner. But they do not talk long before they make it clear that they expect the marriage partner, real or hoped-for, to fill some lack, some vacancy within themselves; and they are anxious and angry because he or she doesn't (May, 1953, p. 14)."

Riesman (1961) explored the problem of personal lack or emptiness with his discussion of the inner- and other-directed characters. A person who has difficulty trusting his own values and guidelines for behavior (intrapersonal) may become dependent upon outside (interpersonal) verification for self-worth. Other-directedness may become a style of life necessary to maintain self-esteem, even if it means constant fluctuation, because no internal criteria seem available and the external criteria continually fluctuate. Dating may well be one way to combat loneliness and seek external guidance.

Another possible approach to human relationships is expressed in developmental terms. Developmental theorists suggest that the need for

intimacy is with us from birth, regardless of the society and times into which one is born. Sullivan (1953) stated that one of the influences upon the developmental process is the need to combat loneliness by seeking intimacy. He maintained that at each of the various stages of a person's life he uses different methods of seeking intimacy.

According to Erikson (1959), young adulthood is most concerned with the problem of intimacy versus isolation, just as every other developmental phase has its major concern. The need for intimacy is the need to go "beyond identity" to advance to a new identity, based upon sharing and the formula "We are what we love." not "I am.". This, as well as all other phases of development are geared toward the growth of all parts of an organism until a "functioning whole" has been achieved (Erikson, 1968).

The psychoanalytic tradition holds that the origins of love ". . . are derived from the infantile fixations of tender feelings on the mother, and represent one of the consequences of that love (Freud, 1910, p. 163)." The infantile primitive instinct to devour, to maintain no distinctions between self and not-self, in part, determine future object relations. Since separation does eventually occur to varying degrees, non-infantile object relations serve the functions of undoing a separation that was experienced earlier in life, and, in part, of counteracting feelings of hostility arising out of that earlier separation (Bak, 1973).

The type of object relationships that one develops, varies a great deal, depending upon early experiences. All, however, to some extent, are motivated to achieve a tensionless state, to return to the mother's body, to symbiotic union. An excellent example and description of this desire to reunite is presented by Sechehaye (1951) who gives a clinical case history of a schizophrenic girl. Menninger (1942) summarized the

psychoanalytic viewpoint by stating that the love of a man for a woman and her love for him are the most intense expressions of the life instinct and through identification each wishes for fusion, "To accomplish this fusion is the object of the love impulse (p. 47)."

General Review of Concepts Related to Intimacy

The remainder of the theoretical discussion will concentrate on an elaboration of those concepts mentioned in the definition of intimacy and those concepts most closely related to that definition. Some of these became the focus of specific hypotheses.

Mutuality

Mutuality is a balance between fusion and separation; a balance between total interdependence or symbiosis and total lack of interdependence. If extreme fusion or interdependence exists, a dyad consists essentially of one person with probably one or possibly both partners finding themselves unable to act independently, autonomously, in the service of growth. If extreme lack of interdependence or separation exists, the dyad consists of essentially two people only, with little overlap and little apparent reason for the existence of the dyad, except perhaps convenience. Understanding would be at a minimum, empathy would be difficult to establish and it makes little sense to think of it as approximating the ideal discussed in this paper. In light of the importance of mutuality to the intimate process, it became one of the dependent variables explored in this study.

According to Buber (1958), relationships vary from the very objective to the very personal. Dating relationships can also vary along this line. If a dating partner is looked at in an intellectual manner with retrospection, analysis, or judgement, the relationship is of the I-It

kind. This means involvement is with an object rather than with a being. Involvement of the I-Thou type means that one is so "wrapped up" in the relationship, that one is such an integral part of it that one cannot speak of two separate things, or at least not very easily; interaction and interrelation is a must. The suggestion from Buber, then, is that in order for a true interrelation to exist, one must be a close part of the relationship. One must be involved in a relationship, rather than be a critical analyzer of the relationship. This is similar to the distinction between one who communes with nature and one who studies nature.

Erikson (1959) commented on the interrelatedness of intimate partners by suggesting a counterpart of intimacy, namely distantiation, ". . . the readiness to repudiate, to isolate, and if necessary, to destroy those forces and people whose essence seem dangerous to one's own (pp. 95-96)." He suggested that "Intimacy with one set of people and ideas would not be really intimate without an efficient repudiation of another set (1968, p. 168)." In other words, in order to have intimate relationships, one must have non-intimate relationships.

Intimacy involves a balance between extreme interpersonal separation and isolation and extreme involvement. Weiss (1960) stated something to that effect when he said that one of the paradoxes of love or closeness with another is that one's whole life has been spend establishing ego boundaries, breaking away from the anaclytic, identifying, symbiotic relationships with a mothering one, only to find oneself again in a somewhat similar situation. This refers not only to a man's relationship with a female intimate, but any adult relationships between two partners.

Blanck & Blanck (1968) also observed that in an intimate relationship it is necessary for the partners to maintain a separateness and yet at times to allow, in the service of the ego, regression to a very symbiotic relationship. Bak (1973) agreed with Blanck & Blanck (1968) that symbiosis does occur at times. Its most extreme form takes place for both males and females through coitus and undoes the primal trauma of separation, namely birth. During orgasm, the self and the object are fused. A "little death" occurs. Modell (1968) suggested that fusion occurs to a greater extent for some people than for others. He stated, "Object relations based on a transitional¹ mode acknowledge the existence of an object outside the self, but its separateness from the self is denied by magical illusion. In mature object relations, the object is clearly delimited from the subject (p. 109)."

Weiss (1960) stated that aside from a sharing of feelings, a differentiation between two intimates also evolves; that is, a synthesis between fusion and separation occurs. The recognition that each intimate has unique interests and areas of involvement, and an attempt on each intimate's part to cultivate these separate areas of interest as well as shared areas of interest is part of the evolving balance between fusion and separation.

Role-Flexibility

The desire and ability to consider one's own and a partner's needs in determining roles that one takes was implied as being necessary for

¹Transitional object relations are one sided symbiotic relations that may be established regardless of the attitudes of the object. Symbiotic object relations refer to the two way relations wherein both derive advantages from the relationship.

the development of intimacy. This requires adaptability of the partners, not only to each other but also to the situation which their interactions have created. Without flexibility, stereotypical or anxiety induced roles may be adopted, leading to immature forms of love. Thus, role-flexibility or adaptiveness became another variable explored in this study.

As part of the intimate process, Sullivan (1953) suggested a theorem of reciprocal emotions which describes his idea of the necessary flexibility within an intimate relationship: ". . . complementary needs are resolved in the interpersonal relations one lives through; reciprocal patterns of activity are developed, refined, made more perfect; and there is foresight of how satisfactions can be gained more quickly, or continued longer, by improved performance (p. 199)." This means more or less answering the question what should I, can I or do I want to do to contribute to the happiness or to support the prestige and feeling of worthwhileness of the other.

Sullivan (1953) stated that to combat loneliness, to seek intimacy, means to possibly arouse some anxiety. Through flexible and adaptable behavior, however, this anxiety can be minimized. The closer the intimacy established between two people approximates the ideal, the less the anxiety. Menninger (1942, p. 272) said that, "Love is impaired less by the feeling that we are not appreciated than by a dread, more or less dimly felt by everyone, lest others see through our masks, the masks of repression that have been forced upon us by convention and culture. It is this that leads us to shun intimacy, to maintain friendships on a superficial level, to underestimate and fail to appreciate others lest they come to appreciate us only too well." Stereotypical roles and

false roles can be the results of repression or lead to repression.

Sullivan (1953) also observed that loneliness is more terrible than anxiety. The problem, then, is how to combat loneliness and to become intimate with a minimum of anxiety. Hartmann's (1958) concept of the conflict-free ego sphere helps to answer that question. The conflict-free ego sphere is, ". . . that ensemble of functions which at any time extend their effect outside the region of mental conflicts (pp. 8-9)." It encompasses those mental functions which can produce satisfaction or achieve goals that are not dependent upon the resolution of some internal battle such as is often waged between the super-ego and the id. In his discussion of adaptation to reality, he suggested that adaptation is a function of both processes; those connected with conflict situations and those which pertain to the conflict-free sphere. It seems that role-flexibility may, to a large extent, be dependent upon conflict-free interaction.

Intimacy and the adaptation to the dating situation or any interpersonal relationship also consists of a mixture of both types of processes. By being able to use the word want, by being aware of each other's wants, the conflict-free sphere of each partner can function at its maximum potential. In order to maximize conflict-free behavior, autonomy must be considered.

Autonomy refers to self-direction, free will and being one's own master. It is a matter of, ". . . being and feeling free to do what one wants to do . . ." On the one hand it has to do with the capacity for and the interest in volitionally and competently directing one's self, one's own muscles, for example, as opposed to helplessness or passivity in this respect; on the other hand, it has to do with the capacity for

and interest in directing oneself according to one's own will and independently of external force or authority (Shapiro, 1965, pp. 81-83)."

A truly autonomous person can relax in two ways. He can allow spontaneity or abandonment at times, and he can relax his will sufficiently at times to listen to, comply with, or even submit to the will of others. "He can 'give in' to himself without feeling anxiety, and he can 'give in' to others without feeling humiliated or worse (Shapiro, 1965, p. 83)." He is able to do what he wants as well as what he should.

Behavior can range between two extremes, neither extreme fulfilling the above requirement for true autonomy. The one extreme may be called fusion or symbiosis--the total interdependence with another person for satisfaction of needs, the complete denial of autonomy. The other extreme may be called denial of dependency--total rejection of external or internal influence. The rigid person who cannot or will not change his behavior as a new situation might demand, and who completely disregards internal impulses by behaving in a rigid, prescribed and inflexible manner exemplifies this extreme. Role-flexible behavior, on the other hand, refers to autonomous behavior which is geared toward mutual satisfaction of needs, and guided by self-awareness and concern for the other.

Empathy

The term dyadic process which was used in the ideal definition of intimacy includes any and all modes that two people use to communicate with each other. The modes may vary from the most subtle verbal communication to the most basic forms of physical coercion. It could be basically stated as the interchange of meanings between two people

(Krech, Crutchfield, & Ballachey, 1962).

For two people to be aware of each other's needs and wants an exchange of meaning is necessary. In order for dyadic communication to be successful, two people must be willing and able to send, receive and interpret messages. This process is labeled empathy for the purposes of this study and became another dependent variable.

Empathy as defined in this study involves the following steps (Engel, 1970):

- a) A has to send off messages
- b) B has to perceive A's state
- c) B indicates that he knows that A is in that state
- d) B convinces A that he cares about A's state and understands by acting in some manner

A and/or B could ostensibly at any point discontinue the process, and the reasons for blockage may be due to either inability or unwillingness to continue.

A variety of other definitions of empathy include, for example, Cowden's (1955, p. 188): ". . . temporary identification with a person for the purpose of anticipating what that person is going to do in certain situations." Dymond (1949, p. 127) defined it as, ". . . the imaginative transposing of oneself into the thinking, feeling and acting of another and so structuring the world as he does." Brammer & Shostrom (1960) go one step further, and approximate the steps suggested by Engel (1970). They stated that empathy involves an understanding of someone else that goes beyond an intellectualized description of that person. It refers to feelings that are aroused and which let the other person know that he is understood and accepted. This is

achieved by using the other person's frame of reference in looking at a situation as well as one's own frame of reference.

In order for empathy to proceed each person must be in touch with their own feelings (insight, self-awareness) so that he can send and receive messages fully equipped to interpret meanings accurately. This includes an awareness of distinct boundaries between the empathizer and the person with whom one empathizes. Weiss (1960) suggested that empathy involves an unegotized resonance content; that is, the other can be seen as an independent agent and is understood through some process that goes beyond identification.

When empathizing, a person is in effect saying, "I sense how you feel." He is not saying, "I feel just the way you feel." That would be identification. Weiss (1960) further stated that it is not enough to know that an intimate is grieved at the loss of a close friend. A feeling other than indifferent knowledge must be generated, a chord that approximates or is in resonance with the grief or joy is somehow struck. Empathy, then, just as the other processes involved in intimacy, seems to imply a partial fusion of the two people involved, a sharing, and at the same time a separation of identities.

Mutual Validation of Personal Worth

Mutual validation of personal worth was mentioned in the definition of intimacy as being indicative of mutual respect and trust. It became another dependent variable in this study. It involves perceiving another person as an entity of worth, regardless of the needs that he may or may not satisfy in the perceiver. This phenomenon was labeled object constancy by Blanck & Blanck (1968) and object comprehension by Hartmann (1958). Validating someone's personal worth means that one can

allow him to be what he is, can accept both his "good" and "bad" qualities. At the same time one must also affirm one's own personal worth. Someone who is plagued by doubts about their worthiness or anxious about being revealed and thereby judged can neither give nor receive love. Apparently the exposure that comes with potential intimacy may be seen as a cause for rejection because inadequacies may become obvious (Fromm, 1939).

Erikson (1968) discussed this interrelation between self-validation of personal worth and the validation of the other's worth as he spoke of the need for a new and shared identity which goes beyond individual identity. During that period in life wherein intimacy versus isolation reaches a crisis level, each person must choose whether he can take chances with his identity by trusting another and sharing intimacy, or whether he needs to isolate himself from others and thus protect what individual identity he has achieved. By choosing to develop a new shared identity a person is saying that he trusts and respects the chosen partner with his own identity, and trusts himself enough to allow himself to be put into a potentially dangerous situation.

Sullivan (1953) termed this process collaboration. It involves mutual concern, and a respect for each other's integrity, and worth. Collaboration and mutually validating behavior, the trust in self and in others can minimize the potential anxiety that may play a part in close relationships. According to Sullivan (1953) the causes of anxiety are many and all anxiety cannot be avoided, but the anxiety of being judged, of having one's identity questioned can be minimized through mutual validation of personal worth.

Self-Esteem

Self-esteem was chosen as the independent variable for this study because of its theoretical importance to all the processes discussed up to this point, and because of personal interest in the concept by this author. Self-esteem or feelings of personal worth, which is determined by an evaluation of the self, can be discussed through any number of theoretical approaches. For example, Symonds (1951) suggested that the self can be defined in four ways, all of which refer to the body and mind, to bodily and mental processes as they are observed and reacted to by the individual.

1. self as perceived
2. self as object of value and interest
3. self as concept
4. self as a system of activities

According to Symonds (1951) the self is a function of awareness of one's internal and external environment, and self-adequacy or self-esteem is the degree to which one is capable of accepting into one's organization any and all aspects of this environment. Self-esteem may vary across different areas of experience. Sex, age and other role-defining situations, as well as an appraisal of abilities are presumably weighted according to their subjective importance and used to arrive at a general level of self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1959).

The importance of self-esteem will now be discussed for each of the concepts presented up to this point. For example, self-esteem, by minimizing interpersonal anxiety, plays an important role in the empathic process. According to Sullivan (1953, p. 113), "Anxiety can often be explained plausibly as anticipated unfavorable appraisal of one's

current activity by someone whose opinion is significant." No one variable seems to be more detrimental to an intimate relationship than the fear of being judged and in turn judging the partner. Open communication is quickly stifled if one fears that his every word, thought or feeling is on a balancing scale and so must be exposed most carefully.

Because we sometimes feel that our partners are extensions of ourselves or because we just cannot be intimate without some sort of judgment, some anxiety is bound to occur, but it can be minimized, and this, it seems, is one aspect of an intimate relationship.

Self-esteem plays an important role in intimacy by minimizing anxiety. Blanck & Blanck (1968) suggested, for example, that external threats from interpersonal situations are at a minimum if a person feels secure in his/her identity. As anxiety is minimized so is the need to use defenses. Less need of defenses increases one's ability to empathize and perceive others more accurately, because inaccuracies in the way in which a person perceives another's feelings stem primarily from unconscious blocks or needs on the part of the perceiver (Fiedler, 1952). Thus, self-esteem and empathy seem to be very much related to each other, and one of the hypotheses tested in this study explored that relationship.

Stotland & Dunn (1963) elaborated upon this theme and suggested that persons high in self-esteem empathize more readily than those who are low in self-esteem. Those with high self-esteem are comfortable enough to "lose" themselves in other people. Those with low self-esteem may be so concerned with their self-evaluation that they react to the experience of others primarily in terms of the implications to themselves.

Self-esteem is also important for the process of mutual validation of personal worth. This was suggested earlier. One cannot accept others for what they are without accepting one's own being (Fromm, 1939). Rogers (1967, p. 9) phrased this very personally when he said, "I am inwardly pleased when I have the strength [self-esteem] to permit another person to be his own realness and separate from me." His is an affirmation of his own and the other's narcissistic self-love or basic worth which is with us from birth, and an affirmation of self-love of himself and the other which develops out of the abilities of the ego.

Rogers' (1967) statement can also be applied to the empathic process, mutuality and role-flexibility. Allowing someone else to be himself encourages communication, encourages free expression of affect, encourages separation and discourages stifling fusion and increases the freedom to try new roles.

Sheerer (1949) gave 14 conditions which arise as a result of self-esteem or self-acceptance. A partial listing of those conditions most relevant to the current discussion is presented. Each condition is related to one of the dependent variables of the study.

A person who accepts and respects himself:

1. Tends to rely more upon his internalized values and principles as guides than upon conventions or standards of others, and is less likely to modify his behavior out of irrational fear of the judgment of others.

2. Tends to assume responsibility for his behavior.

3. Tends to consider the effects of his decisions on others.

These first three conditions, more than any of the others, seem to be referring to autonomous, self-directed behavior as reflected by

role-flexibility.

4. Tends to feel equal to others, neither inferior nor superior.

5. Tends not to irrationally expect rejection by others.

6. Tends to grant others the right to their own beliefs, values, and standards.

These three conditions seem to describe behavior that reflects mutual validation of personal worth.

7. Tends to neither dominate nor assume responsibility for others' decisions.

8. Tends to feel he has something to contribute to a relationship.

These two conditions seem to be referring to behavior that is reflective of some balance between interdependence or fusion and independence or separation.

One final intimacy variable, affect, and its relationship to self-esteem is briefly mentioned, though it was not discussed before. It was chosen as another variable for exploration in order to add a sense of aliveness to the relationships studied.

Affect

Affect, as explored in this study, is defined as the general feeling tone within a relationship. A relationship can vary in feeling tone from blandness or boredom through interest to excitement. Theory suggests that high self-esteem might allow a greater expression of both positive and negative affect. Low self-esteem might produce defenses against affects which can be seen as potentially threatening. The obsessive-compulsive character is a good case in point. Defenses against aggressive impulses result in a repression of the associated anger and hate. A rigid life style such as the obsessive-compulsive displays

prevents spontaneity and surprise, leading to relative blandness in the affective sphere. Positive affect could also be seen as threatening for someone with low self-esteem in that it might be rejected by the one toward whom it is expressed. Possibly also, one may not feel worthy of having positive things happen to him.

However, other examples from clinical practice suggest that intensity of feeling may also be related to low self-esteem, as for example, in the case of the neurotic depressive. Despair may also be the product of low self-esteem. Erikson (1968) said that someone who does not achieve ego integration in mature age, will experience despair, and lack of ego integration is related to low self-esteem.

Theory, therefore, does not describe the exact relationship that exists between self-esteem and intensity and quantity of affective expression in intimate relationships. However, the relationship between the two variables was explored anyway, without predicting the direction of the relationship.

Two further topics need to be briefly mentioned in order to complete this theoretical discussion. One is the role of aggression and the other concerns the part that sexuality plays in intimate relationships.

Aggression

A close relationship such as dating, with possible intense interaction, ". . . though increasing the sentiments of liking and intimacy, also furnishes frequent occasions for conflict and thus can generate hostile feelings . . . (Barry, 1970, p. 47)." Barry (1970) also suggested that the closer the relationships, the more intense the potential conflict.

Most theorists would probably agree that aggression plays a role in everyone's interpersonal relationships, whether they see aggression as a biological drive (Lorenz, 1967) or a learned response (Bandura & Walters, 1963). Psychoanalytic theory, for example, postulates two different instincts: the life instinct and the death instinct, with aggression as one component of the death instinct. In object relations, the two may not be clearly delineated for some people or one may be so powerful as to overwhelm the other. In most intimate relationships, however, some degree of both exist. According to Bak (1973), one function served by identification with a loved one is to counteract or counteract the aggressive component of the ambivalence felt toward a loved one, i.e. identification with the aggressor. This ambivalence is considered to be an outcome of the separation from primary objects which results in feelings of hostility. The dependence and tender feelings which coexisted at the same time are also reproduced in adult object relations. The early feelings of frustration as well as satisfactions are carried throughout life to varying degrees.

If aggression is viewed as a response to frustrating experiences (Dollard, et al., 1939) one can expect two people who are in close contact over extended periods of time to engage in aggressive behavior. It is practically impossible to think of two people who have an intimate relationship who do not at one time or another frustrate each other. How aggression is expressed or how it is dealt with once expressed depends upon a number of variables: early learning experiences, strength of drive and degree, and type of frustration.

Aside from the generalizations above, intimate relationships between two people of the opposite sex have additional factors contributing

to aggression. Current literature, for example Greer (1971) and Millet (1970) suggests that females have good reason for resentment toward males and this may not necessarily be the result of penis envy, but may be the result of arbitrary male domination.

Regarding men's hostility toward women, psychoanalytic theory states that we all to some extent possess both masculine and feminine qualities. The denial of feminine traits by men, the attempt to refute them or overcome them, may, to varying degrees lead to fear of competition from women and result in thwarting, disappointing and injuring them (Menninger, 1942). In addition, Freud (1912) stated that to some extent most civilized men have a need to debase women so that they can combine the sensual aspects of love with the affectional aspects. Since all love relationships are partially incestuous in nature and incest taboos prevent sensual expression toward valued objects, devaluation or debasement is necessary. Debasement is a strong expression of aggression. It seems, therefore, that aggression is an integral part of intimate relationships.

Sexuality

The important role of sexuality in intimate relationships has received a great deal of popular attention, as attested to by the vast number of "sex manuals" currently available, and the number of books written on the topic of sexuality and its expression in and out of love relationships. (Bertocci, 1967; Ellis, 1959; Duvall, 1968; Kinsey et al. 1948, 1953; Masters & Johnson, 1966)

Psychoanalytic theory has a great deal to say about the role of sexuality, particularly in regard to combining that component of love with non-sexual components. There is a tendency among men, even to some

extent in our modern age, to separate women into two types, (Sullivan, 1953, p. 69). ". . . one of which can satisfy a person's loneliness and spare him anxiety, while the other satisfies his lust"

The female, according to Freud (1917), has to content with the issue of potential defloration. As Freud (1910, p. 167) said, "In normal love the woman's value is measured by her integrity, and is reduced by any approach to the characteristic of being like a prostitute." Knowing this, the female will very possibly feel anger, resentment and perhaps even experience frigidity as a result of her first sexual encounter. Granted that some of Freud's ideas have since been reformulated, some of what he postulated does seem to hold today.

Fromm (1956) went beyond the Freudian concept of tension reduction by suggesting that sex is mainly motivated by the need for union, not necessarily of the symbiotic mother-child type. "Sexual attraction creates, for the moment, the illusion of union, yet without love this 'union' leaves strangers as far apart as they were before. . . . (p. 46)." Fromm (1956) stated the "Sexual desire can be stimulated by the anxiety of aloneness, by the wish to hurt and even to destroy, as much as it can be stimulated by love (p. 45)."

Whether to save defloration until marriage, whether intercourse should be or can be a part of--or separated from--other expressions of love are questions still asked. The fear of castration, the loss of self, the ability to sexually "perform" are difficulties still faced. All these are part of the intimate process.

This concludes the theoretical discussion. Of the concepts discussed, those that were chosen for exploration in the current study included: self-esteem and its relationships to the acceptance of

others for what they are (mutual validation of personal worth), its relationship to the ability to communicate (empathy), its relationship to acting according to wants rather than should (role-flexibility), and its relationship to achieving some balance between fusion and separation (mutuality).

Review of Related Research

Some theoretical components of the ideal relationship have thus far been discussed. What about relationships that actually exist in the non-theoretical every-day world? How have relationships actually been explored? How have the variables mentioned in the previous section been quantified and applied? This section will deal with these questions by discussing: self-esteem, empathy, conflict resolution, process recordings and studies dealing with various types of relationships.

Self-Esteem Research

Wylie (1961) is mentioned here in some detail, since she gave a great deal of space in her book on self-concepts to self-esteem. She summarized and discussed various instruments that have been designed to measure self-esteem. One major technique used has been the Q-sort. This technique involves sorting self-referent statements into a variety of categories, indicating how representative of himself the sorter sees each statement. The categories vary in number, but usually cover the range from "Most like me." to "Least like me." The sorting may be forced into approximations of a normal distribution by directing the sorter as to how many statements he must file into each category, or it may not. Sometimes several sorts are made by the same person, reflecting, for example, how a person sees himself, how he would ideally like

to be and how he thinks others see him. Various discrepancy scores may be derived from these different sorts, such as real-ideal, or real-social. The real-ideal discrepancy is usually taken as a reflection of self-esteem.

Other techniques for measuring self-esteem include rating scales, questionnaires, adjective check lists and coding of interviews. Problems associated with all techniques, and even more generally, with all phenomenological research relying upon self-reports, include the following, according to Wylie (1961):

1. S's intent to select what he wishes to reveal to E.
2. S's intent to say that he has attitudes or perceptions which he does not have.
3. S's response habits, such as acquiescence, directionality, social desirability.
4. A host of situational and methodological factors which may also extend more superficial influences on the responses obtained as well as induce variations in 1, 2, and 3 above.

Validity problems further arise when considering the items chosen to reflect self-esteem. For example, are the items chosen from available therapeutic protocols such as Rogers & Dymond's (1954) more or less valid than items chosen from available adjective check lists? The question is probably more important for researchers attempting to measure some absolute quality called self-esteem than for those measuring the relative standings between groups or pre- and post-tests which measure some variable that may be called self-esteem for lack of a better term.

Validity for some self-esteem scales seems to be demonstrated by statistically supported hypotheses which are derived from theory. This is a form of criterion-related validity (Anastasi, 1968). For example, theory would predict that people having high self-esteem would be more able to empathize because of their more secure ego boundaries and

because they have less need for projection and other defense mechanisms. People with low self-esteem would be so concerned with their self-evaluation that they might react to the experiences of others primarily in terms of their implications to themselves, thus perceiving them inaccurately. Thus, Stotland & Dunn's (1963) self-report measure received some concurrent validation in that self-esteem and empathy were found to be positively related. Sometimes, of course, theory is not very clear, or even wrong, and there is the danger of circular reasoning. For example, X is a valid self-esteem measure because it is positively related to empathy, and vice-versa. Among the instruments surveyed by Wylie (1961), face validity seemed to be the most common type of validity.

Reliability also presents difficulties since self-esteem may be viewed as a trait or as an ever changing variable, depending upon the particular situation. Most researchers assume, as did Coopersmith (1959), that some degree of consistency exists.

Among the rating scales that have been used, Achenbach & Zigler (1963) used a four point scale, and Fitzgerald (1963) used a six point scale, suggesting that rating scales consisting of more than two choices were preferable from the viewpoints of greater discriminability among individuals and a less forced choice decision for the self-rater. The number of items to be rated also varies a great deal, from the 225 items of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule used by Murstein (1971) to the 20 used by Fitzgerald (1963). How many items are enough? How representative of the possible universe of self-esteem items are 20 or 225? Validity and reliability questions are still unsettled. However, for purposes of this study the technique chosen was

a self-rating scale with prejudged favorability ratings of the items, one of many available techniques suggested by Wylie (1961).

A great number of studies using self-esteem as an important variable have been conducted, and necessarily, the following discussion is limited. Several studies have related self-acceptance to the acceptance of others, an area of exploration already mentioned as crucial to mutual validation of personal worth. For example, Sheerer (1949), using the technique of scoring interviews, found that those students engaged in counseling, who used a greater number of self-accepting statements as therapy progressed, also used a greater number of statements demonstrating acceptance and respect for others. Kelly (1941) found that married partners who rated themselves above average on various personality traits tended to rate their spouses even higher. Berger (1952) and Stock (1949) also found a positive relationship between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Therefore, in the current study, self-esteem was predicted to be positively related to mutual validation of personal worth.

Kelly (1941) found that partners in a marital relationship who viewed themselves as compatible, as measured by similarities on various personality traits, also tended to have high self-esteem. Murstein (1971) found that engaged or going steady couples tended to end up with partners who had similar real-ideal discrepancy scores. Real-ideal discrepancy scores were used as indicators of self-esteem and determined by a comparison between how a person sees himself as he "really" is and how he would ideally like to be. Therefore, in Murstein's (1971) study, high self-esteem people tended to end up with high self-esteem partners and low self-esteem people with low self-

esteem partners. A person with high real-ideal congruence exudes a certain self-confidence that is desirable to the potential partner. Those with low self-esteem or low real-ideal congruence are more likely to fail to attract someone of high congruence. This suggests that mutual validation of personal worth is already indicated in high self-esteem couples simply by partner choice.

Rubin & Moore (1971), assessing self-esteem and persuasibility, found that subjects with relatively high self-esteem tended to be less persuasible. That is, they were less likely to succumb to the demand characteristics of an experiment, without some questioning. This suggests that high self-esteem dating partners might be more willing to be themselves in a relationship and to be less likely to try to meet unreasonable demands made by partners. Acting according to wants instead of someone else's desires or shoulds was discussed in the theory section as an important variable in intimate relationships. The finding of Rubin & Moore (1971), therefore, seems to predict that high self-esteem couples would be more likely to be honest with themselves and their partners, thus being somewhat free from social pressures to conform to preconceived notions of roles.

Tharp (1963), using happiness as an indicator of marital compatibility, found that partners feeling self-confident were happier than those lacking self-confidence. He also found that they rated their partners higher than themselves and were more flexible in the various roles each took in the relationship. This latter finding and the one by Rubin & Moore (1971) seem important, since role-flexibility was mentioned as a crucial variable in an intimate relationship, and since it is one of the dependent variables explored in the current study.

Therefore, self-esteem was predicted to be positively related to role-flexibility.

Lillibridge & Lundstedt (1967) found that a person's willingness, based upon subjective probability and risk taking, to give away influence to others, is related to self-confidence. The issue, however, is not totally clear, since risk taking may also be seen in self-disclosure, such as occurs in the expression of affect, and Fitzgerald (1963) found that high self-esteem people are not more or less self-disclosing in varying degrees of intimacy (close friend to stranger), than low self-esteem people. Likewise, expression of hostility (one of many affects), looked at as risk taking, does not seem to be related to self-esteem, according to Rosenbaum & Stanners (1961). A problem with Rosenbaum & Stanners' (1961) study was that they explored displaced aggression, from experimenter to TAT stories. Their conclusion might better have been that high self-esteem people did not displace aggression more or less than low self-esteem people. The question of direct expression of aggression and probably other affects is still unanswered, and so the hypothesis dealing with affect was stated non-directionally in this study.

Summarizing the essential aspects of the above research, it might be said that self-esteem seems to be related to a number of the variables that became the dependent variables in this study. The research discussed above suggests that self-esteem is positively related to empathy, role-flexibility and mutual validation of personal worth. The relationships between affect and self-esteem could not be clearly discerned. The current study also explored mutuality. Though mutuality has not received empirical study, theory suggests that self-esteem and

some balance between fusion and separation (mutuality) would be positively related.

Empathy Research

Empathy has been operationally defined in a variety of ways. The following is but a partial review of the research conducted in this area. The review was designed to point out how others have measured empathy, and how the method used in the current study was decided upon.

Historically speaking, Dymond (1949) was among the first to attempt to measure the empathic process. She used six personality traits on which one subject attempted to rate other subjects and themselves, and vice versa. The following ratings, on a five point scale, were made:

- A. 1. A rates self (A).
- 2. A rates B.
- 3. A rates B as A thinks B would rate self (B).
- 4. A rates self (A) as A thinks B would rate him (A).

- B. 1. B rates self (B).
- 2. B rates A.
- 3. B rates A as B thinks A would rate self (A).
- 4. B rates self (B) as B thinks A would rate him (B).

Comparing A3 with B1 and A4 with B2 determined A's empathic ability. Comparing B3 with A1 and B4 with A2 determined B's empathic ability. Scores were determined by the number of points an individual was in error. The smaller the error, the greater the empathic ability.

Since this was a first attempt at measuring empathy, Dymond (1949) tried to assess the validity of her measure by the use of TAT responses. Empathy scores were correlated with subjects' abilities to take the role of or empathize with the characters on the TAT cards. She found that all five high empathizers were rated as high empathizers on the basis of TAT protocols and four out of five low empathizers were

rated as low empathizers on the basis of TAT responses. The technique of Laing, Phillipson, & Lee (1966) which is discussed later and became the technique used in the present study very closely resembles that used by Dymond (1949).

Bender & Hastorf (1953) attempted to ferret out the roles of similarity and projection from the empathic process. They assumed that the greater the similarity between two people, if one or the other used the mechanism of projection or attribution a great deal, that person's empathic ability might appear greater than it really is. The investigators attempted to isolate similarity and projection and eliminate their effects from what they called a refined empathy score. Similarity was measured by comparing the direct responses of two people to 42 statements dealing with attitudes and feelings toward various situations. For example, one person's response to, "I believe in premarital sex." was compared with the other person's response to the same question. Projection was measured by comparing person A's response and his predicted response for person B. Uncorrected empathy was measured by comparing A's predicted response of B and B's actual response. Refined empathy was then determined by subtracting the projection score from the original, uncorrected empathy score.

This method, it seems, has a drawback in that projection or attribution was assumed because one person's direct response was similar to the one he predicted for the other. Some actually empathic responses may thus be discarded. However, Bender & Hastorf (1953) have certainly made us aware of a difficulty which should be considered in all empathy research.

Cowden (1955) used a similar technique, defining projection as

". . . attributing one's own qualities to another (p. 188)." Whereas Bender & Hastorf (1953) found a negative relationship between projection and empathy, Cowden (1955) found a positive relationship because of their exclusion and inclusion, respectively of responses that might have been due to projection.

The role of projection is not yet clear in the empathic process, and its effects have not been successfully eliminated. Laing, Phillipson, & Lee (1966) also dealt with the issue but have arrived at a method for measuring empathy that is more complex than those discussed above and that eliminates the question of projection to some extent. They took the levels of perception discussed by Dymond (1949) one step further and included not only understanding the other's point of view but also the feeling of being understood or misunderstood. If the other feels understood correctly, i.e. he feels and really is understood, then projection becomes almost irrelevant, since projection usually results in a distortion of our perceptions of the other as he "really" is. They suggested that, "Pure projection tells us nothing about the other (p. 17)." In fact, they said that what may appear to be projection may really be a mismatching of expectations about the other. Whatever the case may be, whether projection, attribution or false expectations, by including the last step of "feeling understood correctly," these are eliminated. This way, only distorting projection, assuming there is another type, is eliminated, and not all projection or attribution or even correct empathy as by Bender & Hastorf's (1953) technique.

Further methods for measuring empathy include those developed by Flapan (1957) and Stotland & Dunn (1963). Flapan (1957) assumed that empathy is not a fixed trait, but is an ability which varies from

situation to situation and one which can be taught. He suggested three steps that one goes through in predicting another's behavior:

1. Imagine what the other individual thinks or feels.
2. Imagine which of these various thoughts and feelings the other person will be aware of in a particular situation.
3. Imagine what modifications of these thoughts and feelings the other person will make before he acts.

His method involved married partners listening, via tape recordings, to acted out situations of one partner by the other and their attempts to explain what happened, why the partner said or did what he/she said or did, and to predict what will happen next. This method seems to have both advantages and disadvantages. It seems somewhat cumbersome and time consuming, and yet it does seem to be getting at more immediate experiences than those measured by paper and pencil techniques.

Stotland & Dunn (1963) compared galvanic skin responses of observers with those being observed. They assumed that if the physiological reaction of an observer matched that of the person being observed, empathy might be involved. Again, as with other measures, accidentally accurate projection or attribution could account for some of the similarities in GSR responses, or a person could simply be reacting in his own unique way to the same situation, but have a similar physiological response. Anxiety and pleasurable excitement, for example, may produce similar GSRs.

Of all the methods for measuring empathy, Laing's et al. (1966) seems to have the fewest drawbacks, the greatest efficiency for studying large numbers of relationships and seems most closely to approximate the steps, described in the theoretical review, that Engel (1970) suggested were necessary for the empathic process. It will, therefore, be

discussed in some detail. First, however, a necessary comment is offered. Empathy, as theoretically defined in terms of resonance and partial sharing of feelings, was not really measured by any of the methods discussed, with the exception, perhaps, of the GSR measure described by Stotland & Dunn (1963). Probably a more accurate term for the processes measured is understanding.

Laing's et al. (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM) was designed to assess dyadic relationships by presenting twelve questions concerning each of 60 issues descriptive of dyadic interactions. Some sample issues include: respect, trust, dependence, hate, love and understanding. (For further issues, see Appendix D.) An example of the questions concerning an issue, in this case respect, is given in order to clarify the discussion.

The male answers these questions:

- A. How true do you think the following are?
 - 1. She respects me.
 - 2. I respect her.
 - 3. She respects herself.
 - 4. I respect myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
 - 1. "I respect him."
 - 2. "He respects me."
 - 3. "I respect myself."
 - 4. "He respects himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
 - 1. She respects me.
 - 2. I respect her.
 - 3. She respects herself.
 - 4. I respect myself.

The female answers these questions:

- A. How true do you think the following are?
 - 1. He respects me.
 - 2. I respect him.
 - 3. He respects himself.
 - 4. I respect myself.

- B. How would HE answer the following?
1. "I respect her."
 2. "She respects me."
 3. "I respect myself."
 4. "She respects herself."
- C. How would HE think you have answered the following?
1. He respects me.
 2. I respect him.
 3. He respects himself.
 4. I respect myself.

Each issue can be looked at from four points of view:

1. How the female views, thinks of, or feels about herself is abbreviated the FF viewpoint and exemplified by the male's responses to all questions numbered 3 and by the female's responses to all questions numbered 4.

2. How the female views, thinks of, or feels about the male is abbreviated the FM viewpoint and is exemplified by the male's responses to all questions numbered 1 and by the female's responses to all questions numbered 2.

3. How the male views, thinks of, or feels about himself is abbreviated the MM viewpoint and is exemplified by the male's responses to all questions numbered 4 and by the female's responses to all questions numbered 3.

4. How the male views, thinks of, or feels about the female is abbreviated the MF viewpoint and is exemplified by the male's responses to all questions numbered 2 and by the female's responses to all questions numbered 1.

In addition, each issue can be looked at from three levels of perspective:

1. The direct perspective determines how each person sees a particular issue from all four points of view (MM, MF, FF, FM). All

responses to questions in category A by both the male and female are questions from the direct perspective.

2. The meta perspective determines how each person thinks the other sees the issue from all four points of view. All responses to questions in category B by both the male and female are questions from the meta perspective.

3. The meta-meta perspective determines how each person thinks the other thinks they view an issue from all four points of view. All responses to questions in category C by both the male and female are questions from the meta-meta perspective.

By comparing the various levels of perspectives between partners of a dyad, one can arrive at the measures of: agreeing-disagreeing on a view point; understanding-misunderstanding each other on a view point; being understood-being misunderstood on a view point; and finally feeling understood-feeling misunderstood on a viewpoint. A detailed explanation for determining each of the above is given in the method section of this paper when measurement of empathy is explained.

It is important to point out that Laing et al. (1966) have devised a unique method for determining where in the communication process blocks or strengths may exist. Is it that both understand each other but cannot communicate that understanding? Is it that one or both do not understand each other? Is there so much disagreement on issues that one wonders about their disparate frames of reference? The authors offered reliability figures which averaged 89.12% agreement between test and re-test responses. These will be presented in detail in the method section of this paper, along with the modifications that were made to adapt the IPM to the current study.

Some studies which have attempted to relate empathy to self-esteem and to various types of relationships include Laing et al. (1966), Fiedler (1952) and Stotland & Dunn (1963). Laing et al. (1966) studied, rather extensively, the empathic involvement of married couples, both disturbed and non-disturbed, defined on the basis of their having sought psychotherapeutic help or not. In all cases, that is, for all four view points (MM, MF, FF, FM), partners in the non-disturbed marriages felt understood correctly more often than partners in the disturbed marriages. Laing et al., in great detail, analyzed the responses of one couple before and after psychotherapy and also compared these changes with therapists' (each partner had his/her own therapist) evaluations of change. They found that the test-retest changes fairly accurately reflected the changes perceived by the therapists. This suggests that the measure, much like Rogers & Dymond's (1954) measure of self-esteem, may be used to give some indication of therapeutic progress. Fiedler & Senior (1952) also studied the empathic process in the psychotherapeutic setting. They compared patients' perceptions of their therapists, and found that increased self-awareness and self-esteem improved empathic skill, or accuracy in the perceptions of their therapists. This suggests that in the current study self-esteem and empathy should be positively related.

Stotland & Dunn (1963) using GSR and self-report measures of empathy, attempted to correlate the two measures. Subjects were asked to rate models' levels of anxiety which they felt the models were experiencing in apparently anxiety provoking situations. Subjects observed models either receiving only positive or only negative feedback on some task, and had either performed a similar task or a different task

previously. The main finding relevant to the present study was that persons high in self-esteem empathized more readily and accurately than persons low in self-esteem. Interestingly enough, GSR results did not agree with self-report results. According to a comparison between models' reported levels of anxiety and observers' guesses of those levels, subjects empathized more with people who were engaging in tasks that they themselves had performed than with people who were engaged in different tasks, and high self-esteem subjects were more accurate than low self-esteem subjects. A problem with this study may be that similarity, with its possible concomitant projection, may have accounted for the greater accuracy among people who were seen as similar.

With this review, one can see that empathy has received a great deal of attention in studies of interpersonal relationships. Not all issues concerning empathy have been settled, but the one most important to the current study, its relationships with self-esteem, seems to have received support in the positive direction (Fiedler & Senior, 1952; and Stotland & Dunn, 1963). Thus, the first hypothesis tested in the current study states that self-esteem and empathy are positively related.

At this point three other areas of research are presented in order to complete the background material that prompted the design and method in the current study: conflict resolution research, process recordings research and research on types of marriage and dating relationships. Conflict resolution research is presented because a major part of the interview used in the current study deals with methods that couples adopted for dealing with conflict. It was used to help in the assessment mainly of mutual validation of personal worth and, in part, of

mutuality, role-flexibility and affect. Process recordings research is presented because in the current study the variables of role-flexibility, mutuality and mutual validation of personal worth were assessed via process recordings taken from tape recorded interviews with the dating couples. Finally, research on types of marriage and dating relationships is presented in order to give some ideas of how various interactions between intimate partners have been unified into more comprehensive descriptions of relationships. A similar attempt is made in the discussion chapter of this paper.

Conflict Resolution Research

A brief discussion of conflict resolution research is included because a major part of the interview used in the current study explored styles of conflict resolution in order to arrive at an assessment of the intimacy variable of mutual validation of personal worth. As mentioned above (Rosenbaum & Stanners, 1961), aggression may be an important variable related to self-esteem, and it certainly is an important variable to consider in an intimate relationship. Bach & Wyden (1969) devoted an entire book to the subject and titled the book The Intimate Enemy, somewhat facetiously perhaps. They mentioned the importance of the constructive handling of conflict in order to maximize mutual validation of personal worth. They suggested that conflict may help partners to understand each other better. They gave examples of destructive styles of fighting that some couples have developed. For example, the kitchen sink style of fighting refers to a tendency someone may have for including everything possible when making a complaint about some minor issue. "Not only is my supper cold tonight, but did I ever tell you you're an incompetent housekeeper in general." The vesuvius

style of fighting refers to an eruption of pent up hostilities, because many small complaints or issues remained unsettled for too long a period of time. The positive aspects of constructive conflict resolution and the negative aspects of the lack of overt conflict or destructive handling of conflict are discussed in some detail by Bach & Wyden. They made suggestions, in fact outlined a course of instruction, for learning to handle conflict constructively.

Barry (1970) reviewed literature pointing out the differences between destructive and constructive conflict. Goodrich & Boomer (1963) also discussed the importance of conflict in intimate relationships and described in detail methods for assessing the handling of conflict. Their discussion pointed out methods partners use to resolve conflict and maintain self-esteem, from highly neurotic, sometimes even psychotic like methods to what might be expected at Hartmann's (1958) "average expectable developmental state."

Process Recordings Research

Farina's (1958) study was most helpful in developing the processes measured in the current study. He tape recorded interviews and counted frequency and duration of certain verbalizations to measure dominance and conflict. His dominance measures included: first to speak, last to speak, total time spoken and passive acceptance of a solution. His conflict measures included: frequency of simultaneous speech, duration of simultaneous speech, interruptions and disagreements. The importance of his study, aside from the suggestions of measures, was his demonstration that with careful instructions these types of measures can be assessed quite reliably. He re-rated four cases and found frequency agreements up to 100% for some, and in the 90% range for most. His processes

required some careful judgements on the part of the raters, and a great deal of time per interview. The current study used relatively simple processes, mainly as ancillary data to determine whether verbalizations taken as raw data supported the more complex judgements made by trained clinicians.

Matarazzo, Saslow, & Guze (1956), using slightly different measures, also found reliability when a partially standardized psychiatric interview was conducted twice. Not only were the processes reliably re-coded, but they also seemed to reflect stable styles of interaction. Steinzor (1949) employed some of the same measures and found reliability. Schroeer & Flapan (1971a, 1971b), though not using measures directly related to the current study, found that coding interactional material can be extremely useful in reliably determining age, sex and social class differences.

A study very much related to the current one was conducted by Heiss (1962). He used Bales' (1959) process recordings to measure degrees of sex dominance and related them to varying degrees of involvement; casually dating, seriously dating and committed. He called these different levels of involvement intimacy, and found that the greater the intimacy, the less the male dominance.

Research on Types of Marriage and Dating Relationships

So far a great amount of detail has been given to what goes on within interpersonal relationships. Much less research is available on resulting types of relationships, particularly dating relationships. That is, few attempts have been made to integrate the various aspects of relationships into complete or more comprehensive descriptions. The current study will attempt to do this to some extent.

Cuber & Haroff (1962) conducted an open ended interview study of several hundred well-to-do couples who had been married at least ten years. They began their study with few preconceived notions about what existed and began their interviews with such non-directive questions as, "Well, what's it like to be a woman these days?" or for the men, "What do you think about marriage?" With little more direction than reflection of feelings, they found that all couples that were interviewed fell into one of five types of marriages:

1. Conflict-habituated. Incompatibility is pervasive, conflict is ever-potential and an atmosphere of tension permeates the relationship.
2. The devitalized. At one time deeply in love and now just conveniently living together, with occasional reappearance of sharing of excitement.
3. Passive-congenial. Like the devitalized, only the marriage was never vital. The emphasis is on orderliness and convenience.
4. The vital. The partners are intensely bound together. It is not the doing that is exciting but the doing together. Conflicts are avoided or quickly resolved.
5. The total. Like the vital but more multifaceted. This relationships closely approximates the ideal of intimacy that was described earlier in this paper.

Goodrich, Ryder, & Raush (1968) and Goodrich (1966) have also attempted to explore variations in the psychological patterning of marriage. Their approach consisted of a variety of methods, including interviews, questionnaires, and a conflict resolution test (Goodrich & Boomer, 1963; Raush, Goodrich, & Campbell, 1963). After a factor

analysis of the various sources of data, they found that couples seemed to be differentiable mainly on the basis of: 1. closeness to husband's family, 2. role-orientation, 3. reported problems or complaints, and 4. closeness to wife's family.

Those who have close involvement with the extended family seem to be child-centered and socially active with a non-affective style of husband-wife communication. In general those couples with a high degree of affective expression have cut themselves off from their families. This study suggests that affectivity is measurable and perhaps predictable.

Choice of Variables and Hypotheses Tested

This study was designed to determine whether or not the self-esteem of the partners in dating relationships of varying degrees of involvement was in any way related to styles or patterns of intimacy.

Of the many personality traits contributing to an intimate relationship, self-esteem was chosen. The theoretical importance of self-esteem, it seems, has been amply demonstrated throughout this paper. The research discussed, as well as the theory, indicated relatively clear directions for stating hypotheses about the three variables of empathy, role-flexibility and mutual validation of personal worth. The personal interest of this writer in the concept of self-esteem was an additional factor.

Of all the possible dependent variables that could have been explored as crucial to intimacy, those most closely related to the ideal description given earlier were chosen. The five dependent variables of empathy, mutuality, role-flexibility, mutual validation of personal worth and affect that were finally chosen are the product of many trials

and choices out of many alternatives. They were chosen to maximize the feeling that an alive and existing relationship, rather than an abstraction was being described. They were also chosen to maximize descriptions of a relationship, independent of individual partners' personalities. That is, the description of the variables are of a relationship, not of two individuals.

The variable, empathy, has already been discussed in great detail, and has more or less been equated with understanding and communicating that understanding.

The second variable, mutuality, is a measure of the ability and desire to maintain individual integrity and at the same time the ability to build or actualize through sharing with another.

The third variable, role-flexibility, is mainly based upon the ease or lack of ease with which the dating partners can exchange roles. It is a measure of whether stereotypes or freedom from stereotypes determine roles, and a measure of the ability and desire to adapt flexibly, to new situations as they arise in the dating relationship.

The fourth variable, mutual validation of personal worth, is very much like the collaboration discussed by Sullivan (1953), a mutual respect, trust, support and concern. It includes being helpful and being able to accept help, with each partner allowing him/herself and the other to choose what they wish to become.

The fifth variable, affect, measured mainly in terms of quantity and intensity, is possibly the most difficult to support theoretically. However, to the author it is an important variable and so was included for study. Each relationship has its unique feeling tone, however difficult it may be to detect in public.

Following are the specific hypotheses tested in the current study:

1. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate greater empathy between partners than low self-esteem couples.
2. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate less variability in their degree of mutuality than low self-esteem couples. High self-esteem couples will tend toward the mid range, while low self-esteem couples will tend toward the two extremes.
3. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate greater role-flexibility than low self-esteem couples.
4. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate more mutual validation of personal worth than low self-esteem couples.
5. High self-esteem couples will differ significantly from low self-esteem couples in intensity and quantity of affective expression. The direction of this difference was not predicted.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The method of this investigation will be discussed under the following headings: subject recruitment and data collection which includes a description of how volunteers were recruited; brief descriptions of materials that were given to the volunteers; how subjects were chosen from the pool of volunteers and a description of subjects finally selected; and description of the instruments used in this study, which includes the self-esteem measure, empathy measure, process recordings, couple interviews and judges' ratings of the interviews for each of the remaining variables.

Subject Recruitment and Data Collection

Recruitment took place from the Fall of 1971 through the Fall of 1972, at various colleges throughout the New York City area (City College and Lehman College of The City University of New York, New York University, and Teachers College of Columbia University). Letters were sent to faculty members teaching undergraduate Psychology and Sociology courses. The letters (Appendix A) included a description of the study and directions to the instructors for soliciting subjects. Instructors were asked only to read the experimenter's explanations and hand out assessment materials to those students who expressed interest. No class time was required to fill out forms. In order to assure the anonymity of volunteers, they were asked to return the filled out forms in their sealable envelopes to the experimenter's mailboxes which were located in the departmental offices of the two disciplines at all colleges.

At the time of recruitment, instructors handed out two envelopes (one for the male and one for the female partner, identified by numbers

only) to everyone who expressed interest, since usually only one partner of a couple attended a particular class. Each envelope contained the following materials:

1. General Introductory Comments briefly described the study (though not that self-esteem was involved), what was requested of them and directions for filling out some of the forms (Appendix B). These comments were particularly important for the dating partner who was not in class to hear the instructors. The partners were instructed to fill out their respective forms without communicating with each other until the tasks were completed, at which time they could discuss their various responses, without changing any, of course. They were further told that soon after returning the forms, some of them would be contacted by telephone for the arrangement of an interview.

2. A Personal Information Sheet requested demographic information such as age, religion, years in college and major area of study. Education and occupation of parents were also requested so that social class could be determined, using Hollingshead's (1957) Two Factor Index of Social Position. In addition a number of questions were asked concerning the type, degree and length of involvement the two partners felt they had. All this information was gathered in order to determine at a later date whether any of it was confounding the results.

On the Personal Information Sheet volunteers were given the options of providing their names and telephone numbers, of filling out the forms but not providing their names, or of returning the forms totally blank if they changed their minds about participating. The second option was provided in order to make available a comparison group for the couples who did provide names to see if anonymity was an important factor in terms

of the kind of couples who volunteered. See Appendix E for the frequency of the various types of returns and Appendix C for a copy of the Personal Information Sheet.

3. A Self-Rating Questionnaire (shortened version of the Interpersonal Perception Method of Laing, et al., 1966)¹ was used to assess empathy and self-esteem. See Appendix B for directions, sample answer sheet and the questions. This questionnaire is explained in detail later.

Procedure for the Selection of the Final Thirty Couples

As the envelopes were being returned, those with names and telephone numbers were checked for completeness. Thereafter, the Personal Information Sheets were set aside. Median self-esteem scores of those volunteers who gave names were then calculated continuously as more and more envelopes were returned. At various points in time, whenever several, then current, high-high (HH) or low-low (LL) couples (The first letter refers to male self-esteem and the second to female self-esteem.) had been identified, the numbers of these couples were given to a collaborator who had the Personal Information Sheets with names and in return gave the names and telephone numbers to the interviewer, without informing him of their identifying numbers or their self-esteem standings. This was done in order to minimize interviewer bias. Those couples were then contacted and interviewed. In other words, interviews were conducted at the same time that subjects were still being recruited.

Once approximately twenty couples had returned their forms, the medians for both males and females stabilized, with, at most, a one or

¹Permission to use the Interpersonal Perception Method was granted by the Springer Publishing Company, Inc. on May 19, 1970.

two point fluctuation. When 60 couples had returned their forms, the medians produced enough HH and LL couples so that 15 of each had been interviewed. The sixty couples were distributed on the median self-esteem scores as follows: HH--20 (33%); LL--22 (37%); HL--7 (12%); and LH--11 (18%).

Some couples who had been borderline HH or LL couples were eliminated from the final subject pool as more forms were returned. The minor shift in the median placed them into a mixed category of HL or LH. Some of these may have been interviewed at the time of their HH or LL standing, but they were not included among the final 30 couples. Only those couples who were HH or LL after 60 pairs of forms had been returned were used.

Of the 42 couples contacted for interviews, 12 (28%) were not able to participate. They had either separated in the two week (approximate) period between the return of the forms and the telephone contact, had changed their minds about being interviewed, or could not find a mutually convenient time with the interviewer.

Description of Subjects

Those couples who finally participated in the study consisted of two groups of white, dating couples, differentiated by self-esteem scores only. One group consisted of 15 couples, with both partners having relatively high self-esteem (HH couples), the other group consisted of 15 couples, with both dating partners having relatively low self-esteem (LL couples). The relative self-esteem standings were based upon the median scores calculated separately from 60 males and 60 females. The median for the males was 65.69 and for the females 63.21, with a possible range of 18 to 72. This difference between the males and females was not

statistically significant. A statistical analysis showed that the two groups of couples did not differ significantly on any of the demographic variables tapped by the Personal Information Sheet, but did differ significantly on self-esteem scores. See Table 1 for demographic and self-esteem descriptions of the HH and LL groups.

The 60 couples, who gave their names and were used as the subject pool for the final 30 chosen to participate, were compared on the demographic variables and self-esteem with the 21 couples who returned the filled out forms anonymously. No statistically significant differences were found between these two groups. This indicated that preserving anonymity or not was irrelevant for this study in terms of the kind of couples who volunteered.

Description of Instruments

This study employed five assessment techniques to quantify the variables studied: a shortened or modified version of Laing's et al. (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method was used to develop an empathy scale and a self-esteem scale; judges' ratings made from tape recorded interviews were used to assess role-flexibility; mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect; and process recordings, also taken from the taped interviews, were used to assess role-flexibility, mutuality and mutual validation of personal worth. Each technique will be described in detail.

Modified Interpersonal Perception Method

As described earlier, the Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM) consists of twelve questions about each of 60 issues reflective of dyadic interactions. A modified or shortened version, 30 issues instead of 60, of the IPM was used to assess both empathy and self-esteem.

TABLE 1
Description of Subjects: Two Groups of Dating Couples, Distinguished
by the Relative Self-Esteem of the Dating Partners

	High Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)			Low Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)		
	Self-Esteem ^a					
	Males	Females	Combined	Males	Females	Combined
Mean	68.40	67.40	67.90	59.13	58.73	58.93
SD	1.81	2.32	2.11	4.64	5.52	5.02
Range	66-72	64-72	64-72	50-65	48-63	48-65
	Age					
	Males	Females	Combined	Males	Females	Combined
Mean	20.93	19.27	20.10	19.80	19.00	19.40
SD	2.05	1.90	2.12	1.65	1.41	1.56
Range	17-25	17-24	17-25	17-22	16-22	16-22

^aDetermined by summing response scores to 18 self-referent statements. Scores for each statement varied from one to four. Total score range possible was 18 to 72. Greater detail given later in text.

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 1, continued

	High Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)				Low Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)			
Length of Time Dating (Months)								
Mean	25.20				22.00			
SD	23.40				17.60			
Range	3-84				5-48			
Levels of Involvement ^b								
Level	Dating Casually	Dating Ex- clusively	Considered Their Fu- ture as a Couple	Engaged	Dating Casually	Dating Ex- clusively	Considered Their Fu- ture as a Couple	Engaged
Frequency	5	4	5	1	2	5	3	5
Percent (N/15)	33.3	26.7	33.3	6.7	33.3	33.3	20.0	33.3

^bIf partners disagreed about how involved they were, the lower level was used. If disagreement was by two levels, the middle level was used.

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 1, continued

	High Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)					Low Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)				
Year in College										
Year	1	2	3	4	other	1	2	3	4	other
Frequency	4	7	6	9	4	8	10	5	6	6
Percent (N/30)	13.3	23.3	20.0	30.0	13.3	26.7	33.3	16.7	20.0	3.3
Major Area of Study										
Area	Social Science	Science	No Major	Other		Social Science	Science	No Major	Other	
Frequency	14	5	3	8		11	7	6	6	
Percent (N/30)	46.7	16.7	10.0	26.6		36.7	23.3	20.0	20.0	

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 1, continued

	High Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)					Low Self-Esteem Couples (N = 30, 15 Couples)				
	Social Class									
Class	I	II	III	VI	V	I	II	III	IV	V
Frequency	2	2	5	16	5	4	0	13	11	2
Percent (N/30)	6.7	6.7	16.7	53.3	16.7	13.3	0.0	43.3	36.7	6.7
	Religion in which Raised									
Religion	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	Other	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	Other		
Frequency	12	14	1	3	10	16	0	4		
Percent (N/30)	40.0	46.7	3.3	10.0	33.3	53.3	0.0	13.3		

Empathy was measured by comparing two partners' responses to all 12 questions per issue. Self-esteem was measured by using responses to only one question per issue; i.e. the self-referent (e.g. I like myself.) questions. No comparisons between partners' responses were made to assess self-esteem. In answering the modified IPM, subjects were providing responses for the assessment of both self-esteem and empathy at the same time, without being aware that they were doing so.

Of the 30 issues that were finally chosen for administration, 12 were used to assess empathy only, seven were used to assess self-esteem only, and 11 were used to assess both. This made for a total of 23 empathy issues and 18 self-esteem issues, and 30 issues altogether. For those issues that were used to assess self-esteem only, subjects responded to all 12 questions though only their responses to the self-referent questions were used. This was so because they did not know that self-esteem was being assessed, and the seven issues used to assess self-esteem only were, as far as the subjects were concerned, just like the rest.

Thirty issues instead of all 60 IPM issues were chosen because the entire 60 issue IPM had been administered to a number of pilot couples, and all felt that the task required too much time, at least two hours. This resulted in boredom, confusion about the various levels of perception and careless responses. They suggested that if they knew beforehand that the IPM was to be just one half the required task, they would probably be less likely to volunteer for the study, or to continue it once they had completed the IPM. In an attempt to limit the time required to about one hour for the IPM, the number of issues was reduced from 60 to 30.

With the preset limit of 30 issues, several procedures were used to determine which of Laing's et al. (1966) 60 issues to use in the current study. The 23 issues used to assess empathy were chosen with an attempt toward maintaining some homogeneity and reliability. Since Laing et al. had conducted a factor analysis of responses to all 60 issues and had found six relatively independent factors, these were used in choosing empathy issues for the current study. Two factors, labeled by Laing et al. as "Interdependence and Autonomy" and "Extreme Denial of Autonomy" accounted for 23 of their 60 issues. The issues contributing to these two factors were chosen to be the empathy issues in this study because they contributed the number of issues closest to the preset limit of 30, without going over that limit. In addition, they seemed to be closely related to the intimacy variable of mutuality and were considered important for potential use in future research.

The 18 issues used to assess self-esteem were chosen by a panel of seven clinicians who were presented the self-referent questions from all 60 issues, and asked to rate each in terms of its usefulness in assessing a person's self-esteem. Greater detail is given later. Of the 60 self-referent questions, the judges rated 28 as useful. Of these 28, 11 were self-referent questions concerning issues already chosen for assessing empathy. Therefore, seven more self-esteem issues were chosen to make a total of 30 IPM issues altogether and therefore 18 self-esteem issues.

Since both empathy and self-esteem were assessed by the same instrument, one might expect a spuriously high correlation between empathy and self-esteem. However, this was not the case, because self-esteem was determined by one person's response to one question per issue, while

empathy was determined by a comparison between partners' responses to three different questions per issue.

The Self-Esteem Scale

The 18 self-referent questions used in this study were chosen from the 60 self-referent questions of Laing's et al. IPM. In order to determine which of the 60 would be best suited for assessing self-esteem, seven clinicians rated all 60 self-referent questions in terms of how useful they felt each question was in assessing a person's self-esteem. The seven judges consisted of a psychoanalytically oriented psychiatrist, two Ph.D. clinical psychologists, a Ph.D. social psychologist and three persons holding M.A. degrees who had research experience in clinical psychology.

The 60 IPM questions were rated on a five point scale:

1. Very representative of a person with high self-esteem.
2. Somewhat representative of a person with high self-esteem.
3. Not representative of either, or equally of both, or cannot really decide.
4. Somewhat representative of a person with low self-esteem.
5. Very representative of a person with low self-esteem.

Of the 60 questions, 28 were judged consistently as 1 or 2 or as 4 or 5 with no more than one 3 judgement.

Of these 28, 18 were chosen to make up the self-esteem scale, through the procedure described in the section titled "The Modified IPM". Eleven of the 28 self-esteem questions were questions about issues chosen to measure empathy. This left seven more that had to be selected to make a total of 30 issues. These seven were chosen from the remaining self-esteem issues, making a total of 18 self-esteem issues.

The seven were chosen because they were rated most reliably by the judges and because they maintained a balanced number of positively and negatively stated questions. See Appendix F for judges' ratings of the 28 self-referent questions from which the 18 self-esteem questions were chosen, and Appendix G for a description of which issues were used for self-esteem only, which for empathy only and which for both. However, a few examples are given here. "I make up my own mind.", "I am afraid of myself," and "I respect myself." were used to assess both empathy and self-esteem. "I can't stand myself," and "I am at one with myself." were used to assess self-esteem only.

Each of the 18 self-esteem questions could be responded to with one of the following.

- ++, indicating strong agreement
- +, indicating mild agreement
- , indicating mild disagreement
- , indicating strong disagreement

Depending upon the direction of the seven judges' rating, i.e. whether they rated the item as being indicative of high or low self-esteem, each subject's responses were given scores ranging from one to four. Strong agreement with a question indicative of high self-esteem or strong disagreement with a question indicative of low self-esteem were given scores of four. Strong disagreement with a question indicative of high self-esteem or strong agreement with a question indicative of low self-esteem were given scores of one. Scores of two and three were given to milder agreement and disagreement responses. The possible range of an individual's total self-esteem was 18 to 72.

Degree of agreement or disagreement with a question, that is, four

choices rather than only two choices was selected in order to maximize differentiation. This was suggested by Achenbach and Zigler (1963), who used a four point scale, and Fitzgerald (1963), who used a six point scale.

In order to determine the reliability of the self-esteem scale, 31 undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course were administered just the 18 self-esteem (the self-referent) questions twice, two weeks apart. This was the average time lapse between couples volunteering for the study and being interviewed. The test-retest reliability coefficient of $r = .85$ ($p \leq .01$) suggested that, at least over a two week period, the self-esteem scale was reliable. An internal consistency coefficient of .83 (Kuder-Richardson Formula 20), using the 31 undergraduates' responses to their first test, demonstrated good internal agreement among the questions. Considering the reliability figures, we can conclude that the questions measure the same thing and what is measured remains stable over a relatively short period of time.

The Empathy Scale

Twenty-three empathy issues were chosen on the basis of having been the items selected by Laing et al. (1966) as contributing to the two factors of "Interdependence and Autonomy" and "Extreme Denial of Autonomy". As explained in the section titled "Modified IPM", the choices were made in an attempt to use Laing's et al. factors, so that reliability could be maintained. In addition, the factors seemed of interest in that they are closely related to the intimacy variable of mutuality, and so were chosen as a possible ancillary area of exploration, independent of the major hypotheses of this study.

A couple's empathy score was determined by the total number of items

on which both partners felt understood and actually were understood. An item consisted of a particular viewpoint (MM, MF, FM, FF) on a particular issue (e.g. respect). A score of one was given when both partners felt and were understood, and a score of zero was given when only one or neither partner felt and was understood on a viewpoint of an issue. With 23 issues and four viewpoints per issue, 92 items were scored, with a possible range of zero to 92.

The exact method for determining empathy is explained with the help of Table 2. Table 2 presents the twelve questions concerning the issue of respect and hypothetical responses to the questions.

Of the 12 responses given by each partner only three are used to assess empathy on a particular viewpoint. If we wished to assess empathy on the female's view of herself (FF), the male's responses to the questions numbered 3 in Table 2 would be used and compared with the female's responses to the questions numbered 4 in Table 2. Though four levels of responding were possible, only direction was used. The male's responses to his number 3 questions in Table 2 can be translated as:

- A.3. I think she does not respect herself.
- B.3. I know she thinks she does respect herself.
- C.3. I feel she knows that I think she does not respect herself.

The female's responses to her number 4 questions can be translated as:

- A.4. I think I respect myself.
- B.4. I know he thinks I do not respect myself.
- C.4. I feel he knows that I think I respect myself.

In order to determine whether or not the male understands the female, a comparison between her A.4 and his B.3 responses is necessary. She said, "I think I respect myself." He said, "I know she thinks she

TABLE 2
 Sample Questions and Hypothetical Responses to Help
 Demonstrate How Empathy is Determined

Responses	The Male Answers These Questions ^a
	A. How true do you think the following are?
++	1. She respects me.
+	2. I respect her.
-	3. She respects herself.
+	4. I respect myself.
	B. How would SHE answer the following?
++	1. "I respect him."
++	2. "He respects me."
+	3. "I respect myself."
+	4. "He respects himself."
	C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
++	1. She respects me.
+	2. I respect her.
-	3. She respects herself.
++	4. I respect myself.
Responses	The Female Answers these Questions ^b
	A. How true do you think the following are?
+	1. He respects me.
++	2. I respect him.
++	3. He respects himself.
+	4. I respect myself.
	B. How would HE answer the following?
++	1. "I respect her."
++	2. "She respects me."
+	3. "I respect myself."
--	4. "She respects herself."
	C. How would HE think you have answered the following?
++	1. He respects me.
++	2. I respect him.
+	3. He respects himself.
+	4. I respect myself.

Note.--++ means strong agreement, + means mild agreement, - means mild disagreement, -- means strong disagreement.

^aStatements numbered 1 refer to FM viewpoint, 2 to MF viewpoint, 3 to FF viewpoint, 4 to MM viewpoint.

^bStatements numbered 1 refer to MF viewpoint, 2 to FM viewpoint, 3 to MM viewpoint, 4 to FF viewpoint.

does respect herself." These two responses are in agreement. Therefore, the male seems to understand her on this viewpoint. The female's feeling of being understood or misunderstood is determined by comparing her A.4 response with her C.4 response. She said, "I think I respect myself." and "I feel he knows that I think I respect myself." These two responses are in agreement. Therefore, the female feels understood by the male on this viewpoint. Thus, the female feels and is understood. So far, however, only one half the requirement for an empathy score of one has been fulfilled. It is still necessary to demonstrate that the male also feels and is understood on the same viewpoint.

The female's understanding or misunderstanding of the male's opinion is determined by comparing his A.3 response with her B.4 response. He said, "I think she does not respect herself." She said, "I know he thinks I do not respect myself." The two responses are in agreement. Therefore, the female understands the male on this viewpoint. The male's feeling of being understood or misunderstood is determined by comparing his A.3 and C.3 responses. He said, "I think she does not respect herself." and "I feel she knows that I think she does not respect herself." The two responses are in agreement. Therefore, the male indicates that he feels understood by the female. Now all requirements have been met for the couple to receive an empathy score of one. Both partners feel and are understood. The same procedure is then repeated for the other three viewpoints on this issue and all four viewpoints on all issues. (See Appendix H for a complete sample scoring sheet.)

Whether the female "really" respects herself or not is irrelevant. In this case the two partners happen to disagree. She said, "I think I respect myself." and he said, "I think she does not respect herself."

The communication of these opinions is important for empathy, not the accuracy of them.

The reliability figures offered by Laing et al. (1966) for their 60 issue questionnaire were 89.12 percent agreement between responses given in test-retest four to six weeks apart on 20 subjects (ten married couples), with average agreement being 89.5% for direct perspectives, 88.83% for meta perspectives, and 89.33% for meta-meta perspectives. As with the instrument used in this study, only direction, not degree of agreement or disagreement was used, even though subjects responded to all four possible choices.

Another analysis conducted by Laing et al. (1966) indicated that of the 23 issues chosen for the current empathy scale, only three had test-retest agreements below 76%, and all 23 issues had an average agreement of 86.9%, combining all three levels of perspective and all four viewpoints. The figure of 86.9% was derived from test-retest responses of non-disturbed married couples, i.e. couples who did not express any marital difficulties. For disturbed couples, i.e. couples who sought professional advice (n = 28, 14 married couples), no agreement percentages were below 76%.

Since the 23 issues for the current empathy scale comprise two independent factors, their reliability should be fairly similar to Laing's et al., even though they are out of the context of the total original IPM. In general, then, it seems safe to say that overall reliability is quite good.

The remaining four intimacy variables of role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect were assessed by two judges' ratings of tape recorded interviews with each of the couples.

Tape recordings rather than reading of transcripts was used in order to maximize for the judges a sense of the feeling tone within the relationship.

The Interview

An interview requiring approximately one hour of time was devised to explore the areas of dating relationships considered important for this study. The topics discussed in the interview were by no means exhaustive, but gave enough information for judges to rate each relationship on each of the four variables. The major areas discussed in the interview were:

- A. Quantity and quality of sharing in each other's lives.
- B. Roles and their flexibility in the relationship.
- C. Feelings within the relationship.
- D. Effects each partner has on the other.
- E. The part that conflict plays in the relationship.

Area A was designed to explore mutuality, area B to explore role-flexibility, and area C to explore affect. Areas D and E were designed to explore mutual validation of personal worth. Despite the more obvious area for each intimacy variable, each judge, since he was asked to make his rating on the basis of the entire interview, used information gathered during the exploration of all areas to arrive at a rating for each variable.

At the beginning of the interview, couples were told of the general purpose, again, omitting the explanation of the role of self-esteem. This was explained at the end of the interview, with each couple being told, truthfully, that the interviewer did not know their self-esteem standing. This was possible because a collaborator gave the interviewer

only names and telephone numbers to arrange the interviews. He was told nothing about their self-esteem standings. This was explained in greater detail in the section titled "Procedure for the Selection of the Final Thirty Couples."

The interview was conducted on a semi-structured basis. This was done in order to maximize flexibility and at the same time make certain that all couples were asked the same questions. At times discussions automatically led to topics out of sequence, and to have insisted on a strict order would have made the interviews mechanical and less spontaneous. The interviews were conducted mainly in the home of the experimenter, with as relaxed an atmosphere as possible. A few were conducted at the homes of one of the dating partners because of travel difficulties for the couples. (See Appendix I for the complete interview outline.)

Following are the descriptions for each of the four variables that judges used to make their ratings from the tape recorded interviews. Note that for each variable only three anchor descriptions are given: 1, 3, and 5. Points 2 and 4 were left undefined. For all four variables a high score indicates that a couple has a greater amount of the particular intimate quality. For example, the description numbered five on the mutuality variable indicates that a couple has a great deal of mutuality in their relationship, while the description numbered one indicates a great deal of separateness. The extra points added between the three anchor descriptions were provided to increase differentiation among the couples.

Mutuality

1. This relationship is characterized by a great deal of

separateness. The partners seem to almost lead individual lives and only occasionally share. The doing is usually more important than the doing together. They seem to have their separate groups of friends and activities that only occasionally overlap. Sharing is at a minimum and words like me, mine, I etc. predominate in conversation.

2. (Undefined)

3. This relationship is characterized by a great mixture of mutuality and separateness. The dating partners share much but still can be seen as two individuals. Sometimes the doing is more important than the doing together, and sometimes the doing together is more important than the doing. They have a close relationship, yet they also have their separate lives. They may have friends and activities in common, as well as friends and activities that one partner calls his/her own. In conversations you find a great mixture of words like we, I, us, me, etc.

4. (Undefined)

5. This relationship is characterized by an almost total sense of "We." Most things are done together, and the doing together is more important than the doing, most of the time. It is difficult to think of the dating partners as separate individuals. They share almost everything and rarely are seen alone socially. They have few friends and activities that either partner calls his/her own. In conversation the words we, us, ours are in the vast majority, compared to me, mine, I, etc.

Role-Flexibility

1. This relationship is characterized by roles that were arrived at mainly on the basis of preconceived notions of what should be. Adaptation is guided by these preconceived notions rather than by the unique

needs, desires and abilities of each partner. Role shifting is practically absent. If the female happens to be working and busy, she must cope somehow with the problem on her own (intrapersonally) if her role has been predetermined as social planner. It is possible that the roles adopted by this couple are quite unconventional, but still were adopted on the basis of preconceived notions and with little interpersonal give and take.

2. (Undefined)

3. This relationship is characterized by such a mixture of roles determined on the basis of interpersonal communications of unique needs, desires and abilities, and on intrapersonal adjustment to preconceived notions of what should be, that it is difficult to characterize it as predominantly one or the other. For example, who makes the final decision when there is disagreement may be determined on the basis of predetermined sex-role behavior, but taking care of social calendar planning may be determined on the basis of desires and abilities, e.g. the female may hate to plan and think ahead, so the male takes care of whom to see, what to do and when. The decision making role may be determined on the preconceived notion that the male (even if he does not like to) has the final word. The social planner role is determined on the basis of interpersonal adjustment, the decision making role is determined on the basis of intrapersonal adjustment. In general there is a great mixture of methods of arriving at roles.

4. (Undefined)

5. This relationship is characterized mainly by a flexibility of roles. Each partner is able and willing to shift and adapt his/her roles according to each of the partner's unique needs, desires and abilities.

The dating partners may, for example, shift between giving reassurance and receiving reassurance. If no shifting is obvious now, you perceive that the present structure was arrived at by a working through process between the two partners, and any future role shifting will be determined on the same basis. The arrived-at roles may be quite conventional but the means used to arrive at them was on an interpersonal level with needs, desires and abilities as guides. The overall impression you have of this relationship is that most of the present roles are a function of interpersonal adjustment rather than intrapersonal adjustment of each partner to preconceived notions of what should be.

Mutual Validation of Personal Worth

1. This relationship seems to be characterized by a struggle for superiority or selfish wish fulfillment with little regard for the partner. Discussions seem to be a sort of striving for mastery and defensiveness against anxiety. They seem to be two people vying for attention or are self-absorbed. Contradictions of what each says are very common, or building upon the theme started by one partner with little or no credit to the person who started the theme.

2. (Undefined)

3. This relationship seems to be characterized by a mixture of mutual supportiveness, and separate aggrandizement at the expense of the partner. This may be seen in such a fashion as agreeing and supporting feelings and attitudes at some time and defensive maneuvering, manipulating and self-aggrandizement at other times.

4. (Undefined)

5. This relationship seems to be characterized by mutual supportiveness. The partners seem to validate what each says or does. Any

contradictions or corrections are made in such a way that the original speaker still feels that what he/she said had merit. You get a sense of mutual respect and trust and helpfulness.

Affect

1. This relationship has a sense of blandness or boredom about it. Little fluctuation in intensity or extremes of emotions is obvious most of the time. A kind of planned interaction seems to exist. Emotions are either missing or well hidden or at a relatively stable level. Little of the surprise is obvious. Their language consists mainly of objective, intellectualized terms.

2. (Undefined)

3. This relationship has a sense of interest about it. The feelings in the relationship fluctuate in intensity but not to great extremes all too often. Pleasure and anxiety seem to characterize this relationship. Surprises and novelty are not uncommon, but do not occur in extremes very often. Their language consists of a mixture of feeling and objective intellectualized terms.

4. (Undefined)

5. This relationship has a sense of excitement about it. This excitement may be a rather difficult to define or subtle sparkle in the air, or a rather obvious heightening of extremes in emotions. The partners seem to have a very alive relationship between them. Passion and anguish seem to characterize this relationship. A sense of the unknown, unexpected or surprising pervades. Their language consists mainly of feeling terms.

Two judges listened to the interviews and rated them according to the descriptions just given, and their average rating was used as the

score for that particular variable. Since averages were used, scores could range from one to five, with 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, etc. as possible scores. Variance was, therefore, increased to eight possible scores from the original five.

To evaluate the interjudge reliability of the rating system, six judges and eight pilot interviews were used. Two of the judges used in determining reliability also rated the couples in the study proper. These two judges will be referred to as the study judges for the remainder of this discussion. The other four judges were used in order to compare the ratings of the study judges. These four judges will be called pilot judges for the remainder of this discussion. The purpose of this arrangement was to determine whether or not the ratings of the study judges could be reliably reproduced by any other pair of judges under similar circumstances.

In order to demonstrate interjudge reliability, the following four potential problems (deGroot, 1970) were minimized as much as possible:

1. the conception that each judge has of his task;
2. the persistent influence of preceding judgements;
3. the blinding influence of other aspects of the subjects;
4. the individual biases of each judge.

To make sure that all judges had accurate and similar conceptions of their tasks, without knowing that self-esteem was to be correlated with their ratings, the judges were given the three anchor descriptions of each variable that were presented earlier in this paper, and were told to listen to the entire interview before making any judgements, and to make judgements on the basis of the descriptions only, and not to interpretations of them or to other stimuli to which they may be sensitive

during the interview. Several practice interviews were judged and discussed in order to assure understanding of the task. Eight pilot interviews were then judged with no further communication among the judges.

The persistent influence of preceding judgements was dealt with partially by arranging the ratings so that the four pilot judges rated only two intimacy variables per couple (different ones for different couples) while the study judges rated all four variables for all couples. Even though all judges listened to an entire interview, the two ratings made by the pilot judges could be considered to be somewhat more independent of potential ratings they might have given the couple on the other variables since they concentrated, while listening to the interview, on rating only those two variables. The two study judges, however, were attempting to rate all four variables at the same time, therefore, perhaps ratings on one variable might be influenced by ratings on the other variables. If pilot judges' ratings differed from study judges' we could say that preceding judgements might have influenced the study judges' ratings. This did not seem to be the case, however, as no judge's ratings were found to be significantly different from any other judge's ratings. In addition, the lack of correlation (discussed in greater detail later) among some of the variables suggests that the judgements were made independently of each other.

The third difficulty of blinding influences of other aspects of the subjects was dealt with by giving the judges no information at all about the subjects. They knew nothing about their self-esteem standings, age, etc.

The fourth difficulty of individual biases was dealt with by statistically demonstrating that the average ratings of the study judges could be reliably reproduced by any other pair of judges. The design shown in Table 3 was used to accomplish this task. Consider judges AB one pair, CD another and EF a third. An important characteristic of each pair was that each was made up of a male judge and a female judge. All judges were graduate students with M.A. degrees or equivalent graduate school experience in the area of psychology.

The two pairs, AB and CD were used as the independent criteria, with whom the pair EF were compared. The EF pair rated couples in the study proper. The assignment to the variables was so arranged that the two pairs of pilot judges rated each pair of variables at least once. Appendix J gives the actual ratings assigned by each of the judges.

Two options were considered at the very beginning of this study. One of the potential problems in using the average rating of two judges rather than the rating of one judge only was that the individual ratings might be quite disparate, but their average would obscure any such discrepancies. At the same time, to rely solely on one judge might be unreliable because one judge, after rating several couples, might become tired or respond to future couples' recordings in a less than equal manner. With two judges, this sort of change would more likely be cancelled. However, statistical analyses of the pilot ratings demonstrated that no individual judge varied significantly from any other judge. This finding also received support from correlations between the two judges who rated all 30 couples in the study proper: for role-flexibility $r = .60$ ($p \leq .01$); for mutuality $r = .81$ ($p \leq .01$);

TABLE 3
Assignment of Judges to Intimacy Variables that They Were
to Rate for Each of Eight Pilot Couples to Determine
Reliability of Rating System

Couple	Intimacy Variables			
	Mutuality	Role-Flexibility	Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	Affect
1	CDEF	ABEF	CDEF	ABEF
2	CDEF	ABEF	ABEF	CDEF
3	ABEF	CDEF	CDEF	ABEF
4	CDEF	CDEF	ABEF	ABEF
5	ABEF	ABEF	CDEF	CDEF
6	ABEF	CDEF	ABEF	CDEF
7	CDEF	ABEF	CDEF	ABEF
8	ABEF	CDEF	ABEF	CDEF

Note.--A through F are judges. E and F are the two judges who rated couples in the study proper.

for mutual validation of personal worth $r = .43$ ($p \leq .01$); and for affect $r = .40$ ($p \leq .05$). Two judges were chosen anyway in order to assure both a masculine and feminine viewpoint, assuming that they might differ on some of the material discussed by the couples.

Using t tests it was found that the means of the paired ratings did not differ statistically, and Pearson rs demonstrated that they were significantly related to each other. (See Table K2 in Appendix K for the exact values.) The combination of tests demonstrated that the technique used to rate the couples on each of the four intimacy variables from the tape recorded interviews was reliable and could be reproduced by any other pair of judges using the same descriptions as those used by the study judges. See Appendix K for a detailed description of the actual statistical analyses performed.

Process Recordings

In addition to the judges' ratings, process recordings were also made from the taped interviews (not transcriptions) to arrive at other measures of the four intimacy variables. These procedures were included in the study to see if verbalizations taken as raw data supported the more complex judgements made by trained clinicians.

Role Flexibility

Three processes were developed to assess role-flexibility.

Quantity of speaking ratio. Rather than using an actual word count of every word spoken, or a measure of the amount of time spoken by each partner, the number of personal pronouns uttered was used as a reflection of the quantity of speaking done by a person. The ratio consisted of the number of personal pronouns (when used in referring to self or the couple), both singular and plural (I, me, my, mine, we, us,

ours) spoken by the male partner, divided by the number of personal pronouns spoken by both partners. If a subject repeated him/herself, such as, "I think, I uh, I mean that the relationship . . ." only one personal pronoun rather than three was recorded. The smaller the absolute difference between the ratio and 0.5, the greater the equality of quantity of speaking. If partners spoke about equally as much during the interview, it might be assumed that theirs was a balanced relationship in terms of responsibility, dominance-submissiveness or leadership. The purpose for creating a ratio for this measure as well as most of the following, rather than dealing with frequencies only was to take into account differences among couples in speaking rates and word production in general.

Agreeing ratio. The number of times that the male partner agreed with what the female said was divided by the total number of times that each partner agreed with the other. An agreement consisted of a phrase like, "Yeah.", "Yes.", "Uh hu.", "Right.", "Correct." If an agreeing phrase was followed by a qualifier like "But.", "However.", or "Maybe." it was not counted. Only the brief utterances of "Uh hu.", etc. were used in this measure because more complicated agreements such as elaborations of what the previous speaker said tend to require a more complex judgment than a simple frequency count of the sort described. If a couple is fairly well balanced in terms of the role "supportingness" the ratio should be approximately equal to 0.5. The smaller the absolute differences between the ratio and 0.5, the greater the equality.

First to answer ratio. The number of times that the male partner first answered a question asked by the interviewer was divided by the total number of times that each of the partners first answered a question.

Questions that were answered simultaneously by both partners were not counted, unless one partner stopped and the other continued. For example, if both simultaneously answered, "Yes." and then paused, followed by one or the other going on to elaborate it was not counted. However, if both began with different sentences and one continued and the other stopped, it was counted. Answers such as, "I don't know." or "I don't understand." were not counted nor were questions asked in order to clarify a question asked by the interviewer. Again, if a couple is fairly well balanced in terms of the role, "leadership," the ratio would approximate 0.5. The less the absolute difference between the ratio and 0.5, the greater the equality.

Mutuality

To measure the intimacy variable of mutuality, only one process was recorded. Two were tried on a pilot sample, but one, the number of times that a couple spoke about a specific shared experience versus the number of times a partner spoke about a specific separate experience proved to be useless because the number of experiences talked about were very few in frequency, and no meaningful comparisons could have been made. The one measure used was called the:

Personal pronoun ratio. It was determined by the number of times a plural personal pronoun (referring to the couple) was uttered by the two partners divided by the number of pronouns, both singular and plural, uttered by the partners. The larger the ratio, the greater the mutuality. It was assumed that use of plural pronouns when referring to the couple, would be an indication of "we-ness."

Mutual Validation of Personal Worth

To measure the intimacy variable of mutual validation of personal

worth, three processes were considered, but only two were used. The one discarded was the frequency of interruptions as a measure of lack of mutual validation of personal worth. It was found to be too difficult at times to judge whether a partner was actually interrupting or just inserting a quick statement of agreement or whatever. The following two processes were used:

Agreeing-disagreeing ratio. This was measured by the frequency of agreements (as defined under role-flexibility) by both partners divided by the number of agreements plus disagreements uttered by both partners. A disagreement consisted of a phrase like, "No.", "Wrong.", "I disagree.", "I don't think so." An agreement followed by a qualifier such as "Yes, but.", or expressing disbelief such as "Oh, yeah?" The larger the ratio, the greater the mutual validation of personal worth.

Frequency of simultaneous speech. Anything from one word on up was used, unless the utterance was something like one person speaking and the other was agreeing along the way by saying "Uh, hu.", or "Yes." or when both uttered a short phrase together like "Yes.", "Uh, hu." Simultaneous answers to questions were not counted. With this measure a ratio could not be used. The smaller the frequency, the greater the mutual validation of personal worth.

Three questions had to be answered before these processes were included in the study: How much of each interview should be used in counting, in order to validly represent the entire interview? A representative segment had to be chosen, since listening to all thirty interviews in their entirety would have been extremely time consuming. Do the processes seem to meaningfully reflect the various intimacy variables? Can the frequency counts be reliably made? Since the process recordings

constituted a relatively minor aspect of the study, a detailed description of how the above questions were answered is presented in Appendix L, and a brief summary is given here.

Since some pilot interviews lasted only a half hour, the search for a representative segment was limited to the first thirty minutes of eight pilot interviews. These thirty minutes were broken into three ten minute segments. Timing of the interviews was begun after the interviewer finished asking his first question concerning mutuality. An analysis of the first 30 minutes of the eight pilot interviews demonstrated that the processes seemed to be correlated with the intimacy variables as predicted when detailed descriptions of each process were given. The analysis also showed that the first 10 minute segment was adequately representative of the entire 30 minutes for counting personal pronouns, and the first 20 minutes for counting the remaining processes. The analyses indicated that the processes could be reliably measured, as shown by comparing original counts with repeat counts.

To conclude this chapter, a brief tabular summary is given to indicate the variables that were explored in this study, and how they were assessed.

TABLE 4

Summary of Variables Explored in Study and Methods Used to Assess Each

Variable	Method of Assessment
Self-Esteem	Self-reporting questionnaire, consisting of 18 self-referent questions with four response choices for each. These were selected from Laing's et al. (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method.
Empathy	Comparison between partners' responses to self-reporting questionnaire, consisting of a shortened version (23 of 60 issues) of Laing's et al. (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method.
Mutuality Role-Flexibility Mutual Validation of Personal Worth Affect ^a	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mean of two judges' ratings assessed from tape recordings of interviews with couples. Ratings were made on a five point scale. 2. Process recordings (different ones for each variable) assessed from tape recordings of interviews with couples. These consisted of frequency counts of certain verbalizations made by the dating partners.

^aNo processes were recorded for affect.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The intimacy variables of empathy and mutual validation of personal worth significantly differentiated between high self-esteem (HH) couples and low self-esteem (LL) couples, with HH couples scoring higher on both variables. The remaining three variables of mutuality, role-flexibility and affect did not significantly differentiate between the two groups.

In presenting the results, the hypotheses will first be restated, followed by the analyses of data concerning each. In addition some excerpts taken from the tape recorded interviews will be given in order to demonstrate differences. (The names used are fictitious.) The results concerning process recordings will be presented next. Finally, some additional analyses will be presented.

Hypotheses Restated

Hypothesis 1. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate greater empathy between partners than low self-esteem couples. On the average, HH couples tended to achieve two-way realization of understanding, that is both partners were and felt understood, on the average of 13 more viewpoints than the LL couples (See Table 5). Because of the statistical significance of the difference between the means ($t = 3.29, p \leq .01$, see Table 5) the null hypothesis was rejected and support was given to the alternate hypothesis that high self-esteem couples demonstrate greater empathy than low self-esteem couples. (See Appendix H for a complete set of empathy responses for a LL couple.)

Contrasting examples taken from interviews will help to demonstrate how the difference in empathy manifested itself in the interview setting. The following interchange between John and Mary (HH) took place during a

TABLE 5
 Summary of and Comparison between Scores for High and Low Self-Esteem
 Couples on Each Intimacy Variable

Variable	High Self-Esteem Couples (N = 15)			Low Self-Esteem Couples (N = 15)			Comparison between Groups
	Mean	Range	SD	Mean	Range	SD	t^c
Empathy	75.53	52.85	10.10	62.40	37-78	11.73	3.29**
Role-Flexibility	3.23	2.0-4.5	.82	3.17	1.5-4.5	1.18	.16
Mutuality ^a	3.03	1.5-4.0	.83	2.67	1.5-4.5	1.01	1.06
Mutuality ^b	1.37	0.5-2.0	.52	1.20	0.0-2.0	.68	.67
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	3.80	2.0-5.0	.84	3.20	1.5-4.5	.98	1.82*
Affect	3.17	2.5-4.0	.49	3.00	1.5-4.5	.71	.74

^aHigh score indicates high mutuality or fusion.

^bHigh score indicates balance between fusion and separation.

^c28 degrees of freedom

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$

conversation about role flexibility, and demonstrates that both partners feel understood.

John--Even though we've only known each other a few months--but it's like we know each other extremely well, so even when someone doesn't want to admit that there's a thorn in his side--

Mary--We can see it.

John--Yeah, we can see it.

One can assume that the knowledge they have about each other was gained from the willingness of each partner to reveal him/herself at times and from the willingness of the other to listen and try to understand. The general description of their relationship, given at the beginning of the interview, seems to suggest that the necessary ingredients for empathy exist.

Mary--I think we have a very complete and total relationship.

John--Respectful.

Mary--Respectful, totally honest. It's a very deep and involved relationship.

John--Yeah, it touches all corners. It's total.

In contrast, the beginning description given by a low self-esteem couple starts on a negative tone, and difficulty in empathy can be seen later in the interview.

Henry--Well, as far as like communicating with each other--That is, I guess--, if there is a problem with our relationship it's maybe that. I have trouble saying things that are on my mind. That could be a problem.

This was his beginning description. The following example of conversation demonstrates the difficulties in empathy that they encountered.

Henry--I think we have the same emotions (referring to his and Anne's). I don't think I show them. She shows them.

Interviewer--Are you aware of them?

Henry--I'm aware of them, but I don't think anyone else is.

That's the problem.

Anne--You are? I didn't even know you were aware of them.

Henry--Yeah, you see. I know they're there. I just don't relay them to her.

At least from this brief interchange, it seems that Henry has blocked the empathic process by not sending messages for his partner to receive and deal with.

Hypothesis 2. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate less variability in their degree of mutuality than low self-esteem couples. High self-esteem couples will tend toward the mid range, while low self-esteem couples will tend toward the two extremes. The slight differences in the variance, with the HH couples demonstrating slightly less variability than LL couples, did not receive statistically significant support. Thus the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The data were also analyzed by translating the raw scores into difference scores, in order to arrive at a reflection of a balance between fusion and separation.² As Table 5 indicates, the difference between the means, though in the predicted direction, was not statistically

²This was done by determining the absolute value of the difference between raw scores and the mid range value of 3. Mutuality was rated on a five point scale, with 3 indicating a balance between separation and fusion. Thus, the smaller the absolute difference between a raw score and 3, the greater the balance. In order to maintain consistency with measures of the other variables, the absolute difference was subtracted from 2, so that a high score reflected balance and a low score reflected lack of balance.

significant. The null hypothesis could, therefore, not be rejected and HH couples did not tend toward the mid range any more than did the LL couples.

Despite the lack of support for the hypothesis, some interview examples are offered to demonstrate the variability among couples.

John and Mary (HH) described their concept of sharing as follows:

John--We talk about everything. But we have separate friends as well as shared. We share in the sense that we're involved in what each of us does in a day. Somethings we don't talk about that much. Like I'm very into sports as a participant. She's more a spectator.

Mary--We don't always agree about things. Like one of us may want to party and the other wants to solo. So we have to talk about it and decide what to do.

Another HH couple, Phil and Ellen described their concept of sharing in similar terms.

Phil--We do things together because it might be something either one of us would like to do, and as such we'd like to share it. Like, we might go to a museum. I might not be that interested--in. It's not as if one of us is going to really not enjoy it. As long as we're together, it doesn't really matter that much what we're doing.

Ellen--But other things we don't go together because of one of us, both of us really, couldn't enjoy it as much. Because if he knows I'm not enjoying myself, he won't enjoy himself as much. So if we go alone to some of these we can enjoy them.

Phil--I know it's impossible for us to like all things together.

Both couples seem to have found some balance between mutuality and separation. The first couple, however, seems to be more fused, since they do end up going together to all functions. The second couple seems more willing to be separate at times.

The following two examples demonstrate very different ways of seeking that comfortable balance or lack of balance that each couple must achieve. Gary and Nancy (HH) who characterize their relationship as "growth oriented", have not yet found their comfortable level of sharing, but are searching for it with mutual respect. For example:

Interviewer--How do you feel when something is bugging him and he doesn't share it with you?

Nancy--I feel kind of isolated and I want to share, you know, his thoughts with him. But, uh, I realize, you know,--I respect him for wanting to keep those thoughts to himself, or those that he wants to cope with himself. When he's ready he'll tell me.

Henry and Anne (LL), on the other hand, though also searching for a comfortable balance, seem to do it very differently from Gary and Nancy.

Henry--We share friends. All her friends are my friends, and all my friends are her friends.

Anne--Not really!

(Later in the interview.)

Interviewer--Who usually comes to whom for emotional support?

Henry--Well, we both go to each other.

Anne--But you usually don't come to me, 'cause you never used to say anything.

Henry--I do. I have recently been letting out all of my inner thoughts.

Anne--(reluctantly) I guess so.

It seems that Henry and Anne are not in agreement about how much they share in each others' lives and one can assume from the mild hostility in Anne's comments that their search for a comfortable level may not be an easy one. This difference in methods of seeking some level of comfortable sharing, no matter how fused or how separate it is will be discussed in the next chapter, as perhaps differentiating between high self-esteem and low self-esteem couples.

Hypothesis 3. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate greater role-flexibility than low self-esteem couples. As Table 5 indicates, the difference between the means is miniscule, and the t test for the difference between the means is very small (See Table 5.). Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, and HH couples did not differ in role-flexibility from LL couples.

Again, despite lack of support for the alternate hypothesis, a few contrasting examples are given to indicate some of the variety found in role-flexibility. An example taken from the interview with John and Mary (HH) demonstrates their flexibility.

Mary--I don't think either of us is definitely one thing or the other purposely. We sort of take turns and share.

John--Yeah, we both know different things. We can both be the leader in different situations.

Mary--Funny thing is that he's more pro-women's lib than I am. I like to do housy things. Like, I remember our first date. I was really surprised when I had to pay my own way into the

movie theatre.

John--Yeah, I guess that's true. I have to watch that I don't force things on her that aren't hers.

An example of lack of flexibility taken from the interview with a LL couple, Bob and Louise:

Louise--I want him to be the leader. And if he goes astray, there I am to straighten him out.

Interviewer--Why do you want him to lead?

Louise--Because my father was always the less dominant figure in the family, and I know it made my mother miserable. She used to scream at him and yell at him. If I see him (Bob) doing anything similar to my father, and I love my father, just gets me really upset. And I see myself being a little like my mother. That bothers me.

Bob said that he was willing to try to be the leader, if that is what Louise wants, but, "The point is that when I do make a decision, you're not happy with them. She talks differently and acts differently. She tells me to decide but then lets me know they're wrong." At a later point Bob and Louise again indicate difficulties:

Bob--I wouldn't mind her working.

Louise--Oh, you animal! You kidding? You go out and make the money. I'll stay home and do my volunteer work. You do all the money earning.

Bob--She's spoiled.

Louise--Why should I work if you can make enough money?

Bob--What do you want to waste your time in the house for?

Louise--I told you, I'd do my volunteer work.

Bob--So, why don't you do it for money?

Louise--I don't want regular hours. I'll make you good dinners.

Bob later revealed additional difficulties with roles by stating, "Cooking I wouldn't mind, if I were good at it. But house cleaning would bother me."

Another couple, Phil and Ellen (HH) seemed to have a flexible relationship:

Ellen--I think it's about 50-50.

Phil--How come you always talk first? (Both laugh.)

Ellen--It varies from time to time. I think there are times where Phil dominates and times when I dominate. For example, sometimes he chooses the movie, sometimes I choose the movie. Sometimes he's in an emotional head, sometimes I am.

Phil--I don't think we have a leader follower type of thing. We decide most things together. I don't think either one of us really ever, or very rarely makes a decision and forces it on the other person. We go to each other equally when either of us is bugged. I have no hesitations and she has none.

Phil and Ellen seem to be comfortable in their flexibility. Though John and Mary may not have reached the same stage of flexibility as Phil and Ellen, it seems that they are on their way to a flexible relationship. Bob and Louise, on the other hand, are having difficulty. Louise has strongly preconceived notions of what she wants her partner and herself to be, and at the same time, on some unconscious level, seems to be preventing that structure from developing. Bob is confused to begin with, it seems, and even more so because of her ambivalence. He seems locked into Louise's parental model and his own preconceived notions.

Hypothesis 4. High self-esteem couples will demonstrate more mutual validation of personal worth than low self-esteem couples. As Table 5 demonstrates, the means differed significantly ($t = 1.82$, $p \leq .05$). The null hypothesis was therefore rejected, and support was given to the alternate hypothesis that HH partners validate each other's personal worth more than LL partners.

Several interview excerpts are offered to exemplify differences between HH couples and LL couples. John, of John and Mary (HH), when speaking about his commitment to the relationship said, "I didn't want to say I was totally involved and not be. She was already involved, but I couldn't lie. I don't believe in that scene. Later I could tell her." Mary responded to this by saying, "I appreciated it as much as it made me somewhat nervous, not knowing." Had he not respected her and had a sense of integrity and security in his feelings, he might have said, "I love you." without being sure, thus decreasing her worth and his own.

Phil and Ellen (HH) explained how they are growing by being honest and respectful toward each other.

Ellen--Up until about three weeks ago I was kind of bothered by the fact that I was seeing very little of my friends. Mine are all uncoupled and his are all coupled, and we went out with them. I finally just went out with my friends without Phil and it felt really good, free.

Phil--Yeah, that was good. I used to feel that we had to like each other's friends, but less and less not.

Rather than harbor and build up resentment, Ellen acted in a fashion that was most validating for both. She in effect told Phil that she

respected him enough to be honest with him and respected herself enough not to deny her own needs. In turn, Phil may have felt that she was dealing honestly with him and may even have learned and may now be able to do more of the same with her.

The following interchange between Henry and Anne (LL) demonstrates lack of mutual validation of personal worth at several points.

Interviewer--(asked of Anne) Are you ever more practical than Henry?

Henry--I don't think so! Really!

Anne--Money, maybe.

Henry--Money?

Anne--Yeah!

Henry--Well, I save my money just as well as you do. You go out on a spree every now and then. Like your clothes.

Another example from Henry and Anne after the interviewer asked of Henry why he felt he can now tell his difficulties more readily to Anne.

Henry--I feel that I want to tell her now. I want to explain to her just what is bothering me.

Anne--That means you didn't want to before.

The first interchange seems to reflect a great deal of insecurity, and in an attempt to bolster their own esteems, they enter into competition and try to lower the qualities of the other. The second interchange seems to be a classic example of Berne's (1964) "Now I've got you, you son of a bitch."

Another LL couple, Bob and Louise:

Interviewer--How do you feel when she shares her problems with you?

Bob--I laugh. I think her problems are ridiculous.

Louise--(Chuckles softly) True, he laughs. If it really meant something to me I'd really get mad.

Bob--She tells me her problems whether I'm willing to listen or not.

Here Bob is obviously minimizing the importance of Louise's problems, thereby regarding her as trivial in some respects.

Hypothesis 5. High self-esteem couples will differ significantly from low self-esteem couples in intensity and quantity of affective expression. The direction of this difference was not predicted. This was the only two-directional hypothesis. The means of the two groups did not differ significantly ($t = .74$), and so the null hypothesis could not be rejected. It seems, therefore, that affect as defined in this study, did not differentiate between HH and LL couples. No interview examples will be presented for this variable. However, later in the discussion some examples regarding attitudes toward affect in relationships will be presented. (See Appendix M for scores on all variables for each of the 30 couples.)

This concludes direct presentation of the five hypotheses, and before discussing additional analyses concerning the variables and resulting patterns of intimacy, a brief discussion of the process recordings will be presented in order to compare process recordings with the judges' ratings of the variables that each process was designed to assess.

Process Recordings

The quantity of speaking ratio and the agreeing-disagreeing ratio were the only two processes that were significantly related to the judges' ratings of the same intimacy variable that they were designed

to assess. The quantity of speaking ratio was measured by dividing the number of personal pronouns that the male uttered by the number of personal pronouns uttered by both partners. This ratio was found to be positively related to the judges' ratings of the variable of role-flexibility. The more flexible the couple was judged to be, the more equal the amount of speaking done by both partners. The quantity of speaking ratio, just as the judges' ratings of role-flexibility, did not differentiate significantly between the two groups of self-esteem couples.

The agreeing-disagreeing ratio which was assessed by dividing the number of agreements by the number of agreements plus disagreement, was positively related to the judges' ratings of mutual validation of personal worth. The greater the mutual validation of personal worth of a couple the larger the agreeing-disagreeing ratio. This is not to say that couples rated high on mutual validation minimized disagreements in their relationship, but that on the whole they agreed more often than they disagreed in their interviews. As would be expected, the agreeing-disagreeing ratio differentiated significantly between the HH and LL couples, as did mutual validation of personal worth. (See Table 6 for specific r and t tests.) At this point, therefore, the process recordings designed for this study do not seem to be adequate indicators of the raw data that judges might have used to make their ratings.

Additional Analyses

In addition to testing the hypotheses, further analyses were conducted in order to determine what else the data had to offer in terms of suggestions for future explorations. These analyses are presented in

TABLE 6
 Summary of Process Recordings Analyses: Correlations with Intimacy
 Variables and Comparisons between High and Low
 Self-Esteem Couples

Intimacy Variable	Process Recording	Pearson r Relating Process to Intimacy Variable	t Test Comparing Process Means of the Two Groups
Mutuality ^a	Personal Pronoun Ratio	.05	.05
	First to Answer Ratio	-.11	.26
Role- Flexibility	Quantity of Speaking Ratio	-.44**	.27
	Agreeing Ratio	-.22	.28
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	Agreeing- Disagreeing Ratio	.43**	3.36**
	Simultaneous Speech	-.12	.74

^aHigh score indicates balance between fusion and separation.

** $p \leq .01$

three major sections. The first discusses correlations among all six variables. The second section explores each of the six variables as they are related to levels of involvement and the third as they are related to length of time dating.

Before continuing, the reader is cautioned that the following is much more speculative than the discussion of the hypotheses since the correlations were not predicted and the chance of finding statistically significant relationships increases as more and more analyses are performed.

Intercorrelations

Three extremely high correlations among the variables were found (See Table 7): the correlation between self-esteem and empathy, between empathy and mutual validation of personal worth, and between mutual validation of personal worth and role-flexibility. In light of their extremely high values these correlations will be discussed in some more detail in the next chapter.

More interestingly, by looking at Table 7, one can discern some pattern among the correlations. It seems that empathy and mutual validation of personal worth were significantly related to all other variables, as well as to each other. All other variables, however, were only related to empathy and mutual validation of personal worth. Since empathy and mutual validation of personal worth were arrived at by two completely different measures (Empathy was assessed by self-reporting questionnaires and mutual validation of personal worth by judges' ratings of interviews.), it seems unlikely that they were merely reflections of the same single psychological process.

This consistency among the correlations suggested the possibility

TABLE 7
 Correlations among Variables Studied, Based
 upon 30 Couples' Scores

Variable	Empathy	Mutuality ^b	Role-Flexibility	Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	Affect
Self-Esteem ^a	.66**	.07	.04	.40*	.18
Empathy		.32*	.32*	.70**	.38*
Mutuality ^b			.14	.37*	.03
Role-Flexibility				.71**	.29
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth					.47**

^aBiserial r was used to determine relationships between self-esteem and other variables, since a couple's self-esteem score was presented as either high or low.

^bThis measure of mutuality indicates a balance between fusion and separation.

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$

of different patterns of intimacy. Four are mentioned and will be discussed in the next chapter. These four consist of three significantly intercorrelated variables each. That is, if a couple scored high on one of the three variables or low on one of the three within a particular pattern, it tended to score high or low respectively on the other two variables in the patterns. The four patterns are:

1. empathy, self-esteem, mutual validation of personal worth
2. empathy, role-flexibility, mutual validation of personal worth
3. empathy, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth
4. empathy, affect, mutual validation of personal worth

Levels of Involvement

Levels of dating involvement (dating casually, dating exclusively, considered their future as a couple, and engaged) were treated as discrete categories, rather than as a continuous variable with a normal distribution. Table 8 presents the means of the intimacy variables, self-esteem and dating length for each level of involvement. A coefficient of concordance, corrected for discontinuity ($W = .54, p \leq .05$), suggested that these couples who ranked high on one of the intimacy variables or self-esteem (dating length was not included) also tended to rank high on all other variables. According to this ordinal analysis, couples who have seriously considered their future as a couple tend to rank consistently higher on all variables than the other groups of couples. Those who are dating exclusively, but have not seriously considered their future as a couple, rank next, then dating casually and finally those who are engaged. If self-esteem is discounted, according to rankings, the dating exclusively and considered future groups rank closely together and the dating casually and engaged groups seem to rank closely

together. The implications for this will be discussed in the next chapter.

Length of Time Dating

By determining correlation coefficients between dating length in months and each of the other variables, several statistically significant findings emerged. Dating length was positively related to mutuality ($r = .34$, $p \leq .05$) when mutuality was defined as a balance between separation and fusion. However, when raw mutuality was used (mutuality as indicative of fusion: a high score indicating fusion, a low score indicating separation), no significant relationships was found. (See Table 9 for exact values.) This suggests that as partners are involved with each other over an extended period of time, they tend toward a balance between separation and mutuality. The low correlation between raw scores and dating length, suggests that they do not go from more separation to more mutuality, or from more mutuality to more separation, but from wherever they started they go toward a balance.

Two further significant findings were the negative correlation between dating length and affect ($r = -.52$, $p \leq .01$) and dating length and empathy ($r = -.37$, $p \leq .05$). The former suggests that couples begin at a more exciting level, both positive and negative, and tend toward a more subdued or lesser emotionally charged type of relationship. The latter suggests that as a couple remains together over a period of time, the empathy displayed between them decreases. An additional important finding was that levels of involvement and dating length were not significantly related ($F = 1.94$ with 3 and 26 degrees of freedom). Apparently lengthy dating does not automatically lead to engagement and eventually marriage. The implications of this finding and others will be discussed in the next chapter.

TABLE 8
 Mean Scores on Each Intimacy Variable, Self-Esteem and
 Dating Length for Four Levels of
 Dating Involvement

	Levels of Involvement			
	Dating Casually (n=7)	Dating Exclusively (n=8)	Considered Their Future as a Couple (n=8)	Engaged (n=6)
Self-Esteem ^a	71.00	44.00	63.00	17.00
Empathy	65.83	66.89	77.75	64.29
Role-Flexibility	3.21	2.94	3.57	3.08
Mutuality ^b	2.80	2.83	3.32	3.17
Mutuality ^c	.79	1.50	1.44	1.33
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	3.29	3.94	3.81	3.33
Affect	3.07	3.17	3.31	2.70
Dating Length (Months)	31.14	14.89	17.38	35.00

^aPercent of high self-esteem couples.

^bHigh scores indicates fusion.

^cHigh scores indicates balance between fusion and separation.

TABLE 9
 Correlations between Dating Length (Months) and
 Measures of Self-Esteem and Intimacy
 (N = 30)

Variable	<u>r</u>
Self-Esteem ^a	.11
Empathy	-.37*
Mutuality ^b	.34*
Mutuality ^c	.00
Role-Flexibility	.04
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	-.24
Affect	-.52**

^abi serial correlation

^bHigh score indicates balance between separation and fusion.

^cHigh score indicates fusion.

*P ≤ .05 **P ≤ .01

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Both theory and prior research predicted that couples high in self-esteem would also score high in empathy and in mutual validation of personal worth. For example, Weiss (1960), as presented in the review chapter of this paper, assumed that in order for someone to empathize with another, one has to have relatively strong ego boundaries so that the process does not become one of identification. Modell (1968) assumed that one must be able to "lose" him/herself in the one being empathized with, without fear of loss of self. Both assumptions have gained support from the current study. Couples with high self-esteem, and the related autonomy (Shapiro, 1965), have the ability to maintain ego boundaries as well as the ability to release them at times, and thus can engage in empathic behavior.

The data concerning empathy also support the empirical findings of Fiedler & Senior (1952) and Stotland & Dunn (1963) who found a positive relationship between self-esteem and empathy.

The relationship between self-esteem and empathy might be summarized as follows: One needs self-esteem in order to express oneself accurately and willingly. The reverse is also true. In order to have a relatively accurate self-appraisal, one that is affected by how a person thinks others see him/her, one has to be accurate in interpreting the others' responses directed at him and/or relating to him. This involves empathy, which was suggestively relabeled as understanding earlier in this paper. The two, therefore, seem to go hand in hand.

Regarding mutual validation of personal worth, the current study supports the empirical findings of Sheerer (1949), Berger (1952) and

Stock (1949), each having found a positive correlation between self-esteem and acceptance of others. As pointed out by Hartmann (1958) and Blanck & Blanck (1968), anxiety-free or conflict-free interaction, a consequence of self-esteem, should result in acceptance of others. The data confirm this expectation.

In order to accept, trust and respect others, one first needs to accept, trust and respect oneself. In return, one's self-esteem may be a consequence of someone else's evaluation. So, if an important person sees you as trustworthy, worthy of respect, and accepts you for what you are, you may feel similarly about yourself. It is also possible that high self-esteem in a person results in another also esteeming him. This is the self as object of value, according to Symonds (1951). The two, therefore, are very much intertwined. As one increases, the other increases, and as one decreases so does the other.

The lack of differentiation between the two groups of couples on the variable of mutuality was not very helpful in clarifying the relationship between the theoretical balance, arrived at by some mixture of interdependence or fusion and independence or separation. (Erikson, 1959; Blanck & Blanck, 1968; Fromm, 1960; or Weiss, 1960) and self-esteem. According to the earlier discussion of mutuality, self-esteem would be expected to play an important role in establishing some "ideal" level of mutuality. However, the data indicate that self-esteem does not seem to be related to the level of mutuality chosen by couples.

One problem may be that of translating a hypothetical construct into something which is empirically verifiable. Or, perhaps the concept of "ideal mutuality", just as "ideal mental health" is a myth. The measure of balance used in the current study assumed that high self-esteem couples

would have closer to a 50-50 balance between total fusion and total separation than low self-esteem couples. This balance or any preconceived balance, however, may be an artificial one.

This study seems to indicate that while not at either extreme of fusion or complete separation, high self-esteem partners may choose to share a great deal in each others' lives, or they may choose to remain quite separate. The vital and the devitalized couples described by Cuber & Haroff (1962) may be taken as examples of the above two possibilities. Perhaps the major differentiation between the two groups of couples in this study is a matter of freedom of choice. A low self-esteem couple may become locked into a 50-50 relationship; one partner may want greater mutuality but cannot achieve it for fear of loss of self, another partner may want greater separation but cannot achieve it for fear of loss of the partner. A high self-esteem couple, on the other hand, may have the freedom to find that level of mutuality that is most comfortable for both partners, be it a great deal or relatively little. The interview examples given within the presentation of the hypothesis dealing with mutuality suggested something like this, and the point was made then that high self-esteem couples may have greater freedom of choice.

The lack of differentiation between the two groups of couples on the variable of role-flexibility may be due, in part, to the self-esteem assessment technique used in the current study. Self-reports are easily influenced by the wish (conscious and/or unconscious) to play certain roles. We must assume that such influence invaded the responses of some subjects, but not all.

Thus, the general self-esteem measured by the instrument in this

study might have been partially determined by some subjects' self-assessed success or failure in fulfilling specific roles. The self as a system of activities (Symonds, 1951) may have been some subjects' main mode of self-assessment. Partners that are very much locked into specific roles in relation to each other, and see themselves as fulfilling these roles successfully, may score high on self-esteem but low on role-flexibility, because any change in their roles would reduce their feelings of self-esteem.

It is also possible that low self-esteem partners create a dating situation in which they can be as flexible or inflexible as high self-esteem partners are in their created environment. For example, the low self-esteem couple mentioned in the results chapter (Bob and Louise) might eventually be forced by necessity to change; he being forced to adapt to her needs for fear of losing her, and she to his for fear of losing him. Neither may be doing so with a sense of autonomy but each engage in behavior which to an outside observer appears to be flexible. The question, then, of the role of self-esteem in the process of mutual satisfaction of needs and the requisite flexibility (Sullivan, 1953) remains unanswered.

Affect, as dealt with in this study, was defined mainly in terms of intensity and quantity. Positive and negative affect were grouped together. It is quite possible that no differentiation between the two groups of couples was found because of the lack of finer distinctions among types of affect. One might suspect, for example, that a separation into positive and negative affect would produce some differences. A couple with high self-esteem might be more likely to display a predominance of positive affect with varying degrees of intensity. A couple with

low self-esteem would probably be more likely to demonstrate a predominance of negative affect with varying degrees of intensity. Even this is not very clear because low self-esteem couples might avoid negative affect for fear of endangering the relationship and feelings about self that they have. It seems likely, however, that high self-esteem would be positively related to positive affect. Some support for this may be seen in that most couples interviewed seemed to display positive affect (This by recollection of the interviewer only.), and a slight, though not significant relationship, was found between self-esteem and affect.

Having discussed each of the five hypotheses, the author will now attempt to deal in greater detail with the intercorrelations among all six variables. As pointed out in the previous chapter, very high correlations were found between self-esteem and empathy, between empathy and mutual validation of personal worth, and between mutual validation of personal worth and role-flexibility. The relationships between self-esteem and empathy has already been discussed, and so only the others will be briefly discussed.

Regarding empathy and mutual validation of personal worth, one may say that in order to respect someone for what he is, to trust him/her, one has to understand him accurately. In turn, in order to even care to understand someone or empathize with them, and particularly to communicate this understanding, some respect and trust for the other has to exist. The two processes seem to be very much intertwined. This was discussed in some detail in the review chapter (Rogers, 1951; Fromm, 1939; Kaiser, 1965). Kaiser (1965), for example, stated that autonomous behavior is encouraged when judgement is minimized, and one cannot

empathize and judge at the same time. The current study, then, supports the above authors' views.

One can say that empathy is necessary for mutual validation of personal worth and it is necessary for empathy, without saying which causes or leads to the other, that is, where the circle begins. One couple very clearly explained the interdependence of these two processes. They stated that whenever one of them did something the other disagreed with, they relied on their respect and trust for each other. The respect and trust gave them the ability to say, "He/she must have good reason." Empathy, in turn, enabled them to determine what might have prompted the action. Without the validation of personal worth, the empathy might not have occurred. Without empathy, the respect might not have existed. Each is necessary for the other.

The very high correlation between mutual validation of personal worth and role-flexibility is also of interest. It suggests that in order to allow someone to be what he/she wants to be and sometimes has to be, one needs to respect that other's choices as worthy. This includes the feeling that the other is occupying roles that are best for both, that the adopted roles have included thought about the effect they may have on both. That is, trust is required. In turn, in order to mutually validate each other's personal worth, partners in a relationship must be flexible in the roles they take. Again, each is necessary for the other, and they coexist side by side. Sullivan's (1953) concept of collaboration seems to receive support; that mutually validating behavior and role-flexibility are interdependent.

For example, if the female partner needs the reassurance that what she has done is worthy of her, the male partner must be flexible enough

to be the reassurer. Later he may need reassurance himself, the asking for and receiving of which requires flexibility by both partners. This role-flexibility also validates the worth of each partner. Her worth is validated in that he tells her she is worthy and his worth is validated because she trusts him enough to feel reassured by what he says.

Some of the confusion encountered in attempting to relate the data of this study to theory can be reduced by looking further at the intercorrelations among the six variables. The clarification that follows is speculative. As pointed out in the previous chapter, mutual validation of personal worth was related significantly to all other variables, whereas, self-esteem was related only to empathy and mutual validation of personal worth.

If one looks more closely at the presentation of theory in the review chapter, one can note that many of the processes described seem to be interpersonal, while self-esteem, as measured in this study, is an intrapsychic, phenomenological variable. Mutual validation of personal worth may be a more objective, interpersonal indicator of self-esteem. Those couples who demonstrate high mutual validation of personal worth act as high self-esteem partners are theoretically expected to, and the assessment was made by someone other than the persons themselves. The measure is derived from interpersonal behavior, whereas self-assessment is very much dependent upon subjective internal criteria.

If mutually validating behavior is used as the measure of self-esteem, much of the theory presented in the review chapter receives support. Buber (1958), Erikson (1959), Blanck & Blanck (1968), Weiss (1960) and others spoke of behavior that results in some balance between fusion

and separateness. One fuses with or separates from another by acting in a certain manner (unless you include symbolic fusion or separation). Without mutually validating behavior, no interpersonal balance can be achieved.

The same holds for role-flexibility. Since role-flexibility was assessed from a sample of behavior, relating it to another sample of interpersonal behavior, like mutually validating behavior, may be more accurate than relating it to the phenomenologically determined variable of self-esteem, as assessed in the current study. In fact, at the end of the literature review section of this paper, the author elaborated upon the relationship between Hartmann's (1958) concept of conflict-free ego functioning and Shapiro's (1965) concept of autonomy by using behavioral terms rather than phenomenological ones. Relating one set of objectively verifiable behaviors to other verifiable behaviors may be more accurate than relating phenomenological interpretations of behaviors.

The point of this discussion is that mutual validation of personal worth may be seen as an objective measure of interpersonal behavior reflecting self-esteem. Self-esteem, however, as measured in this study, was not dependent upon behavior that was objectively verifiable. Therefore, what was assumed to be a measure of self-esteem may not have been a reflection of the total picture, but only a partially accurate one; the self as perceived by the individual (Symonds, 1951).

Additional discussion about the intercorrelations is presented because of the potential they present for future research. The following borders on a discussion of causality, which the data do not in actuality permit, but some license is taken.

Since self-esteem was related only to empathy and mutual validation of personal worth but empathy and mutual validation of personal worth were both related to all variables, the following sequence might be hypothesized. In order for a couple to be empathic and mutually validating it is necessary for the partners to have self-esteem and vice-versa. However, self-esteem alone is not sufficient for a couple to be rated high on the variables of role-flexibility, mutuality and affect. Empathy and mutual validation, on the other hand, are necessary and sufficient for the couple to be rated high on at least one other variable. Each variable in turn enhances empathy and mutual validation of personal worth.

This suggests that self-esteem, empathy and mutual validation of personal worth are very much interrelated, however, mainly the process of empathy and mutual validation of personal worth, which are measures of interpersonal behaviors, determine partners' flexibility, mutuality and affectivity. That is, self-esteem, which is a measure of intrapersonal processes, may be indirectly related to the three variables via the processes of empathy and mutual validation. It is possible to see empathy and mutual validation as modes of communication which influence and are in turn influenced by the degrees and types of self-esteem, role-flexibility, mutuality and affect, each independently of the other. Using this type of reasoning would make the theory discussed earlier consistent with the data of this study, with the modification of theory that self-esteem may play an integral but indirect role in intimate behavior.

An analogy is offered with the caution that comparisons between psychological processes and non-psychological processes are always somewhat strained. Someone may be a generally good athlete, however, general

ability may not be directly related to skill in a particular sport. The processes of practice and exercise may be directly related to skill in a particular sport. In order for practice and exercise to be effective some general ability must also exist, and the practice and exercise in turn enhance further the general ability. So, all three exist together, but only practice and exercise are directly related to skill in a specific sport. Likewise, self-esteem, mutual validation of personal worth and empathy exist together but only mutual validation of personal worth and empathy (interpersonal) are directly related to the variables of role-flexibility, mutuality and affect (also interpersonal).

This sort of thinking leads to a variety of possibilities. One might hypothesize that each couple has a limited amount of energy that can be used to deal with the myriad of issues which arise in an interpersonal relationship. The amount of energy, which for lack of a better term, might be called psychic energy, varies from person to person and couple to couple. Using this concept it is possible to see that each couple may be able to deal with only three of the studied variables at a time. Two of them being always empathy and mutual validation of personal worth. A few exceptions may be able to deal with more or less. The comparison with the athlete may be continued by pointing out that most become good at only one sport because of the exertion required by practice and exercise, and it is the rare athlete who becomes a professional in more than one sport. A comparison of the limited energy concept might be made with Toffler's (1970) concept of modular relationships, in which only certain aspects of rather than the total personality of an individual are dealt with in our day to day relationships with most people.

In the area of affect, the concept of limited energy or the need to deal with modules seems most clear. If a couple were to deal with the variable of affect to the extreme of maintaining constant excitement the drain would be tremendous. In order to maintain a relationship that has its continual "ups and downs", a continual high intensity of emotion may leave little for other aspects of a relationship. Dealing with surprises and the unknown can require a great deal of energy. This seems to be indicated by the significant decrease in affect as dating length increases and the sudden though not significant decrease in affect between those couples who had seriously considered the future and those who were engaged. With the new type of involvement, new areas of concern present themselves. To try to deal with them and continue the intensity found at the previous level of involvement might result in serious difficulty.

Two couples briefly discussed this aspect of their relationship. John of John and Mary (HH), for example, said, "The excitement is always there because we just flip over each other. But when you're with each other for a long time the excitement can't sustain itself for that long, in the sense that we can always get it up when we want to get it up (chuckle), but we don't stay there all the time." Another couple, Phil and Ellen (HH) described the change in affect this way. Ellen said, "I think at the beginning of the relationship there were times when we got into really insecure heads. I would think, 'what if I lose him,' and get really down. Then I'd get really high when he convinced me how much he loved me. That doesn't happen anymore. Our moods are much more stable."

Additional support comes from the finding that empathy was also

negatively related to dating length. This suggests that perhaps couples channel their energies into other areas of exploration and development after having achieved certain levels of comfort with one aspect of the relationship. Unfortunately, it seems that those areas which couples have dealt with successfully and have now turned away from, seem to suffer rather than remain at the same level of functioning.

It is possible that some sort of developmental process exists, wherein peaks and valleys for each variable may be found. That is, rather than dealing on an equal level with all six variables as a relationship progresses, couples deal with mainly three at a time, and while some are being dealt with others are being ignored.

The finding presented in the previous chapter suggested that casually dating couples and engaged couples ranked about equally on each of the intimacy variables, while dating exclusively and considered the future seriously couples ranked about equally. This seems to hint at a developmental sequence which approaches an approximation of "ideal intimacy" and then departs from it. Initial results of an undergraduate class project in a psychology course taught by the writer, suggest that overt display of affectionate behavior peaks in frequency during the second year of the exclusively dating period and decreases thereafter.

Some questions that might be asked concerning the above are: Is the similarity between casually dating couples and engaged couples due to a temporary regression on the part of the engaged couples to some of the behavior displayed during earlier periods of involvement? Perhaps role-confusion or a re-analysis of the relationships brought about by commitment to marriage produces changes. Response availability of the casually dating behavior is greatest since it was probably engaged in

for a relatively long period of time. Another possibility is that now that the culturally prescribed behavior of engagement has been performed, there may be a tendency to try to satisfy other culturally prescribed behaviors that go along with engagement. Rather than adapting to each other, some partners may now try to adapt to preconceived notions and become confused as to what should now happen.

This seems a good possibility considering the revolutionary social changes occurring today. The alternatives before marriage, to marriage and within marriage in today's American society have increased tremendously (Rogers, 1972). The change in pre-marital sex standards (Reiss, 1969) might be taken as a case in point. Though Reiss suggested that he does not see a comprehensive overall sexual revolution, he does see some change in attitudes toward sex as well as some changes, to a lesser extent, in behavior. This depends, in part, upon a person's independence from extended family involvement and socio-cultural setting, according to Reiss (1969). The conflict between family pressures and courtship pressures regarding sexual behavior may easily be seen as also existing in regard to other behaviors. The women's liberation movement could be confusing and become crucial when partners decide to join in marriage.

The possibility of confusion and fluctuation rather than steady development may also be seen in the lack of correlation between length of time dating and level of involvement, found in this study. This may be looked at as a consequence of anomie. Preset patterns or sequences of events are no longer available. Couples may, therefore, become locked into a relationship which remains at one level of involvement because it is comfortable and further development is not clearly defined. Or, they

may jump into old patterns and go through them very quickly, again, with some loss of clarity, as to exactly how and at what rate they should proceed.

The lack of correlation between length of time dating and levels of involvement, however, may also be viewed in a positive way. It suggests that the generation of dating couples represented by the sample in this study do not feel compelled to follow any prescribed order of events such as a few months of casual, then exclusive dating, then engagement, and finally marriage. It is possible that they may be free enough to maintain a casual relationships for an extended period of time without feeling pressure to either dissolve it as not "natural" or unproductive or advancing to a further stage.

Rogers (1972, p. 8) wrote, "It is becoming increasingly clear that a man-woman relationship will have permanence only to the degree to which it satisfies the emotional, psychological, intellectual, and physical needs of the partners." He further predicted for the year 2,000, and said this may already be true to some extent today, "The dissolving of the union may be painful, but it is not a social catastrophe, and the experience may be a necessary step in the personal growth of the two individuals toward greater maturity (p. 9)." Thus, the findings concerning dating length and levels of involvement may be interpreted as being signs of either constructive or destructive changes in our society.

Limitations of Study

Probably the most apparent limitation of this study is the relatively small size and the non-representativeness of the sample. Social class and religion were the two most obvious demographic variables that suggested non-representativeness. The sample in this study consisted

mainly of middle and lower middle class couples and mainly of Catholics and Jews who lived in an urban setting. In addition, the majority of subjects were attending or had attended college. Therefore, extrapolation to dating couples in general must be made with extreme caution. This study should be viewed as exploratory in nature.

Some further limits might be a function of the assessment techniques used. Self-reporting questionnaires have built in limitations in terms of honesty of responses and the tapping of a representative sample of items from the possible universe of items. Interviews have similar drawbacks. What sort of facades (conscious or unconscious) might have been presented? How different from a natural setting is the interview situation?

In addition, the amount of information available for making ratings on the intimacy variables of role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect may not have been equal. For example, mutual validation of personal worth may have been rated from the entire interview, while role-flexibility may have been rated from only that part of the interview dealing specifically with the amount of sharing that occurs within the relationship. That is, the amount of interview material available may have varied somewhat among the four intimacy variables. Future studies should take this difficulty into account.

A potential limitation in interpreting the findings is due to the greater range of self-esteem scores for low self-esteem couples than for the high self-esteem couples. The low self-esteem couples' range of scores was twice as great as that for high self-esteem couples (18 vs. 9). Many of the low self-esteem couples were actually quite close to being high self-esteem couples, that is, they were only a few points from the

median that was used as the cut-off point to distinguish between high and low self-esteem. Practically speaking, therefore, the low self-esteem couples could be seen as a mixture of almost high self-esteem couples and truly low self-esteem couples. This might, in part, account for the relatively few statistically significant differences between the two groups of couples. The relatively small variances of the four intimacy variables might also have reduced the number of significant or perhaps more definitive findings. This sort of difficulty could be dealt with in future research by using groups of couples at greater extremes of self-esteem, with a larger gap between them, and allowing for a larger number of response choices for the judges' ratings for the four intimacy variables. More suggestions will be offered in the section titled "Suggestions for Further Research."

Related to this is the negatively skewed distribution of the self-esteem scores, and the greater variance on all intimacy variables of the low self-esteem couples. Though only for self-esteem was the difference in variance statistically significant ($F = 5.66, p \leq .01$), the trend can be seen in Table 5. The differences are probably due to the greater variety of couples represented by the low self-esteem group. None of the distributions, however, deviated significantly from a normal distribution; based upon χ^2 analyses for goodness of fit. The exact effect of these distributions on the results is not clear. Since the t test is a robust test, minor deviations from its mathematical assumptions are not crucial, particularly if sample sizes are equal. ". . . for samples of equal size relatively big differences in the population variances seem to have relatively small consequences for the conclusions derived from a t test (Hayes, 1963)." Future research should attempt to

avoid this sort of potential difficulty, by attempting to equalize ranges and variances in the independent variable.

An additional limitation, which is probably inherent in any exploratory study involves the choice of variables. First, are they the ones most crucial to an understanding of intimacy? Second, have they been defined too grossly (this is related to the small variances), thereby hiding finer distinctions among couples?

One final limitation, though an intentional one, is the criteria used to chose subjects. Only those relationships within which both partners had relatively high self-esteem or both had relatively low self-esteem were examined. What about mixed self-esteem couples, that is high-low or low-high? What about those at the two extremes of self-esteem in contrast to those in the middle? These are questions for future exploration.

Conclusions

Considering the limitations mentioned above, a number of tentative conclusions can be stated:

1. The self-esteem of dating partners, and probably of any two people in close contact, is positively related to the empathic skill displayed by the partners toward each other and to the process of mutual validation of personal worth. Both the theoretical formulations and the empirical findings of others, thereby received support and confirmation;
2. The relationships between self-esteem and role-flexibility, self-esteem and mutuality and self-esteem and affect were not statistically significant and so the hypotheses derived from theory were not confirmed. However the possibility of indirect involvement was suggested;
3. The process recordings developed for this study do not seem to

be indicative of the raw data that the judges used in making their ratings of the intimacy variables assessed in this study.

4. The intercorrelations among the study variables seemed to suggest an important area for future research and hold promise for greater clarification of interrelationships among interpersonal behaviors important to intimacy.

Suggestions for Further Research

Certainly the role of self-esteem in intimate relationships has by no means been exhaustively explored. Possibly some factor analytic study separating self-esteem into its various components and relating each of these components to various aspects of intimacy would shed more light on some of the questions asked in the discussion. An example might be, the self as a system of activities and its relationship to role-flexibility. Another possibility might be to assess the self as seen by others and its relationship to any of the intimacy variables; a look at differences among and similarities between the phenomenological selves and objectives selves, and their relationships with the intimacy variables.

A further study might deal with mixed couples, that is those wherein one partner has low and the other high self-esteem. This might be helpful in answering such questions as: Is the self-esteem of an individual related to his own general acceptance of others, general empathic ability, general role-flexibility, or affectivity? How is this manifested in intimate relationships? That is, what happens when he becomes intimate? Are the same skills or attributes apparent to the same, lesser or greater extent depending upon the self-esteem of the partner?

In addition, finer distinctions might be used. That is, rather than

grouping couples on the basis of high, low or even high, middle, low, actual self-esteem scores could be used to see what combinations of male and female scores produce what kind of intimate relationships. These finer distinctions may produce findings that differ from those of the current study.

To explore the possibility of developmental fluctuations, a longitudinal or cross-sectional study of some magnitude might be conducted to see which variables change over time or as levels of involvement change. Some questions that might be asked are: Do the patterns for an individual couple change? We already suspect that single variables change, e.g. empathy and affect decreased significantly over time. What about patterns, however?

Probably the most interesting questions raised were those concerning the intercorrelations. A possible study might be simply to repeat the current one, with a larger sample. In addition a larger number of variables might be incorporated, such as styles of adapting to the environment (e.g. alloplastic, autoplatic or leaving the situation). This might help to find other variables that fall into the suspected groupings of intercorrelated variables, thus, perhaps shedding some light on what within each of the groupings unifies the variables.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether patterns of intimacy within dating relationships were related to the self-esteem of the partners. Specific predictions concerning differences between high self-esteem and low self-esteem couples were made with regard to five variables in the intimacy domain: empathy, role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect.

Subjects consisted of two groups of dating couples, each group containing 15 couples. In one set of couples both partners had relatively low self-esteem, and in the other set both partners had relatively high self-esteem. The relative self-esteem standings were determined on the basis of median scores for males and females separately. Subjects were recruited from undergraduate classes at various colleges and universities in the New York City area.

The independent variable of self-esteem and the dependent variable of empathy were both assessed from a self-report questionnaire, consisting of a modified version of Laing, Phillipson & Lee's (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method. Self-esteem was measured by responses to 18 self-referent statements with four response choices. Empathy was measured by comparing partners' responses to 92 questions. The dependent variables of role-flexibility, mutuality, mutual validation of personal worth and affect were assessed from tape recorded joint interviews with each couple. Scores for each variable were determined by averaging two judges' ratings made on a five point scale. These variables were also assessed via process recordings taken from the taped interviews. Each of six processes was hypothesized to be reflective of a specific intimacy

variable.

The results indicated that high self-esteem partners were significantly more empathic toward each other and were significantly more mutually validating than low self-esteem partners. The variables of role-flexibility, mutuality and affect did not significantly differentiate between the two groups of couples. Interview material was presented to exemplify the findings.

Two processes were significantly related to the judges' rating. These were the quantity of speaking ratio and the agreeing-disagreeing ratio. The first was reflective of role-flexibility and the second of mutual validation of personal worth. Only the second differentiated significantly between the two groups of couples, with high self-esteem couples demonstrating a larger proportion of agreements than low self-esteem couples. The conclusion concerning process recordings was that they did not seem to be adequate indicators of the raw data that the judges used in making their ratings.

Additional analyses suggested that both empathy and mutual validation of personal worth were related to the four variables of self-esteem, role-flexibility, mutuality and affect, as well as to each other; the four variables, however, were related only to empathy and mutual validation of personal worth, and not each other. The analyses also indicated the existence of possible groupings among the study variables, and four such groupings, each based upon three significantly intercorrelated variables were discussed.

Further discussion included tentative explanations for the findings concerning each of the hypotheses and the additional analyses, a discussion of the limitations of this study, a short presentation of conclusions,

and suggestions for further research. The major implication from the results of this study were that the concept of intimacy, just as any other concept must be looked at in terms of what really exists, perhaps in terms of types of interpersonal relationships, like the four suggested, rather than what ideally exists. Some speculation about an indirect relationship between self-esteem and the intimacy variables was presented. Changing modules within relationships and limited psychic energy were also mentioned as possible explanations for some of the findings. Finally, the existence of some developmental sequence in intimate processes was suggested.

Appendix A

Literature given undergraduate faculty members. This includes a letter of introduction describing the study (Appendix A1), and the explanation instructors were asked to read to their students when asking for volunteers (Appendix A2).

Appendix A1

To: Undergraduate Faculty Fall, 1971
 From: Rudy Schroeer (212) 365-0129 Third year graduate student in
 Clinical Psychology at CUNY

I am currently engaged in Ph.D. dissertation research and am requesting your help in asking for volunteers. Since I am on internship and there is a great number of you, I must resort to writing you this note, rather than speaking to each of you personally.

My study concerns intimate (not physically) relationships as they are manifested in college-age dating couples. (Should you have any questions concerning the ethics of my research, you may contact Drs. Engel, Nechin, Hertzman, Gould or Lynch of CCNY.) As the attached sheet of explanations describes, the study consists of two parts. Your help is requested in asking for volunteers for the first part. The entire process should take you between five and ten minutes, at the most, since the volunteers will not be filling out any forms in your classes. All I ask of you is that you read the attached explanations to your classes, and hand out the envelopes to those students who volunteer. I have put this letter into every mailbox, including actual faculty and teaching or course assistant boxes. I would like to recommend that in the case of large lecture classes with several smaller recitation classes or labs, that the volunteers be asked for in the smaller classes. I suggest that you take about 10 pairs of envelopes with you to class, depending on the size of your classes.

Since I am asking for the help of faculty members from several disciplines, you will have to ask the secretary of your discipline where the envelopes are. You may take as many as needed.

Any help you can offer (even if only one or two couples per class) will be greatly appreciated. In advance, thank you very much for any help.

Please print your name and check one or more of the following, and return to my box:

Your name: _____

1. I will hand out the envelopes in my classes: _____
2. I would like to hand out the forms, but would like some more information concerning the study first: _____

You can call me by telephone: Tel. No. _____

Days and times: _____

3. I would rather not hand out the forms myself, but would be willing to give you class time: (several choices, if possible, of when and where)

4. I would rather not participate at all: _____

5. Other: _____

Appendix A2

To the faculty member: Explanation for asking for volunteers.

1. Identify me. I'm a third year graduate Clinical Psychology student. My name and telephone number are inside the envelopes, as well as further explanation for them.
2. Purpose of study: How dating couples (including engaged, but not married) look at their relationship. How they see themselves, their partners, and the relationship they have created. It is not a sex survey.
3. I cannot pay money, but it should be interesting for them, in that they will be discussing themselves, and a relationships which I assume is important to them.
4. Entirely confidential. Name and telephone numbers are requested only so that I can contact them by telephone to arrange for interviews. You, the instructor, will never see what they have said, and have no involvement with the study.
5. Study consists of two parts.
 - A. Answering the questionnaire and the personal information forms which are in the envelopes you will be handing out. These are to be filled out at home, not in your class. (They should fill them out without discussing them with their partners, until they have both filled them out. Then they can discuss them, without changing any answers, of course.) There are two envelopes for each couple (one for the male partner and one for the female partner, identified with M and F.) This part should take about half an hour.
 - B. A one hour interview with each couple separately. They will be contacted by telephone for arrangements.
6. Ask them to return the envelopes to the Psych., Soc., etc. (depending on the courses you are teaching) office and ask the secretary where to put them. If they decide not to participate, ask them to return the unanswered forms anyway, so that I can use them with another couple.
7. Since they represent just one half of a dating couple, tell them if they want to participate, but are not sure that their partner will want to, to take two envelopes anyway, and then if the partner says no, return the unanswered forms.
8. When you hand out the envelopes, make sure that the numbers on the two envelopes for each couple are the same. The envelopes have already been paired.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, I REALLY APPRECIATE THE TIME!

Rudy Schroeer

Appendices B through D3

These include all the materials subjects were given as they volunteered in class to participate in the study. The contents were in a sealable envelope.

Appendix B

General Introduction

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. I feel certain that you will find the project interesting and well worth your while. All information that you give is entirely confidential.

The study is a Ph.D. dissertation being conducted by Rudy Schroeer who is a fourth year graduate student in Clinical Psychology. Should you have any questions at any time you may reach him evenings at (212)365-0129.

The purpose of the study is to explore the unique ways that men and women pattern their relationships, in terms of values, goals and so on. Part one of the study consists of filling out the Personal Information sheet and the Questionnaire. Based upon your responses to part one and on a random basis some couples will be contacted by telephone sometime this term to participate in a one hour interview (each couple separately). You may participate in part one only, if you do not want to be interviewed, by leaving out your name and telephone number on the Personal Information sheet. Or you may decide not to participate at all. In that case, please return the unanswered forms, as I have only a limited number and will use them with another couple.

PLEASE RETURN ALL THE MATERIALS, AS THERE ARE ONLY A LIMITED NUMBER AVAILABLE!

Important: Answer your set of questions without consulting your dating partner. However, after you have completed them, feel free to discuss your answers, without changing any, of course.

If at all possible, try to return the forms in the envelopes within a week to my box.

Thank you again.

Rudy Schroeer

Appendix C

Personal Information

Please fill out the following items as accurately as possible (please print). If you do not wish to continue with the second part of the study (interview) skip names and telephone numbers, but fill out the rest of the items, as well as the Questionnaire. (What you say here will be treated with complete confidentiality, your partner will not know what you have said, unless you yourself tell him/her.)

1. Your name: _____ 2. Telephone number: _____
 3. Partner's name: _____ 4. Telephone number: _____

The remaining questions refer to you only.

5. Age: _____ 6. Sex: _____
 7. Number of years in college: _____ 8. Major: _____
 9. Length of time you have been dating your partner: _____
 10. Average number of times you see each other per week or month (please specify), not counting in classes: _____
 11. Do you consider yourselves to be dating casually or seriously:
 Casually: _____ Seriously: _____
 12. Do you date your partner exclusively? Yes: _____ No: _____ If no, to what extent do you date others? Rarely: _____ Occasionally: _____ Often: _____
 13. Have you talked to each other about future plans as a couple? Yes: _____ No: _____
 If yes, how serious were your discussions? Serious: _____ Casual: _____
 If yes, have you made plans: Yes: _____ No: _____
 If yes, have you announced your plans or intentions to anyone?
 Yes: _____ No: _____ To whom? _____
 14. Are you engaged to your dating partner: Yes: _____ No: _____
 15. Religion you were brought up with: _____
 16. Are you practicing any religion now? Yes: _____ No: _____
 If yes, which religion? _____ How seriously? Casually: _____
 Seriously: _____
 17. Education of parents: Mother: _____ Father: _____
 18. Occupation of parents: Mother: _____ Father: _____
 (Please be as specific with occupations as you can.)

Appendix D

Instructions to volunteers for responding to the modified Interpersonal Perception Method (Appendix D1), one sample answer form (Appendix D2), and a set of questions for the male (Appendix D3).

INSTRUCTIONS

Read each question and mark the answer form thus (✓) to show how true you think each statement is:

	‡	+	-	=	?
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					

Answer Form

If you feel the statement is very true, put a mark in column ‡

If it is slightly true, put a mark in column +

If it is slightly untrue, put a mark in column -

If it is very untrue, put a mark in column =

You will see that each of the 30 items has three sections: A, B, and C. In Section A, the questions are direct. In Section B, you will be putting in the answers you think your partner would give, and in Section C, you will be putting the answers that your partner would think you would give to each question.

There will be some questions that you may find difficult because they are true or untrue sometimes, but not at other times. When this is very strongly the case, you should still try to decide whether it is in balance true or untrue, but add also a mark in the last column(?).

It is best to do the questions quickly, because your first thoughts will be more useful, and because there are a great many questions to do.

Appendix D2

ANSWER FORM

	†	+	-	=	?
A.1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
B.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
C.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
A.1.	\	\	\	\	\
2.					
3.					
4.					
B.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
C.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
A.1.	\	\	\	\	\
2.					
3.					
4.					
B.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
C.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					

	†	+	-	+	?
A.1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
B.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
C.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
A.1.	\	\	\	\	\
2.					
3.					
4.					
B.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
C.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
A.1.	\	\	\	\	\
2.					
3.					
4.					
B.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					
C.1.	/	/	/	/	/
2.					
3.					
4.					

Appendix D3

THE QUESTIONS (MALE)

1. A. How true do you think the following are?
 1. She understands me.
 2. I understand her.
 3. She understand herself.
 4. I understand myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
 1. "I understand him."
 2. "He understand me."
 3. "I understand myself."
 4. "He understands himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
 1. She understands me.
 2. I understand her.
 3. She understands herself.
 4. I understand myself.
2. A. How true do you think the following are?
 1. She makes up my mind for me.
 2. I make up her mind for her.
 3. She makes up her own mind.
 4. I make up my own mind.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
 1. "I make up his mind for him."
 2. "He makes up my mind for me."
 3. "I make up my own mind."
 4. "He makes up his own mind."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
 1. She makes up my mind for me.
 2. I make up her mind for her.
 3. She makes up her own mind.
 4. I make up my own mind.
3. A. How true do you think the following are?
 1. She is wrapped up in me.
 2. I am wrapped up in her.
 3. She is wrapped up in herself.
 4. I am wrapped up in myself.

THE QUESTIONS

- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I am wrapped up in him."
 2. "He is wrapped up in me."
 3. "I am wrapped up in myself."
 4. "He is wrapped up in himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She is wrapped up in me.
 2. I am wrapped up in her.
 3. She is wrapped up in herself.
 4. I am wrapped up in myself.
4. A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She depends on me.
 2. I depend on her.
 3. She depends on herself.
 4. I depend on myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I depend on him."
 2. "He depends on me."
 3. "I depend on myself."
 4. "He depends on himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She depends on me.
 2. I depend on her.
 3. She depends on herself.
 4. I depend on myself.
5. A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She takes me seriously.
 2. I take her seriously.
 3. She takes herself seriously.
 4. I take myself seriously.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I take him seriously."
 2. "He takes me seriously."
 3. "I take myself seriously."
 4. "He takes himself seriously."

THE QUESTIONS

- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She takes me seriously.
 2. I take her seriously.
 3. She takes herself seriously.
 4. I take myself seriously.
6. A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She can't stand me.
 2. I can't stand her.
 3. She can't stand herself.
 4. I can't stand myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I can't stand him."
 2. "He can't stand me."
 3. "I can't stand myself."
 4. "He can't stand himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She can't stand me.
 2. I can't stand her.
 3. She can't stand herself.
 4. I can't stand myself.
7. A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She is afraid of me.
 2. I am afraid of her.
 3. She is afraid of herself.
 4. I am afraid of myself.
- B. How would She answer the following?
1. "I am afraid of him."
 2. "He is afraid of me."
 3. "I am afraid of myself."
 4. "He is afraid of himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She is afraid of me.
 2. I am afraid of her.
 3. She is afraid of herself.
 4. I am afraid of myself.

THE QUESTIONS

8. A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She respects me.
 2. I respect her.
 3. She respects herself.
 4. I respect myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I respect him."
 2. "He respects me."
 3. "I respect myself."
 4. "He respects himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She respects me.
 2. I respect her.
 3. She respects herself.
 4. I respect myself.
9. A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She makes me the center of her world.
 2. I make her the center of my world.
 3. She makes herself the center of her world.
 4. I make myself the center of my world.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I make him the center of my world."
 2. "He makes me the center of his world."
 3. "I make myself the center of my world."
 4. "He makes himself the center of his world."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She makes me the center of her world.
 2. I make her the center of my world.
 3. She makes herself the center of her world.
 4. I make myself the center of my world.
- 10.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She loves me.
 2. I love her.
 3. She loves herself.
 4. I love myself.

THE QUESTIONS

B. How would SHE answer the following?

1. "I love him."
2. "He loves me."
3. "I love myself."
4. "He loves himself."

C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?

1. She loves me.
2. I love her.
3. She loves herself.
4. I love myself.

11.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. She takes responsibility for me.
2. I take responsibility for her.
3. She takes responsibility for herself.
4. I take responsibility for myself.

B. How would SHE answer the following?

1. "I take responsibility for him."
2. "He takes responsibility for me."
3. "I take responsibility for myself."
4. "He takes responsibility for himself."

C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?

1. She takes responsibility for me.
2. I take responsibility for her.
3. She takes responsibility for herself.
4. I take responsibility for myself.

12.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. She lets me be myself.
2. I let her be herself.
3. She lets herself be herself.
4. I let myself be myself.

B. How would SHE answer the following?

1. "I let him be himself."
2. "He lets me be myself."
3. "I let myself be myself."
4. "He lets himself be himself."

THE QUESTIONS

- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She lets me be myself.
 2. I let her be herself.
 3. She lets herself be herself.
 4. I let myself be myself.
- 13.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She is honest with me.
 2. I am honest with her.
 3. She is honest with herself.
 4. I am honest with myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I am honest with him."
 2. "He is honest with me."
 3. "I am honest with myself."
 4. "He is honest with himself."
- C. How would She think you have answered the following?
1. She is honest with me.
 2. I am honest with her.
 3. She is honest with herself.
 4. I am honest with myself.
- 14.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She hates me.
 2. I hate her.
 3. She hates herself.
 4. I hate myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I hate him."
 2. "He hates me."
 3. "I hate myself."
 4. "He hates himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She hates me.
 2. I hate her.
 3. She hates herself.
 4. I hate myself.

THE QUESTIONS

- 15.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She treats me like a machine.
 2. I treat her like a machine.
 3. She treats herself like a machine.
 4. I treat myself like a machine.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I treat him like a machine."
 2. "He treats me like a machine."
 3. "I treat myself like a machine."
 4. "He treats himself like a machine."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She treats me like a machine.
 2. I treat her like a machine.
 3. She treats herself like a machine.
 4. I treat myself like a machine.
- 16.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She worries about me.
 2. I worry about her.
 3. She worries about herself.
 4. I worry about myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I worry about him."
 2. "He worries about me."
 3. "I worry about myself."
 4. "He worries about himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She worries about me.
 2. I worry about her.
 3. She worries about herself.
 4. I worry about myself.
- 17.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She can face up to my conflicts.
 2. I can face up to her conflicts.
 3. She can face up to her own conflicts.
 4. I can face up to my own conflicts.

THE QUESTIONS

- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I can face up to his conflicts."
 2. "He can face up to my conflicts."
 3. "I can face up to my own conflicts."
 4. "He can face up to his own conflicts."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She can face up to my conflicts.
 2. I can face up to her conflicts.
 3. She can face up to her own conflicts.
 4. I can face up to my own conflicts.
- 18.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She is at one with me.
 2. I am at one with her.
 3. She is at one with herself.
 4. I am at one with myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I am at one with him."
 2. "He is at one with me."
 3. "I am at one with myself."
 4. "He is at one with himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She is at one with me.
 2. I am at one with her.
 3. She is at one with herself.
 4. I am at one with myself.
- 19.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She won't let me be.
 2. I won't let her be.
 3. She won't let herself be.
 4. I won't let myself be.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I won't let him be."
 2. "He won't let me be."
 3. "I won't let myself be."
 4. "He won't let himself be."

THE QUESTIONS

- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She won't let me be.
 2. I won't let her be.
 3. She won't let herself be.
 4. I won't let myself be.
- 20.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She thinks a lot of me.
 2. I think a lot of her.
 3. She thinks a lot of herself.
 4. I think a lot of myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following
1. "I think a lot of him."
 2. "He thinks a lot of me."
 3. "I think a lot of myself."
 4. "He thinks a lot of himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She thinks a lot of me.
 2. I think a lot of her.
 3. She thinks a lot of herself.
 4. I think a lot of myself.
- 21.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She has lost hope for my future.
 2. I have lost hope for her future.
 3. She has lost hope for her own future.
 4. I have lost hope for my own future.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I have lost hope for his future."
 2. "He has lost hope for my future."
 3. "I have lost hope for my own future."
 4. "He has lost hope for his own future."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She has lost hope for my future.
 2. I have lost hope for her future.
 3. She has lost hope for her own future.
 4. I have lost hope for my own future.

THE QUESTIONS

- 22.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She likes me.
 2. I like her.
 3. She likes herself.
 4. I like myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I like him."
 2. "He likes me."
 3. "I like myself."
 4. "He likes himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She likes me.
 2. I like her.
 3. She likes herself.
 4. I like myself.
- 23.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She has a warped view of me.
 2. I have a warped view of her.
 3. She has a warped view of herself.
 4. I have a warped view of myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I have a warped view of him."
 2. "He has a warped view of me."
 3. I have a warped view of myself."
 4. "He has a warped view of himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She has a warped view of me.
 2. I have a warped view of her.
 3. She has a warped view of herself.
 4. I have a warped view of myself.
- 24.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She readily forgives me.
 2. I readily forgive her.
 3. She readily forgives herself.
 4. I readily forgive myself.

THE QUESTIONS

- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I readily forgive him."
 2. "He readily forgives me."
 3. "I readily forgive myself."
 4. "He readily forgives himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She readily forgives me.
 2. I readily forgive her.
 3. She readily forgives herself.
 4. I readily forgive myself.
- 25.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She belittles me.
 2. I belittle her.
 3. She belittles herself.
 4. I belittle myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I belittle him."
 2. "He belittles me."
 3. "I belittle myself."
 4. "He belittles himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She belittles me.
 2. I belittle her.
 3. She belittles herself.
 4. I belittle myself.
- 26.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She believes in me.
 2. I believe in her.
 3. She believes in herself.
 4. I believe in myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I believe in him."
 2. "He believes in me."
 3. "I believe in myself."
 4. "He believes in himself."

THE QUESTIONS

- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She believes in me.
 2. I believe in her.
 3. She believes in herself.
 4. I believe in myself.
- 27.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She humiliates me.
 2. I humiliate her.
 3. She humiliates herself.
 4. I humiliate myself.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I humiliate him."
 2. "He humiliates me."
 3. "I humiliate myself."
 4. "He humiliates himself."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She humiliates me.
 2. I humiliate her.
 3. She humiliates herself.
 4. I humiliate myself.
- 28.A. How true do you think the following are?
1. She makes me into a puppet.
 2. I make her into a puppet.
 3. She makes herself into a puppet.
 4. I make myself into a puppet.
- B. How would SHE answer the following?
1. "I make him into a puppet."
 2. "He makes me into a puppet."
 3. "I make myself into a puppet."
 4. "He makes himself into a puppet."
- C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?
1. She makes me into a puppet.
 2. I make her into a puppet.
 3. She makes herself into a puppet.
 4. I make myself into a puppet.

THE QUESTIONS

29.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. She spoils me.
2. I spoil her.
3. She spoils herself.
4. I spoil myself.

B. How would SHE answer the following?

1. "I spoil him."
2. "He spoils me."
3. "I spoil myself."
4. "He spoils himself."

C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?

1. She spoils me.
2. I spoil her.
3. She spoils herself.
4. I spoil myself.

30.A. How true do you think the following are?

1. She owes everything to me.
2. I owe everything to her.
3. She owes everything to herself.
4. I owe everything to myself.

B. How would SHE answer the following?

1. "I owe everything to him."
2. "He owes everything to me."
3. "I owe everything to myself."
4. "He owes everything to himself."

C. How would SHE think you have answered the following?

1. She owes everything to me.
2. I owe everything to her.
3. She owes everything to herself.
4. I owe everything to myself.

Appendix E
 Summary of Number of Forms Handed out by Instructors
 to Student Volunteers, and Frequency
 of Various Types of Returns

Handouts and Returns	Frequency	Percent	Usable Returns
Returned; Filled out with names and telephone numbers	66	14	60/66 (91%)
Returned; Filled out but no names or telephone numbers	26	6	21/26 (84%)
Returned; Totally blank	15	3	
Handed out but not returned	364	77	
Total number handed out	471	100	

Appendix F
Self-Esteem Items and the Ratings that
Seven Judges Gave each of them

Description of Item and Number on Questionnaire	Ratings				Questionable
	Very Representative of High Self-Esteem	Somewhat Representative of High Self-Esteem	Somewhat Representative of Low Self-Esteem	Very Representative of Low Self-Esteem	
2. I make up my own mind	4	2	.	.	1
6. I can't stand myself				7	
7. I am afraid of myself			3	3	1
8. I respect myself	7				
11. I take responsibility for myself	4	2			1
12. I let myself be myself	2	4			1
13. I am honest with myself	4	3			
14. I hate myself				7	
18. I am at one with myself	4	3			
19. I won't let myself be myself			4	2	1
21. I have lost hope for the future			3	4	
22. I like myself	5	1			1
23. I have a warped view of myself			3	3	1
24. I readily forgive myself	4	2			1
25. I belittle myself			1	5	1
26. I believe in myself	5	2			
27. I humiliate myself			2	5	
28. I make myself into a puppet			5	2	

Appendix G

Items Used for Self-Esteem and Empathy Scales

Item number from Laing et al. (1966)	Item number in current study	Item used in empathy scale	Item used in self-esteem scale
1	1	X	
2	2	X	X
3	3	X	
4	4	X	
6	5	X	
8	6		X
11	7	X	X
12	8	X	X
13	9	X	
15	-10	X	
19	-11	X	X
21	-12	X	X
28	-13	X	X
29	-14		X
33	-15	X	
35	-16	X	
36	-17	X	
37	-18		X
38	-19	X	X
40	-20	X	
42	-21		X
43	-22		X
44	-23	X	X
45	-24	X	X
49	-25		X
53	-26	X	X
54	-27		X
56	-28	X	X
57	-29	X	
58	-30	X	
Total number of items in scale		23	18

Note.--For self-esteem, statements A.4 only were used, though subjects responded to all 12 statements in order to avoid any insight on their part that these were self-esteem items.

Appendix H

A complete set of responses to the modified Interpersonal Perception Method, given by a low self-esteem couple. One sheet is necessary for each view point (MM, MF, FM, FF).

Explanation of symbols

SEO--means an item was used to measure self-esteem only.

SE --means an item was used to measure self-esteem and empathy.

A blank in front of a number means that an item was used to measure empathy only.

1 --means direct perspective

2 --means meta perspective

3 -- means meta-meta perspective

F -- means failure of realization; being misunderstood but feeling understood

Ⓕ -- means failure of realization; being understood, but feeling misunderstood.

R --means realization; being misunderstood, and feeling misunderstood.

Ⓖ --means realization; being understood and feeling understood.

M --means misunderstanding other's view

U --means understanding other's view

D --means disagreeing

A --means agreeing

IPM CHART:		MM Viewpoint																	
		Male						Female											
		F	R	M	U	D	A	M	F	M	F	M	F	A	D	U	M	R	F
	1. Understands		(R)	M			A	+	+	+	+	-	+	A		U			F
SE	2. Makes up mind for		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	3. Is wrapped up in		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	4. Depends on		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	5. Takes seriously		R		U	D		+	+	-	+	+	+		D			M	(R)
SEO	6. Can't stand																		
SE	7. Is afraid of		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
SE	8. Respects		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	9. Makes center - world		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	10. Loves		(R)	M			D	-	-	-	+	-	-		D	U			R
SE	11. Takes responsibility		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SE	12. Lets be self		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SE	13. Is honest with		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	14. Hates																		
	15. Treats like machine		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	16. Worries about	(F)			U		A	+	-	-	-	+	-	A		U		(R)	
	17. Can face conflicts		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	18. Is at one with																		
SE	19. Won't let be		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	20. Thinks a lot of	(F)			U	D		+	-	-	+	+	-		D	U			(F)
SEO	21. Has lost hope																		
SEO	22. Likes																		
SE	23. Has a warped view of		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
SE	24. Readily forgives	F			M		D								D			M	F
SEO	25. Belittles																		
SE	26. Believes in		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	27. Humiliates																		
SE	28. Makes into a puppet		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	29. Spoils		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	30. Owes everything to		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	

FF Viewpoint

IPM CHART:		Male						FF Viewpoint						Female					
		F	R	M	U	D	A	3	2	1	1	2	3	A	D	U	M	R	F
	1. Understands	F			U		A	+	-	+	+	+	+	A				M	(R)
SE	2. Makes up mind for		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
	3. Is wrapped up in		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	-	A		U			(F)
	4. Depends on		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
	5. Takes seriously		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SEO	6. Can't stand																		
SE	7. Is afraid of		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U			(R)
SE	8. Respects		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
	9. Makes center - world		(R)	M			D	+	+	+	-	+	-		D	U			F
	10. Loves		(R)	M			A	+	+	+	+	-	+	A		U			F
SE	11. Takes Responsibility		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SE	12. Lets be self		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SE	13. Is honest with		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SEO	14. Hates																		
	15. Treats like machine		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U			(R)
	16. Worries about	F			U		A	+	-	+	+	+	+	A			M		(R)
	17. Can face conflicts		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SEO	18. Is at one with																		
SE	19. Won't let be		R		U	D		-	-	+	-	-	-		D		M		(R)
	20. Thinks a lot of		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SEO	21. Has lost hope																		
SEO	22. Likes																		
SE	23. Has a warped view of		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U			(R)
SE	24. Readily forgives	F			U		A	-	+	-	-	-	+	A			M		(F)
SEO	25. Belittles																		
SE	26. Believes in		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U			(R)
SEO	27. Humiliates																		
SE	28. Makes into a puppet		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U			(R)
	29. Spoils		(R)	M			D	+	+	+	-	+	-		D	U			F
	30. Owes everything to	F			U		A	+	-	+	+	+	+	A			M		(R)

IPM CHART:		MF VIEWPOINT																	
		Male						Female											
		F	R	M	U	D	A	3	2	1	1	2	3	A	D	U	M	R	F
	1. Understands	(R)			U	D		+	+	+	-	-	+		D	U			(F)
SE	2. Makes up mind for	R			U		A	+	+	-	-	-	+	A			M		(F)
	3. Is wrapped up in	(R)			U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	4. Depends on	R	M				A	-	-	+	+	-	-	A			M	R	
	5. Takes seriously	R			U	D		-	-	+	-	-	+		D		M		(F)
SEO	6. Can't stand																		
SE	7. Is afraid of	(R)	M			D		-	-	-	+	-	-		D	U		R	
SE	8. Respects	(F)			U		A	-	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	9. Makes center - world	(F)			M		A	-	+	+	+	-	+	A		U			F
	10. Loves	F			M		D	-	+	-	+	-	+		D		M		F
SE	11. Takes responsibility	F			M		D	+	-	+	-	+	+		D		M	R	
SE	12. Lets be self	(R)			U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SE	13. Is honest with	(R)			U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	14. Hates																		
	15. Treats like machine	(R)			U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	16. Worries about	F			U	D		+	-	+	-	-	-		D		M	(R)	
	17. Can face conflicts	(R)	M			D		+	+	+	-	+	+		D	U		R	
SEO	18. Is at one with																		
SE	19. Won't let be	(R)			U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	20. Thinks a lot of	(R)			U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	21. Has lost hope																		
SEO	22. Likes																		
SE	23. Has a warped view of	(R)			U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
SE	24. Readily forgives	(R)			U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
SEO	25. Belittles																		
SE	26. Believes in	(F)			M		A	-	+	+	+	-	+	A		U			F
SEO	27. Humiliates																		
SE	28. Makes into a puppet	(F)				U	D	+	-	-	+	+	-		D	U			(F)
	29. Spoils	F				U	A	-	+	-	-	-	+	A			M		(F)
	30. Owes everything to	(F)			M		A	+	-	-	-	+	-	A		U			F

FM Viewpoint

IPM CHART:		FM Viewpoint																	
		3	2	1	1	2	3	A	D	U	M	R	F						
		F	R	M	U	D	A	M	F	M	F	M	F	A	D	U	M	R	F
	1. Understands	(F)			U		A	-	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SE	2. Makes up mind for		(R)	M			A	-	-	-	-	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	3. Is wrapped up in		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	4. Depends on	F			U	D		-	+	-	+	+	+		D		M	(R)	
	5. Takes seriously	(F)			U		A	-	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	6. Can't stand																		
SE	7. Is afraid of		(R)	M		D		-	-	-	+	-	-		D	U		(R)	
SE	8. Respects		(R)		U		A	-	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	9. Makes center - world		R		U	D		+	+	-	+	+	+		D		M	(R)	
	10. Loves	F		M		D		-	+	-	+	-	+		D		M		F
SE	11. Takes responsibility	(F)			U		A	+	-	-	-	-	+	A		U		(F)	
SE	12. Lets be self	F		M		D		-	+	-	+	-	+		D		M		F
SE	13. Is honest with	(F)			U		A	-	+	+	+	+	-	A		U		(F)	
SEO	14. Hates																		
	15. Treats like machine		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	16. Worries about	(F)			U		A	-	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
	17. Can face conflicts	F			U		A	+	-	+	+	+	+	A			M	(R)	
SEO	18. Is at one with																		
SE	19. Won't let be	F		M		D		+	-	+	-	+	-		D		M		F
	20. Thinks a lot of		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	21. Has lost hope																		
SE	22. Likes																		
SE	23. Has a warped view of		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
SE	24. Readily forgives		(R)	M		D		-	-	-	+	-	-		D	U		(R)	
SEO	25. Belittles																		
SE	26. Believes in		(R)		U		A	+	+	+	+	+	+	A		U		(R)	
SEO	27. Humiliates																		
SE	28. Makes into a puppet		(R)		U		A	-	-	-	-	-	-	A		U		(R)	
	29. Spoils		(R)	M		D		-	-	-	+	-	+		D	U		(R)	F
	30. Owes everything to	F		M		D		-	+	-	+	-	+		D		M		F

Appendix I

Outline of Interview Conducted with Couples

Introduction

Before we begin the more formal aspects of this interview, let me once again tell you that you are one of approximately 40 couples participating in this study, that the purpose of this study is to explore how couples related to each other in terms of values, ideals, goals, etc.

You were chosen on a random basis. If I tell you much more I'm afraid that I might bias your responses to the interview. Afterward we can discuss any questions you may have in greater detail.

Again, anything you said on your personal information form, on the questionnaire, and anything you say here is treated with total confidentiality. Your names were only necessary to contact you by telephone. This interview will be taperecorded so that I don't have to take notes and can refer back to what was said at a later date.

I realize you may be a bit nervous at first, but you will find that you forget about it as the interview progresses. Any questions?

Please do not discuss your experiences here with others who are participating unless they have also been interviewed already, since I want spontaneous discussion from all couples.

1. How do you feel about being interviewed? Are you apprehensive, nervous, excited or what? Can you think of any reasons why this might be so?
2. How did you feel about filling out the questionnaire?
Did you find it difficult? Did you enjoy it? Did you learn anything about yourself? Can you elaborate on that?
3. Did you discuss the personal information sheet and the questionnaire with each other?
If yes, can you tell me what you talked about?
If not, can you tell me why not?

Questions:

My questions will consist of two parts, your relationship as it is and the way each of you would like it to be.

Can you give me a sort of general idea of what your relationship is like? I know it's a difficult question, but to get things started, can you sort of describe the kind of relationship you feel you have with each other? I have specific areas I would like to cover, but first I would like your own ideas.

- A. How much do you share in each other's lives. What do you share, what do you keep separate? Friends, activities, interests, experiences you do or do not talk about. What do you do because you enjoy doing it together and what do you do because you enjoy the activity regardless with whom you are doing it? (What would you like to see in this regard? More sharing, less sharing, as is?)

Appendix I cont.

- B. What about parts that each of you play in your relationship? Who is usually the leader, the follower; the strong one, the weak one; the emotional one, the practical one, etc.?
1. Who usually comes to whom for emotional support?
 2. Does one or the other of you usually have the final say when you make decisions?
 3. Is there any fluctuation in any of the above?
What are the circumstances?
(What would you like to see in this regard?)
- C. How would you characterize your relationship in terms of general feelings in the relationship? Not personal feelings, but a sort of overall combined feeling tone.
1. Is it exciting, passionate, interesting, comfortable, practical or what?
 2. Are there extremes in this over-all tone, or slight fluctuations about a middle point?
 3. What individual emotions have you felt when with each other?
How strongly: Let me give you some more examples:
Anger, love, passion, comfort, hate, surprise, boredom, excitement, interest, fear, etc.
 4. If you have said, "I love you." to each other, what did it feel like and what were the circumstances.
What does it mean to you to say that.
(What would you like to see in regard to either the overall feeling tone, or the individual emotions?)
- D. What if anything, has each of you brought into the other's life that wasn't there before:
1. Did you awaken new feelings in each other that weren't there before?
 2. How has each of you changed because of your relationship?
e.g. do you feel more alive, more intense feelings, more secure, more self-confident, etc.?
 3. How do you contribute to each other's moods, if at all?
What does the other person do to make you sad, happy, etc.?
(What would you like to see in this regard?)
- E. How does fighting, arguing, conflict, etc. fit into your relationship?
1. What do you fight about, how much, how strongly?
 2. If you avoid fights, why? Do you hesitate to start fights, why?
 3. Do any issues repeat themselves? If so, which and which ones do each of you take lightly (they can't be settled so why bother, or they aren't important, or they're too touchy and dangerous) and which do you take seriously? Why?

Appendix I cont.

E. cont.

4. How do your arguments usually start (who for example), how do they go, and how do they end?
5. Do you have any implied or understood or actually verbalized rules about fair fighting? What are they?
E.g. No physical stuff, no name calling, etc.
(What would you like to see in regard to conflict?)

Have you any questions? Would you like to add anything, which you feel might add to what has been said? Or are there any areas you feel I have not covered?

Appendix J

Ratings Assigned by Six Judges to Eight Pilot Couples
on Four Intimacy Variables; Used to Determine
Reliability of Rating System

Couples	<u>Mutuality</u>						<u>Role-Flexibility</u>					
	Judges						Judges					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
1			2	2	3	3	2	2			2	1
2			5	5	4	5	5	4			4	5
3	3	3			3	3			2	2	3	2
4			2	2	2	3			2	3	3	4
5	4	5			4	4	5	5			4	5
6	1	2			2	1			1	3	2	1
7			2	4	3	3	4	4			4	2
8	2	3			2	2			2	4	3	5

Couples	<u>Mutual Validation of Personal Worth</u>						<u>Affect</u>					
	Judges						Judges					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
1			1	1	2	1	2	3			3	2
2	4	5			4	4			5	4	3	5
3			1	2	1	1	3	3			2	1
4	2	1			2	1	5	3			4	4
5			5	4	5	4			5	3	4	2
6	1	2			2	1			1	3	2	3
7			2	5	3	1	1	4			3	3
8	2	2			1	4			3	4	3	4

Note.--A through F denote judges. E and F are the study judges.

Appendix K
Statistical Analyses Performed to Demonstrate
Reliability of Judges' Ratings
(N = 16, 8 couples)

To demonstrate that no single judge had a directional response tendency that varied significantly from any other judge, 11 t tests for related means were performed. These t tests used all the ratings any one judge made and compared them with the ratings of all judges who made the same ratings about the same variables for the same couples. All comparisons had 15 (16-1) degrees of freedom, except the EF comparison (that between the two judges who rated the couples in the study proper) which had 31 (32-1) degrees of freedom, since they rated all the variables for all the couples. No statistically significant differences were found. A further analysis comparing judges' ratings within each variable demonstrated the variance due to judges' differences was not statistically significant. This was done in order to demonstrate that directionality for the judges did not differ among the four variables.

An example of how t tests for related means and reliability correlations were determined for the mean ratings of two judges is given in Table K1. Assume these are mean ratings assigned to the eight pilot couples on one intimacy variable.

One may question the two different pairs of ratings in one column and only one pair of ratings in the other. Actually, a totally different pair of judges could have been used for every couple and the measure would still be valid. The purpose, after all, was to demonstrate that the EF means could be reproduced by any other pair of judges in the whole universe of pairs of judges. Statistically speaking, the effect

of having two sets of criterion pairs in one column was to increase the variance. Thus the comparisons were conservative, rather than inflated (Lynch, 1971).

TABLE K1
Comparison between Mean Ratings of Pairs of Judges
to Determine Reliability of Rating System

Couple	Criterion Rating	Comparison Rating
1	\overline{AB}	\overline{EF}
2	\overline{AB}	\overline{EF}
3	\overline{AB}	\overline{EF}
4	\overline{AB}	\overline{EF}
5	\overline{CD}	\overline{EF}
6	\overline{CD}	\overline{EF}
7	\overline{CD}	\overline{EF}
8	\overline{CD}	\overline{EF}

Note.-- \overline{XY} denotes mean rating of two judges. A through F denotes judges.

Using the eight EF means within each intimacy variable and comparing these means with the combined means of the AB and CD means, four t tests for related means were performed, with no significant differences in any of the comparisons (See Table K2)

TABLE K2
 Comparisons between Mean Ratings of the Two Study Judges
 and the Two Pairs of Pilot Judges on the Four
 Intimacy Variables Rated from Interviews
 (N = 8)

Intimacy Variable	<u>t</u>	<u>r</u>
Mutuality	0.00	.92**
Role-Flexibility	0.00	.81**
Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	0.81	.89**
Affect	1.00	.67*

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01

Making the comparisons over all four intimacy variables, and comparing the mean ratings of Judges AB with EF and CD with EF, no statistically significant differences were found either. Thus, it can safely be said that mean ratings did not seem to differ within any of the variables. The question still remained whether the paired averages were significantly related to each other or whether the lack of differences was due to a random cancellation of judgements like 2-4, 4-2, 5-1, or 1-5 which would indicate no differences in the means but would not necessarily indicate a high degree of correlation. The Pearson r's for related means on all four variables were statistically significant. (See Table K2 for exact values.)

Appendix L
Analyses Performed to Demonstrate Efficacy and
Reliability of Process Recordings
(N = 16, 8 couples)

First a representative time segment had to be chosen. The most difficult task was the counting of personal pronouns because of their frequency of occurrence. They had to be counted separately with little chance of listening for other responses at the same time. All the other processes could be counted at the same time because of the comparative infrequency. The first 10 minute segment seemed to produce personal pronoun ratios that reflected the judges' ratings of mutuality more closely than the other 10 minute segments. It is suspected that since the first part of the interview dealt with the issues of mutuality and separateness, the opportunity for saying we, us, etc. were greater, and therefore, reflected the judges' ratings more closely. The first ten minutes of each tape were therefore chosen in counting the personal pronoun frequencies.

The remaining processes, except for speaking quantity, which was also recorded from the pronouns of the first ten minutes, were taken from the first twenty minutes of each interview. Twenty minutes, rather than just ten minutes were chosen because of the relatively fewer number of occurrences of each of the verbalizations being counted, and an adequate number was wanted for statistical purposes. Each of the processes was tried for the full first thirty minutes of the eight pilot tapes and they seemed to be somewhat stable, with the first twenty minutes being fairly accurate when compared with the judges' ratings. One other important factor which helped in the decision to use the first twenty

minutes rather than the second or middle, was that the processes should be taken from the same segment of time. To measure one process from one part of the interview and another from another part would put them all into different settings, making comparisons more difficult. It is possible, for example, that couples become more comfortable as the interview progresses.

It seemed that on the basis of the eight pilot interviews, the processes did meaningfully reflect the intimacy variables. The first ten minutes were sufficient for the counting of personal pronouns and the first twenty minutes were sufficient for the counting of the other verbalizations.

To answer the questions of reliability or accuracy in counting, each of the chosen timed segments were listened to a second time for each verbalization and the frequencies were compared. To demonstrate reliability, two measures were used: t tests for related means and Pearson r 's for dependent measures. Reliability was fairly high. All t values were non-significant and all r values were in the .90's. (See Table L1 for exact values.) Despite the minor inaccuracies in counting, the resulting proportions when comparing original with repeat, were relatively consistent.

TABLE L1
 Comparison between Original and Repeat Frequency Counts
 of Process Recordings Taken from Taped Interviews
 to Determine Reliability of Coding Technique
 (N = 16, 8 couples)

Process	\underline{t}^a	\underline{r}^b
Singular Personal Pronouns	0.00	.99**
Plural Personal Pronouns	0.61	.99**
Agreements	0.33	.97**
Disagreements	0.27	.94**
Simultaneous Speech ^c	0.42	.97**
First to Answer	0.31	.95**

^a \underline{t} test for related means

^b \underline{r} for related scores

^cbased on couples' scores rather than individual scores, so degrees of freedom were six rather than 14.

**
 $p \leq .01$

Appendix M1
 High Self-Esteem Couples' Scores on Self-Esteem
 and Intimacy Variables

Couple	Self-Esteem		Empathy	Role-Flexibility	Mutuality ^a	Mutuality ^b	Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	Affect
	Male	Female						
1	68	67	85	3.5	3.5	1.5	4.0	3.0
2	69	69	79	2.0	4.0	1.0	3.5	2.5
3	70	70	80	4.5	3.5	1.5	4.5	3.0
4	69	68	85	3.5	2.0	1.0	4.0	3.0
5	67	66	81	3.5	3.0	2.0	5.0	4.0
6	68	66	81	2.5	1.5	0.5	3.5	3.5
7	70	72	84	4.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
8	70	64	52	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.5
9	70	65	70	3.5	1.5	0.5	3.0	2.5
10	68	68	69	3.0	3.5	1.5	4.0	3.0
11	66	66	55	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.5
12	66	67	75	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.0
13	67	70	80	2.5	4.0	1.0	4.5	3.0
14	66	64	78	3.0	3.5	1.5	4.0	3.5
15	72	69	79	4.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.5

^aHigh score indicates fusion, low score indicates separation.

^bHigh score indicates balance between fusion and separation.

Appendix M2
 Low Self-Esteem Couples' Scores on Self-Esteem
 and Intimacy Variables

Couple	Self-Esteem		Empathy	Role-Flexibility	Mutuality ^a	Mutuality ^b	Mutual Validation of Personal Worth	Affect
	Male	Female						
1	61	61	72	4.5	4.5	0.5	4.5	3.5
2	65	63	67	1.5	2.0	1.0	1.5	3.0
3	63	62	56	1.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	3.0
4	54	48	69	2.5	2.0	1.0	2.5	3.0
5	65	62	74	3.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
6	60	63	37	4.5	1.0	0.0	3.5	2.0
7	64	58	72	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
8	63	63	78	4.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
9	55	54	53	3.5	3.5	1.5	4.0	3.0
10	54	52	63	4.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	4.5
11	58	62	52	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.5
12	50	63	64	4.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	1.5
13	59	59	59	2.0	3.5	1.5	3.0	3.0
14	55	48	74	4.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.0
15	61	63	46	1.5	2.0	1.0	2.0	3.0

^aHigh score indicates fusion, low score indicates separation.

^bHigh score indicates balance between fusion and separation.

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T., & Zigler, E. Social competence and self-image disparity in psychiatric and nonpsychiatric patients. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67(3), 197-206.
- Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Bach, G. R., & Wyden, P. The intimate enemy. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1969.
- Bak, R. C. Being in love and object loss. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1973, 54, 1-8.
- Bales, R. F. Small group theory and research. In Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Barry, W. A. Marriage research and conflict: An integrated review. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73(1), 41-54.
- Bender, I. E., & Hastorf, A. H. On measuring generalized empathic ability (social sensitivity). Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48(4), 503-506.
- Berger, E. M. The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.
- Berne, E. Games people play. New York: Grove Press, 1964.
- Bertocci, P. A. Sex, love and the person. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- Blanck, R., & Blanck, G. Marriage and personal development. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Brammer, L. M., & Shostrom, E. L. Therapeutic psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Buber, M. I and thou. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Coopersmith, S. A method for determining types of self esteem. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 87-94.
- Cowden, R. C. Empathy or projection? Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11, 188-190.
- Cuber, J. F., & Harroff, P. B. The significant americans. New York: Appleton-Century, 1965.

- de Groot, A. D. Methodologies: Foundations of inference and research in the behavioral sciences. Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1970.
- Dollard, J., Doob, J. W., Miller, N. E., Lowrer, G. H., & Sears, R. R. Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.
- Duvall, E. M. Love and the facts of life. New York: Associated Press, 1968.
- Dymond, R. F. A scale for the measurement of empathic ability. Journal of Consulting Psychiatry, 1949, 13, 127-133.
- Ellis, A. E. Sex without guilt. New York: Hillman Periodicals, 1959.
- Engel, M. Personal communication. City University of New York, 1970.
- Erikson, E. H. Identity and the life cycle. New York: International University Press, 1959.
- Erikson, E. H. Identity Youth and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1968.
- Farina, A. Patterns of role dominance and conflict in the interaction of parents of schizophrenic patients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1958.
- Fiedler, F. E., & Senior, K. An exploratory study of unconscious feeling reactions in fifteen patient-therapist pairs. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 446-453.
- Fitzgerald, M. Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance and areas of self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 405-412.
- Flapan, M. H. Empathy in the marital relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1910) A special choice of object made by men: Contributions to the psychology of love, I. Vol. XI. Standard Edition, London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1912) On the universal tendency to debasement in the sphere of love: Contributions to the psychology of love, II. Vol. XI. Standard Edition. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- Freud, S. (1917). The taboo of virginity: Contributions to the psychology of love, III. Vol. XI. Standard Edition. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.
- Fromm, E. Selfishness and self-love. Psychiatry, 1939, 2, 507-523.
- Fromm, E. The art of loving. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

- Goodrich, D. W. Psychoanalytic speculations on a taxonomy of marriage. Reprint from The National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland, 1966.
- Goodrich, D. W., & Boomer, D. S. Experimental assessment of modes of conflict resolution. Family Process, 1963, 2, 15-24.
- Goodrich, D. W., Ryder, R. G., & Raush, H. L. Patterns of newlywed marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30(3), 383-389.
- Greer, G. The female eunuch. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1971.
- Hartmann, H. Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation. New York: International University Press, 1958.
- Hayes, W. L. Statistics for psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.
- Heiss, J. S. Intimacy and male-female interaction. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 197-208.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Two factor index of social position. Reprint, 1957.
- Kaiser, H. Effective psychotherapy. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Kelly, E. L. Marital compatibility as related to personality traits of husbands and wives as rated by self and spouse. Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 193-198.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., Gebhard, P., et al. Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. S., & Ballachey, E. L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Laing, R. D. The divided self. London: Tavistock Publication, 1960.
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. Interpersonal perception. New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1966.
- Lillibridge, J., & Lundstedt, S. Some initial evidence for an interpersonal risk theory. Journal of Psychology, 1967, 66, 119-128.
- Lorenz, K. On aggression. New York: Bantam Books, 1967.
- Lynch, D. Personal communication. City University of New York, 1971.

- Masters, W. H., & Johnson, V. E. Human sexual response. Boston: Little Brown, 1966.
- Matarazzo, J. D., Saslow, G., & Guze, S. B. Stability of interaction patterns during interviews: A replication. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1956, 20, 267-274.
- May, R. Man's search for himself. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1953.
- Menninger, K. Love against hate. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1942.
- Millet, K. Sexual politics. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- Modell, A. H. Object love and reality. New York: International Universities Press, 1968.
- Murstein, B. I. Self-ideal-discrepancy and the choice of marital partner. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37(1), 47-52.
- Raush, H. L., Goodrich, D. W., & Campbell, J. D. Adaptation to the first years of marriage. Psychiatry, 1963, 26(4), 368-380.
- Reiss, I. L. How and why Americans' sex standards are changing. In B. N. Ard, & C. C. Ard (Eds.) Handbook of marriage counseling. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1969.
- Riesman, D. The lonely crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. Being in relationship. Reprint of lecture given at APGA Convention, Dallas, Texas, March, 1967.
- Rogers, C. R. Becoming partners: Marriage and its alternatives. New York: Dell, 1972.
- Rogers, C. R., & Dymond, R. F. Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Rosenbaum, M. E., & Stanners, R. F. Self-esteem, manifest hostility and expression of hostility. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 646-649.
- Rubin, Z., & Moore, J. Assessment of subject's suspicions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17(2), 163-170.
- Schroeder, R. S., & Flapan, D. Assessing aggressive and friendly behaviors in young children. The Journal of Psychology, 1971, 77, 193-202.(a)

- Schroeder, R. S., & Flapan, D. Aggressive and friendly behaviors of young children from two social classes. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 1971 2(1), 32-41.(b)
- Sechehaye, M. Autobiography of a schizophrenic girl. (translated by G. Rubin-Rabson). New York: Grune & Stratton, 1951.
- Shapiro, D. Neurotic styles. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Sheerer, E. T. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others in ten counseling cases. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 169-175.
- Steinzor, B. The development and evaluation of a measure of social interaction. Human Relations, 1949, 2(2), 103-121.
- Stock, D. An investigation into the interrelations between the self-concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 176-180.
- Stotland, E., & Dunn, R. E. Empathy, self-esteem, and birth-order. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 532-554.
- Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.
- Symonds, P. M. The ego and the self. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.
- Tharp, R. G. Psychological patterning in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 1963, 60, 97-117.
- Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.
- Weiss, E. The structure and dynamics of the human mind, New York: Grune & Stratton, 1960.
- Wylie, R. C. The self concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.