THE EXPRESSION OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS,
WARMTH, AND OPENNESS IN THE
ACQUAINTANCE PROCESS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
DEIRDRE F. CONWAY
1968

THESIS

G 22 — 204
B — 289
g — 158
DEC 5 1974 272
R 090
X74
DE R29
321
KU 86
B 112
5331

ABSTRACT

THE EXPRESSION OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS,
WARMTH, AND OPENNESS IN THE
ACQUAINTANCE PROCESS

by Deirdre F. Conway

In this study, four aspects of the acquaintance process were
examined: 1) the effect of Dogmatism, as measured by the Rokeach
Dogmatism Scale, on the expression of empathy, genuineness, warmth,
and openness, during single encounters, and over time 2) the changes
over time in amount of empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness
displayed by people originally showing relatively high and rela-
tively low amounts of these variables 3) the interrelationships
among a person's empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness and 4)
the relationship between one person's expression of empathy, genu-
ineness, and warmth, and another's expression of empathy, genuineness,
warmth and openness.

To study these aspects of the acquaintance process, thirty-two
college students were matched on the basis of scores on the Rokeach
Dogmatism Scale, so that sixteen male-female couples were formed.
Of these, four couples were formed in which both persons scored high,
and four couples were formed in which both persons scored low on
Dogmatism. There were four couples in which the male was a high,
and the woman a low Dogmatic, and four couples in which the woman was
a high Dogmatic, while the male was a low Dogmatic. Each couple met

for a fifty minute session each week for five weeks. Tapes were made

of the sessions, and the tapes from the first and fifth sessions were

rated by trained undergraduate raters, for amount of empathy, genuine-

ness, warmth, and openness displayed by each S. The scales developed

by Truax for the rating of empathy, genuineness, and warmth, were used

in the rating of these variables. Openness was rated according to an

openness scale developed for this project.

Results

Though couples expressed significantly more empathy, genuineness,

and warmth on the 5th session, as compared to the first, the interaction

of male and female Dogmatism did not affect the amount of empathy, warmth,

and genuineness shown by couples. Though male and female Dogmatism failed

to interact significantly, it was found that couples in which the male

was a high Dogmatic displayed more warmth on both sessions, than couples

in which the male was a low Dogmatic. Couples in which the woman was a

high Dogmatic increased significantly in empathy displayed from the 1st

to the 5th session, unlike couples in which the woman was a low Dogmatic.

When individuals (rather than couples) were considered, according

to whether or not they were high or low on genuineness, warmth and open-

ness in the 1st session, it was found that Ss beginning low increased

significantly. Ss beginning high on genuineness and warmth maintained

their 1st session level during the 5th session. Ss beginning high on

openness decreased significantly from the 1st to the 5th session. Dur-

ing the 5th session, Ss originally low on genuineness surpassed origi-

nally high Ss, while for warmth and openness there were no significant

differences between Ss originally high and low.

The hypothesized intercorrelations between a S's empathy, genuineness, and warmth, were substantially confirmed for genuineness, but only partially confirmed for empathy and warmth. The hypothesis that a S's high empathy, genuineness, and warmth would correlate with his sum and/or proportion of openness about self related topics was confirmed only for genuineness.

Correlations between self scores on empathy, genuineness, and warmth, with each of partner's scores for empathy, genuineness, and warmth showed that the greatest number of expected correlations were those between self and partner scores on the same variable.

Finally, the correlations between a S's empathy, genuineness, and warmth scores, and his partner's openness scores, showed that a S's genuineness was the variable most related to his partner's openness.

Altogether, results tended to support Newcomb's theory that partners in the acquaintance process strive to achieve balance or symmetry. The results also supported the findings of Truax and Carkhuff, that genuineness is the most basic of the empathy, warmth, and genuineness triad. Further implications of the results for the acquaintance process were discussed, and the reasons for results which were unpredicted, or contrary to the hypotheses, were explored.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

THE EXPRESSION OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS,
WARMTH, AND OPENNESS IN THE
ACQUAINTANCE PROCESS

By

Deirdre F. Conway

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1968

To

Dennis Wynne

and to my sister

Bethany

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Gary Stollak for helping me to get involved in my own research, for helping me to implement my ideas, and for his confidence in me.

To Dr. Lawrence Messé I wish to express special thanks, for the many hours of patient and willing help he gave me with the statistics, and with the actual writing of this thesis.

I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Dozier Thornton whose empathy and genuineness I hope to emulate as a therapist, and who gave such subtle but important moral support.

I would like to thank Dr. Joel Aronoff for being one of the best advisers I have ever had.

To Dennis Skinner I would like to express my deepest appreciation, for his help in conceiving the ideas for this thesis, and for sticking with me through the thick and thin of collecting and analyzing the data. Without him, this thesis could not have been written.

I would like to thank my raters Marie Smith, Bill Kohen, Mary Ellen King, and Ellen Passman for their patient and conscientious rating of the acquaintance process tapes.

Finally, I would like to thank Kathy Yamanaka for preparing and punching the data for the computer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

Therapists are often confronted with the problem of how to help clients develop more satisfying relationships with people outside the therapeutic setting. How this problem is dealt with must depend in part not only on the therapist's conception of what constitutes a satisfying relationship, but on his understanding of the means by which such a relationship is achieved. Thus one of the goals of acquaintance process research should be to discover the step-by-step activities between people as they get to know and like each other. But definitive studies of this process have yet to be done. The few existing studies of the acquaintance process to date have focused on interpersonal attraction and on <u>outcome</u>, that is, on predicting whether or not two people will like each other. The work and theories of Newcomb (1961), Winch (1958), Izard (1960), and of Thibaut and Kelley (1959), have all been along this line.

According to Newcomb (1961), the greater the agreement on attitudes of mutual importance, the greater will be the attraction between two people. The variables of attraction, orientation or attitudes, and perception of the other's orientation, are at the same time determinants and consequences of one another. Interpersonal relationships are characterized by a striving for symmetry or balance. Balance is achieved when two people are attracted to each other, and have similar attitudes about things of importance to both of them. When imbalance occurs, one of the above mentioned

1

variables must be changed to achieve balance again. Newcomb's theory and research, however, do not describe the step-by-step processes by which people communicate their attraction for each other.

Winch (1958) has put forth a theory of complementary needs, according to which people with different but complementary needs are attracted to one another. Another component of his theory is that people are attracted to other people who possess qualities they wish they had.

The theory of Thibaut and Kelley (1959) is expressed in terms of reward, cost, outcome, and comparison level. Attraction presumably occurs when the awards in an acquaintanceship are greater than the costs, yielding a positive outcome which is greater than that which would have been expected from the comparison level.

Izard (1960) postulates the importance of affective needs in the forming of friendships. Unlike Newcomb, Winch, Thibaut and Kelley, however, she emphasizes the importance for attraction of _ways_ of expressing and receiving positive affect expression, which she defines in terms of self-involving interest, acceptance, and esteem.

The work of Carl Rogers, and its application by Truax, Carkhuff, and others, suggests one way in which the acquaintance process _as_ process is carried forward.

In exploring the process by which successful therapy progresses, Rogers (1961) hypothesized that nonpossessive warmth, accurate empathy, and genuineness are the three crucial therapist personality variables operative in determining therapeutic outcome. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) further state that these three characteristics form a common element which is found in many divergent theories of psychotherapy. They cite numerous studies in which these three variables were found to go together.

Truax has developed a scale in which he (Truax and Carkhuff (1967))
delineates fairly distinct levels within warmth, empathy and genuine-
ness. In studies supporting Rogers' hypotheses it was found that in
using these scales high interjudge reliability could be achieved in
the rating of therapy tapes for varying degrees to which a therapist
gave evidence of these qualities.

According to Rogers (1966), high degrees of therapist warmth,
empathy and genuineness evoke changes in the client in six areas,
which are changes in (1) relationship to feelings, (2) in interpersonal
relationships, (3) in communication of self, (4) in manner of experienc-
ing, (5) in personal constructs, (6) and in relationship to problems.
Most relevant for this project are the changes toward acceptance and
expression of feelings, toward relating in an open, undefensive manner
to others, and changes toward more direct communication of self. These
three areas, of the six areas of change outlined by Rogers, are encom-
passed in this study by use of a scale for openness about feelings.

Since psychotherapy is a special case of the acquaintance process,
it seemed reasonable that variables similar to those Rogers found to
be operative in therapy might also be important in the process of
acquaintance. In fact, this is suggested by Truax and Carkhuff (1967).
Thus it was decided, for the purposes of this study, to approach the
acquaintance process from a Rogerian frame of reference, and to see
to what extent the process is carried forward by the interaction of
the variables of warmth, empathy, genuineness, and openness.

In an effort to match couples in such a way as to maximize dif-
ferences on these variables, it was decided to use the Rokeach Dogmatism
Scale. Rokeach (1960) found that differences between low and high

Dogmatics (or open and closed minded people), as measured by his scale, are apparent and consistent in many different areas of attitude and behavior. Low Dogmatism is associated with viewing the world as a basically friendly place, with judging "truth" by objective rather than authority dependent criteria, and with the ability to integrate beliefs into a new system contradictory to one's everyday system. Similarly, Plant, Telford, and Thomas (1965) conducted a study in which they compared the scores of high and low Dogmatics on three tests (the California Psychological Inventory, the Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey Values Scale, and the School and College Ability Test). They found that unlike low Dogmatics, high Dogmatics tended to be immature, impulsive, defensive, conventional and stereotyped in their thinking. Rogers (1966), and Truax and Carkhuff (1967) have indicated that these characteristics, apparently found in high but not in low Dogmatics, are conducive to a lack of empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness. They have further indicated that the characteristics found in low Dogmatics, of trust, maturity, undefensiveness, and flexible thinking are prerequisites for empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness.

The problem being explored in this thesis, then, is how the interaction of personality variables such as high and low Dogmatism, warmth, empathy, genuineness, and amount of openness interact in the process of acquaintance between two people.

CHAPTER I

HYPOTHESES

1) It was hypothesized that couples in which both $\underline{S}$s scored low on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale would both begin and end relationships expressing higher amounts of empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness, than any of the other groups of couples. As compared to couples in which both $\underline{S}$s scored low on Dogmatism, couples in which both $\underline{S}$s scored high on Dogmatism were expected to begin and end relationships expressing lower amounts of empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness. Those couples in which one $\underline{S}$ scored high, and the other low on Dogmatism, were expected to show, both at the beginning and at the end of the relationship, the least warmth, empathy, genuineness, and openness of the four groups of couples.

2) Though expected to begin and end expressing differing amounts of the dependent variables, as outlined above, all couples were expected to increase in empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness once the acquaintance process was underway.

3) Whether or not Dogmatism proved to be a significant factor, it was hypothesized that all $\underline{S}$s, whether beginning high or low on empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness, would increase on these variables.

4) It was hypothesized that after the acquaintance process was underway there would be less of a difference between $\underline{S}$s who were

5

originally high, and Ss who were originally low on each of the dependent variables. Thus it was expected that the effects of Dogmatism would be ameliorated by interaction over time, such that any differences in empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness would tend to decrease. This was hypothesized because of Newcomb's theory that people strive to achieve balance in interpersonal relationships. For hypotheses three and four, no sex differences were expected.

5) It was hypothesized that in a given session, a S's amounts of empathy, genuineness, and warmth would show significant intercorrelations.

6) Ss displaying high amounts of empathy, genuineness, and warmth were expected to show a high amount of openness in expressing feelings about controversial and "self" related topics. What openness was displayed by Ss low on empathy, genuineness and warmth was expected to be openness about "nonself" and noncontroversial topics.

7) The more empathic, genuine and warm a S was in a particular meeting, the more empathic, genuine, and warm his partner was expected to be.

8) Finally, high amounts of empathy, genuineness, and warmth displayed by a S were expected to correlate with his partner's amount of openness about controversial and "self" related topics. Similarly, low amounts of empathy, genuineness, and warmth were expected to correlate with partner's openness about noncontroversial and "nonself" related topics.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The subjects for this project were unmarried college students,
between nineteen and twenty-three years of age, at Michigan State
University. They were recruited through a newspaper advertise-
ment, bulletin board notices and announcements in selected classes.

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and a brief version of the Allport-
Lindzey Values Scale (see appendix) developed by Newcomb (1960) were
administered to prospective subjects. From seventy prospective $\underline{S}$s,
thirty-two $\underline{S}$s were chosen: The eight men and eight women scoring
lowest on Dogmatism and the eight women and eight men scoring highest
on Dogmatism. Sixteen male-female couples were then formed so that
four couples were composed of low Dogmatic $\underline{S}$s, four were composed of
high Dogmatic $\underline{S}$s, four were made up of low Dogmatic women and high
Dogmatic men, and four were made up of high Dogmatic women and low
Dogmatic men. Table 1 presents the mean Dogmatism scores for $\underline{S}$s in
each of these groups. To control for differing values as a possible
confounding variable, the brief version of the Allport-Lindzey Values
Scale was used to form couples such that partner's had like values.
$\underline{S}$s were matched for the values they rated first, second, and sixth.

Each couple met once a week, five times, for a fifty minute
session. Tapes were made of the sessions. The tapes from the 1st
and 5th sessions were rated by trained under-graduate raters who had

7

Table 1.—Mean Dogmatism Scale Score of Subjects
by Groups of Couples

	High Dog. Male	High Dog. Female	High Dog. Male	Low Dog. Female	Low Dog. Male	High Dog. Female	Low Dog. Male	Low Dog. Female
Mean D-Scale Scores	106.75	97.50	104.25	70.00	56.5	96.5	49.25	63.75
	Total $\overline{X}$ = 102.13		Total $\overline{X}$ = 87.13		Total $\overline{X}$ = 78.5		Total $\overline{X}$ = 56.5	

no knowledge of the subjects or of the hypotheses. Raters were trained to criterion by the experimenter. Acceptable reliability was defined as a correlation coefficient of .8 or above. Tapes from a pilot study were used to train the raters. A modified form of the scales developed by Truax (1967) for accurate empathy, genuineness, and nonpossessive warmth, was used to rate Ss for amounts of these variables displayed during a given session (see appendix). Each S was also rated during a given session for amount of openness, according to an openness scale developed for this project (see appendix). The complete tapes of the 1st and 5th sessions were scored at fifteen second intervals, for each of the four variables.

Scoring Procedures

The following sections explain the determination of a S's scores on the four dependent variables (empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness).

Empathy.--A S was given an empathy rating each time his partner expressed an unqualified feeling. If the S was unaware of, or ignored his partner's expression of feeling, he was given a "1" or a "2" for empathy (see appendix for further description of these and other numerical ratings). An accurate response to the feeling, however, was rated "3", "4", or "5", depending on the S's apparent understanding of his partner's additional, unexpressed feelings.

In this study, then, a S's low empathy score for a whole session was defined as the sum of his "1" and "2" empathy scores for the given session. The greater the sum of "1" and "2" empathy ratings, the less the empathy. A S's amount of high empathy was defined as the sum of his "3" and up empathy ratings.

In the analysis of variance for empathy classified by Dogmatism of male, Dogmatism of female, and by session (see Chapter III) a $\underline{S}$'s sum of "3" and up empathy was added to his partner's sum of "3" and up empathy, yielding an empathy score for that couple on a given session.

Genuineness.--A genuineness rating was given to a $\underline{S}$ for each 15 second interval during which he was talking. Ratings of "1", "2", and "3" represent a lack of genuineness, but from greater to lesser defensiveness. Genuineness ratings of "4" and "5" indicate that a $\underline{S}$ was being genuine, or very genuine, respectively.

A $\underline{S}$'s low genuineness score for a whole session was the sum of his "1", "2", and "3" genuineness ratings for the given session. His high genuineness score was the sum of his "4" and "5" genuineness ratings.

In the analysis of variance for genuineness classified by Dogmatism of male, Dogmatism of female, and by session (see Chapter III) a $\underline{S}$'s sum of "4" and "5" genuineness ratings was added to his partner's sum of "4" and "5" genuineness, yielding a genuineness score for that couple on a given session.

Warmth.--A $\underline{S}$'s score for low warmth on a session was the sum of his "1" and "2" warmth ratings for that session. The sum of his "3", "4", and "5" warmth ratings constituted his score for high warmth.

In the analysis of variance for warmth classified by Dogmatism of male, Dogmatism of female, and by session (see Chapter III), a $\underline{S}$'s sum of "3", "4", and "5" warmth ratings was added to his partner's sum of such warmth score for that couple on a given session.

Openness.--A S was rated for openness during each 15 second interval that he expressed a feeling directly. Ratings were along a continuum of openness about feelings about "self", "partner", "controversial issues," "significant others", and "miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics." Unlike the rating of warmth, empathy, and genuineness, rating for openness consisted in simply checking the appropriate type of openness, during the 15 second interval in which it occurred.

Amount of openness for a given session was construed in several ways, depending on the hypothesis being tested. Openness about miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics was the number of ratings for this type of openness. A S's openness score at the "self" end of the continuum was the number of openness ratings under "self", "partner", and "controversial issues." Unless otherwise specified, in the sections that follow, "openness" refers to openness at the "self" end of the continuum, and "high openness" refers to high amounts of this type of openness. To test certain of the hypotheses, in some cases the proportion of "miscellaneous" openness ratings to total openness ratings was also used, as was the number of "self", "partner", and "issues" ratings proportionate to the total number of openness ratings.

In the analysis of variance for openness classified by Dogmatism of male, Dogmatism of female, and by session (see Chapter III.), a S's number of openness ratings at the "self" end of the continuum were added to his partner's number of ratings for such openness, giving an openness score for that couple on a given session.

The data were analyzed in the following ways. (a) An analysis of variance was done for each of the four dependent variables classified by male Dogmatism, female Dogmatism, and by session. (b) For genuineness,

warmth, and openness, an analysis of variance was done for each variable classified by sex, amount of that variable shown on the 1st session, and by session. Such an analysis of variance was not done for empathy because all Ss were so low on empathy during the first session that it was not possible to divide them into high and low groups.

(c) In addition, correlational analyses were done. Broadly classified, these correlations fall into two groups. In the first group are those correlations dealing with the interrelationships of a S's empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness. In the second group are those correlations dealing with the relationship between a S's scores on empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness, and his partner's scores on these variables.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

Analyses of Variance for Dependent Variables
Classified by Male Dogmatism, Female
Dogmatism, and by Session

In this section Hypotheses One and Two from the first chapter
(p. 5), will be discussed in light of the results obtained. To do
so, this chapter has been divided into (a) a discussion of the first
hypothesis for all the dependent variables, (b) a discussion of the
second hypothesis for each of the dependent variables, and (c) a
discussion of unpredicted main effects of male Dogmatism and of
female Dogmatism.

The first hypothesis was that male and female Dogmatism would
interact in such a way that (a) couples composed of $\underline{S}$s scoring low
on Dogmatism would rank highest on each of the dependent variables,
(b) couples in which both $\underline{S}$s scored high on Dogmatism would be less
high, and (c) couples in which one $\underline{S}$ scored high, and the other low
on Dogmatism would both begin and end relationships expressing lesser
amounts of empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness than either of
the groups of couples matched for like Dogmatism.

Hypothesis Two was that all couples were expected to increase
on each of the dependent variables from the 1st to the 5th session.

The data were subjected to analyses of variance, summarized for
empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness on Tables 3, 5, 7, and 9

13

respectively. Cell means for empathy, genuineness, warmth, and open-
ness are presented in Tables 2, 4, 6, and 8 respectively. Presented
below are these results discussed in terms of the hypotheses, and in
terms of unpredicted findings.

Hypothesis One
(Interaction of levels of Dogmatism)

It was expected that male and female Dogmatism would interact in
such a way that couples in which both Ss scored low on Dogmatism would
score highest on each of the dependent variables; couples in which both
Ss scored high on Dogmatism would be less high; and couples matched
for opposing Dogmatism scores would be lowest of all. This hypothesis
was not confirmed.

There are at least two reasons why similarities and differences
in the personality variable of Dogmatism did not interact in the ex-
pected way. One explanation is that the Ss in this sample, despite
the wide range of their Dogmatism scores, tended to be low Dogmatics,
as compared with the general population. Therefore, among the Ss in
this study, the differences in Dogmatism might not have been sufficient
to produce the expected interaction of male and female Dogmatism. The
other explanation is that in fact, similarities and differences in
Dogmatism, as measured by Rokeach's Scale, do not affect the exchange
of empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness in the acquaintance pro-
cess.

However, trust in others, an alternate personality variable, but
somewhat related to Dogmatism, might be important in producing inter-
actions in which differences in empathy, genuineness, warmth, and open-
ness are maximized. Low Dogmatism was supposed to be associated with

Table 2.--Mean Empathy Scores for Pairs, Classified by
Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism
of Female, and by Session

a. Overall classification.--For sessions 1 and 5, mean pair scores
of couples in which (1) the male was a high Dogmatic and the fe-
male was a high Dogmatic (2) the male was a high Dogmatic and
the female was a low Dogmatic (3) the male was a low Dogmatic
and the female was a high Dogmatic (4) the male was a low Dog-
matic and the female was a low Dogmatic.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	3.75	20.75	24.50
	Low Female Dogmatism	2.25	5.25	7.50
Low Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	3.00	17.75	20.75
	Low Female Dogmatism	3.75	7.00	10.75
Total		12.75	50.75	63.50

b. Mean pair scores for the four groups of couples.

	High Female Dog.	Low Female Dog.	Total
High Male Dogmatism	24.50	7.50	32.00
Low Male Dogmatism	20.75	10.75	31.50
Total	45.25	18.25	63.50

Table 2--Continued

c. Mean pair scores for couples in which the male was a
   high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	6.00	26.00	32.00
Low Male Dogmatism	6.75	24.75	31.50
Total	12.75	50.75	63.50

d. Mean pair scores for couples in which the female was a
   high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Female Dogmatism	6.75	38.50	45.25
Low Female Dogmatism	6.00	12.25	18.25
Total	12.75	50.75	63.50

Table 3.—Summary of Analysis of Variance for Empathy
Classified by Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism
of Female, and by Session

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Male Dogmatism	1	62.12	∠1
Female Dogmatism	1	364.50	3.82*
Male Dog. X Female Dog.	1	24.50	∠1
Error	12	95.4	
Session	1	722.00	8.63**
Male Dog. X Session	1	5.00	∠1
Female Dog. X Session	1	325.12	3.89*
Sessions for high female dog.	1	2,016.13	24.10***
Sessions for low female dog.	1	78.12	∠1
Empathy for 1st session	1	1.24	∠1
Empathy for 5th session	1	1,378.12	16.47***
Male Dog. X Female Dog. X Session	1	3.13	∠1
Error	12	83.65	.

*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

Table 4.--Mean Genuineness Scores for Pairs, Classified by
Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism of
Female, and by Session

a. Overall classification.--For sessions 1 and 5, mean pair scores
of couples in which (1) the male was a high Dogmatic and the fe-
male was a high Dogmatic (2) the male was a high Dogmatic and the
female was a low Dogmatic (3) the male was a low Dogmatic and the
female was a high Dogmatic (4) the male was a low Dogmatic and
the female was a low Dogmatic.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	52.25	245.00	297.25
	Low Female Dogmatism	140.25	149.25	289.50
Low Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	77.00	188.50	255.50
	Low Female Dogmatism	88.00	254.50	342.50
Total		357.50	837.25	1184.75

b. Mean pair scores for the four groups of couples.

	High Female Dog.	Low Female Dog.	Total
High Male Dogmatism	297.25	289.50	586.75
Low Male Dogmatism	265.50	342.50	608.00
Total	562.75	632.00	1194.75

Table 4.--Continued

   c. Mean pair scores for couples in which the male was a
      high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	192.50	394.25	586.75
Low Male Dogmatism	165.00	443.00	608.00
Total	357.50	837.25	1194.75

   d. Mean pair scores for couples in which the female was a
      high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Female Dogmatism	129.25	433.50	562.75
Low Female Dogmatism	228.25	403.75	632.00
Total	357.50	837.25	1194.75

Table 5.--Summary of Analysis of Variance for Genuineness
Classified by Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism
of Female, and by Session

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Male Dogmatism	1	225.78	<1
Female Dogmatism	1	2,397.78	<1
Male dog. X Female dog.	1	3,591.30	<1
Error	12	13,383.82	
Session	1	115,080.03	8.64*
Male dog. X Session	1	2,907.04	<1
Female dog. X Session	1	8,288.29	<1
Male dog. X Female dog. X Session	1	28,500.75	2.14
Error	12	13,318.43	

*$p < .05$

Table 6.--Mean Warmth Scores for Pairs, Classified by
Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism
of Female, and by Session

a. Overall classification.--For sessions 1 and 5, mean pair scores
of couples in which (1) the male was a high Dogmatic and the
female was a high Dogmatic (2) the male was a high Dogmatic and
the female was a low Dogmatic (3) the male was a low Dogmatic
and the female was a high Dogmatic (4) the male was a low Dog-
matic and the female was a low Dogmatic.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	76.75	146.50	223.25
	Low Female Dogmatism	105.25	118.5	223.75
Low Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	49.00	75.25	124.25
	Low Female Dogmatism	79.50	102.00	181.50
Total		310.50	442.25	752.75

b. Mean pair scores for the four groups of couples.

	High Female Dog.	Low Female Dog.	Total
High Male Dogmatism	223.25	223.75	447.00
Low Male Dogmatism	124.25	181.50	305.75
Total	347.50	405.25	752.75

Table 6.--Continued

c. Mean pair scores for couples in which the male was a high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	182.00	265.00	447.00
Low Male Dogmatism	128.50	177.25	305.75
Total	310.50	442.25	752.75

d. Mean pair scores for couples in which the female was a high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Female Dogmatism	125.75	221.75	347.50
Low Female Dogmatism	184.75	220.50	405.25
Total	310.50	442.25	752.75

Table 7.--Summary of Analysis of Variance for Warmth
Classified by Dogmatism of Male, Dogma-
tism of Female, and by Session

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Male dogmatism	1	9,975.78	6.20*
Female dogmatism	1	1,667.53	< 2
Male dog. X Female dog.	1	1,610.29	< 2
Error	12	1,603.43	< 2
Session	11	8,679.03	7.89*
Male dog. X Session	1	586.47	< 1
Female dog. X Session	1	1,815.04	< 2
Male dog. X Female dog. X Session	1	1,391.26	< 2
Error	12	1,1099.51	

*p < .05

Table 8.--Mean Openness Scores for Pairs, Classified by
Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism
of Female, and by Session

a. <u>Overall classification.</u>--For sessions 1 and 5, mean pair scores
of couples in which (1) the male was a high Dogmatic and the
female was a high Dogmatic (2) the male was a high Dogmatic and
the female was a low Dogmatic (3) the male was a low Dogmatic
and the female was a high Dogmatic (4) the male was a low Dog-
matic and the female was a low Dogmatic.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	6.25	8.00	14.25
	Low Female Dogmatism	18.25	6.00	24.25
Low Male Dogmatism	High Female Dogmatism	13.25	13.25	26.50
	Low Female Dogmatism	10.50	6.00	16.50
Total		48.25	33.25	81.50

b. Mean pair scores for the four groups of couples.

	High Female Dog.	Low Female Dog.	Total
High Male Dogmatism	14.25	24.25	38.50
Low Male Dogmatism	26.50	16.50	43.00
Total	40.75	40.75	81.50

Table 8.--<u>Continued</u>

   c. Mean pair scores for couples in which the male was a
      high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Male Dogmatism	24.50	14.00	38.50
Low Male Dogmatism	23.75	19.25	43.00
Total	48.25	33.25	81.50

   d. Mean Pair scores for couples in which the female was a
      high or a low Dogmatic, across sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
High Female Dogmatism	19.50	21.25	40.75
Low Female Dogmatism	28.75	12.00	40.75
Total	48.25	33.25	81.50

Table 9.--Summary of Analysis of Variance for Openness
Classified by Dogmatism of Male, Dogmatism
of Female, and by Session

Source of variation .s	df	MS	F
Male dogmatism	1	10.13	∠1
Female dogmatism	1	0.00	0
Male dog. X Female dog.	1	200.00	2.01
Error	12	99.48	
Session	1	112.50	∠2
Male dog. X Session	1	18.00	∠1
Female dog. X Session	1	171.13	∠2
Male dog. X Female dog. X Session	1	45.14	∠1
Error	12	90.85	

trust, but perhaps an independent measure of trust should have been
used. Trust was and is presumed to be important in the positive regard
and the unconditionality which marks high levels of warmth and empathy.
Similarly, an attitude of trust is necessary if a person is to be
undefensive, which is part of being highly genuine. Trust would also
seem to be a prerequisite for being open toward the "self" end of the
openness continuum. Finally, as Truax and Carkhuff (1967) suggest,
genuine warmth and empathy displayed by one person tend to create an
attitude of trust in the other person.

Hypothesis Two

The hypothesized session effect was confirmed for empathy (F = 8.63,
df = 1,12; $p < .05$), genuineness (F = 8.64, df = 1,12; $p < .05$), and warmth
(F = 7.89, df = 1,12; $p < .05$), but not for openness. For openness, none
of the Fs were significant. However, many of the Fs for openness of
individuals (rather than couples) classified by sex, first session amount
of openness, and by session were significant (see the following section
pp. 39-44).

In the case of empathy, the significant Female Dogmatism X Session
interaction (see Table 3, and discussion of unpredicted findings) indi-
cates that this increase was greatest for couples in which the woman
scored high on Dogmatism, regardless of whether her partner was high or
low. In fact, the F value of the simple effect for high female Dogmatism
across sessions was highly significant (F = 24.10, df = 1,12; $p < .01$).
Given the analysis used it was not possible to tell if this increase
in empathy shown by couples in which the woman scored high on Dogmatism
was due to these women becoming more empathic, or due to their elicit-
ing more empathic responses from their male partners. Because of this,

at least two explanations of these results must be considered: (a) it may have taken high Dogmatic women a full five sessions to achieve their relatively high amounts of empathy. In this case, low Dogmatic women may not have experienced this "warm up" effect. By being forced to interact in an interpersonal situation, these women scoring high on Dogmatism may have been exposed to an uniquely positive experience. If this is the case, they may have been overcompensating in response to such an experience, which would account for their very significant increase in amount of empathy displayed from the 1st to the 5th session. (b) Similarly, it may have taken high Dogmatic women a full five sessions to elicit relatively high amounts of empathy from their partners. In this case, low Dogmatic women were presumably eliciting relatively constant empathic responses from their partners.

Discussion of Unpredicted Findings

The main effects of Dogmatism of male and Dogmatism of female were not expected to contribute significantly to differences in degree shown of the dependent variables by couples on the 1st and 5th sessions. However, significant differences in amounts displayed of empathy and warmth were found to be attributable to female and male Dogmatism scores respectively.

For empathy there was a main effect of female Dogmatism which was of borderline significance ($\underline{F}$ = 3.82, $\underline{df}$ = 1,12; .05 < $\underline{p}$ < .10). Moreover, a Female Dogmatism X Session interaction was also of borderline significance ($\underline{F}$ = 3.89, $\underline{df}$ = 1,12; .05 < $\underline{p}$ < .10). An analysis of simple effects revealed that differences attributable to female Dogmatism occurred in the 5th session. During this session, couples in which the female was a high Dogmatic displayed significantly more empathy than couples in

which the female was a low Dogmatic (F = 16.47, df = 1,12; $p < .01$).
However, during the 1st session this difference was negligible. As
suggested earlier (see pp. 28), the 5th session may represent a
"warm up" effect for either the man or the woman in couples in which
the woman was a high Dogmatic. Assuming that this very significant
increase in empathy was due to increased empathy displayed by high
Dogmatic women, this may reflect the fact that this study provided
a new and positive experience for them, to which they were overreact-
ing. Similar effects were not apparent for males scoring high on
Dogmatism. This is probably because it is more socially acceptable
for women to be emotionally responsive.

Another unpredicted result was the significant main effect attri-
butable to male Dogmatism when warmth was the dependent variable under
consideration (F = 6.20, df = 1,12; $p < .05$). This indicated that couples
in which the male was a high Dogmatic showed more warmth, irrespective
of session and Dogmatism level of partner. Given the analysis used,
two explanations are possible, as noted above. High Dogmatic males
may have displayed more warmth, or they may have elicited more warmth
from their partners.

The latter alternative seems more likely. Since high Dogmatic
men are probably somewhat insecure, they might have been expected to
need more reassurance from their partner's, such as is afforded by
warmth. Thus their female partner's, in their cultural role as reas-
suring and nurturing, might have responded to this need by giving more
warmth. Also, it may be that women tend to give way readily in con-
versation with highly Dogmatic men, and find it easier to ask questions
and accept the man's opinions (both aspects of higher levels of warmth)
than to negatively evaluate his opinions (an aspect of low levels of
warmth) and have to defend such an evaluation.

Analyses of Variance for Genuineness,
Warmth, and Openness Classified by
Sex, First Session Amount of Dep-
endent Variable, and by Session

In this section Hypotheses Three and Four from Chapter I (pp.5-6)
will be discussed in light of the results obtained. To do so, this
section has been divided into sections considering genuineness, warmth
and openness for differences attributable to 1st session amount of the
dependent variable, session effects, and sex differences.[1]

It was expected that there would be significant differences among
Ss in the 1st session, and that these differences would be smaller in
the 5th session. Thus on the basis of the data obtained, Ss were
divided into high and low groups on each of the dependent variables,
according to their scores on the 1st session. In this way, an analysis
of differences in the 5th session could be obtained.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three stated that all Ss, whether beginning
high or low on empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness, would increase
on these variables. However, it was expected that Ss starting low on a
variable would increase on that variable at a greater rate than those
starting high. Thus Hypothesis Four was that Ss originally high, and
Ss originally low on each of the dependent variables, (that is, in the
1st session) would show smaller differences in the 5th session. Though
no sex differences were anticipated, as a precaution, the data were also
classified by sex.

_____

[1] Empathy is not discussed because the similarity of most S's
empathy scores for the 1st session precluded the forming of Ss into
groups high and low on empathy.

The rationale behind these hypotheses was that in a 1st meeting, people have few clues as to what the other person is like, and therefore bring a wide range of individual differences in empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness into the acquaintance situation. With this in mind, it was expected that there would be significant differences among Ss on the dependent variables during the 1st session. After several sessions, however, people have presumably formed some idea of those feelings, attitudes and beliefs which they have in common with the other. Presumably they are also aware of those feelings, attitudes, and beliefs which are threatened by, or are threatening to, the other. Thus they have some idea where it is gratifying to be more empathic, genuine, warm and open, and feel freer to be so. The hypothesis that all Ss would increase on the dependent variables addressed itself to this point. Originally low Ss were expected to increase more than originally high Ss, because in five meetings there are probably general upper limits in empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness, to which originally high Ss are fairly close at the beginning. Newcomb's theory that people strive for balance in interpersonal relationships accounts for the hypothesis that by the 5th session the differences between originally high and low Ss would be smaller.

Genuineness

Genuineness scores were classified by sex, first session amount of genuineness, and by session (cell means are presented in Table 10). The data were subjected to an analysis of variance, summarized in Table 11. These results are discussed below in terms of the hypotheses.

Table 10.--Mean Genuineness Scores Classified by
Sex, First Session Amount of Gen-
uineness and by Session

a. Overall classification.--Mean genuineness (table 12, warmth;
    table 14, openness) scores of males and females Ss, divided
    into groups for those who showed high and those who showed
    low amounts of genuineness (warmth, openness) in the 1st
    session, and the mean scores of those groups on the 5th
    session.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
Male	High 1st ses. gen.	78.13	101.13	179.26
	Low 1st ses. gen.	12.50	100.63	113.13
Female	High 1st ses. gen.	77.13	78.50	155.63
	Low 1st ses. gen.	11.00	138.38	149.38
Total		178.76	418.64	597.40

b. Mean genuineness (warmth, openness) of males and females,
    divided into groups for those who showed high and those
    who showed low amount of genuineness (warmth, openness)
    on the 1st session.

	High 1st ses. gen.	Low 1st ses. gen.	Total
Male	179.25	113.13	292.38
Female	155.64	149.38	305.02
Total	334.89	262.51	597.40

Table 10.--Continued

  c. Mean genuineness ~~(warmth, openness)~~ scores for males and
      females on the 1st and 5th sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
Male	90.63	201.75	292.38
Female	83.13	216.89	305.02
Total	178.76	418.64	597.40

  d. Mean genuineness ~~(warmth, openness)~~ scores for the high and
      low 1st session groups, for the 1st and 5th sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
Hi 1st ses. genuineness	155.25	179.64	334.89
Lo 1st ses. genuineness	23.51	239.00	262.51
Total	178.76	418.64	597.40

Table 11.—Summary of Analysis of Variance for Genuineness
Classified by Sex, Amount of Genuineness
During 1st Session, and by Session

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Sex	1	159.39	< 1
1st Session Amount of genuineness	1	5,238.14	< 2
Sex X 1st Ses. amount of genuineness	1	3,585.02	< 2
Error	28	3,118.29	
Session	1	57,440.00	5.25**
Sex X Session	1	310.60	< 1
1st Session amount of genuineness X Session	1	36,528.76	3.34*
Sessions for hi gen.	1	2,376.57	< 1
Sessions for low gen.	1	185,761.00	16.99***
Gen. for 1st session	1	69,431.25	22.27***
Gen. for 5th session	1	14,101.57	4.52**
Sex X 1st ses. genuineness X Session	1	3,705.77	< 1
Error	28	10,931.90	

*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

First session amount of genuineness.--The First session amount of genuineness X Session interaction was of borderline significance (F = 3.34, df = 1,28; .05< p <.10). An analysis of simple effects indicated that, as expected, there was a significant difference between $\underline{S}$s high and low on genuineness during the 1st session (F = 22.27, df = 1,28; p <.01). The results supported the hypothesis that on the 5th session there would be less difference between $\underline{S}$s originally high and low on genuineness (F = 4.52, df = 1,28; p <.05). The results showed, however, that the relationship between the originally high and low groups of $\underline{S}$s was reversed on the 5th session. That is, $\underline{S}$s originally low on genuineness increased more than expected, surpassing $\underline{S}$s who were originally high. There are two possible and complementary explanations for this result. The first is that $\underline{S}$s originally low on genuineness not only increased in genuineness by the 5th session, but also increased in volume of talking; this would have contributed somewhat to their genuineness scores, due to the way in which genuineness was rated (see Chapter II). The second possible explanation is that $\underline{S}$s originally low on genuineness suffered from social discomfort which interfered with their interpersonal functioning in the initial phase of the acquaintance process. By the 5th session, when this initial effect wore off, their potential for highly genuine behavior became apparent.

Session.--As hypothesized, there was a significant main effect due to session (F = 5.25, df = 1,28; p <.05), with all $\underline{S}$s increasing in genuineness from the 1st to the 5th session. As mentioned above, there was also a First session amount of genuineness X Session interaction. An analysis of simple effects revealed that the increase in genuineness for originally low $\underline{S}$s was significant, as expected (F = 16.99, df = 1.28; p <.01).

However, contrary to the hypothesis, Ss originally high on genuineness did not increase significantly in genuineness from the 1st to the 5th session. This may have been because the originally low Ss may have been talking much more in the 5th session, as suggested above; thus Ss originally high in genuineness may have been no less genuine, but were simply spending more time listening.

Sex.--As expected, there were no significant differences in genuineness among individuals attributable to sex differences.

Warmth

Warmth scores were classified by first session amount of warmth, by session, and by sex (cell means are presented in Table 12). The data were subjected to an analysis of variance, which is summarized in Table 13. These results are discussed below in terms of the hypotheses.

First session amount of warmth.--There was a significant main effect due to first session amount of warmth ($F = 9.47$, $df = 1,28$; $p < .01$). Moreover, as hypothesized, there was a significant First session amount of warmth X Session interaction ($F = 10.26$, $df = 1,28$; $p < .01$). An analysis of simple effects revealed that there was the expected significant difference between the high and low groups formed from data for the 1st session; however, as expected, on the 5th session the differences between Ss originally high and low had decreased such that there was no longer a significant difference between them.

Session.--As expected, a significant main effect due to session was found ($F = 10.67$, $df = 1,28$; $p < .01$). In addition there was the expected First session amount of warmth X Session interaction, as mentioned above. The analysis of simple effects showed that the increase in warmth for the originally low group was significant ($F = 41.85$, $df = 1,28$; $p < .01$),

Table 12.--Mean Warmth Scores Classified by
Sex, First Session Amount of
Warmth and by Session

a. <u>Overall classification</u>.--Mean ~~genuineness (table 12,~~ warmth;
~~table 14, openness)~~ scores of male and female S̲s, divided
into groups for those who showed high and those who showed
low amounts of ~~genuineness~~ (warmth, ~~openness)~~ in the 1st
session, and the mean scores of those groups on the 5th
session.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
Male	High 1st ses. warmth	64.125	53.250	117.375
	Low 1st ses. warmth	21.000	48.375	69.375
Female	High 1st ses. warmth	54.500	66.000	120.500
	Low 1st ses. warmth	15.625	53.500	69.125
Total		155.250	221.125	376.375

b. Mean ~~genuineness~~ (warmth, ~~openness)~~ of males and females,
divided into groups for those who showed high and those
who showed low amounts of ~~genuineness~~ (warmth, ~~openness)~~
on the 1st session.

	High 1st ses. warmth	Low 1st ses. warmth	Total
Male	117.375	69.375	186.750
Female	120.500	69.125	189.625
Total	237.875	138.500	376.375

Table 12.--Continued

c. Mean ~~genuineness~~ (warmth, ~~openness~~) scores for males and
females on the 1st and 5th sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
Male	85.125	101.625	186.750
Female	70.125	119.500	189.625
Total	155.25	221.125	376.375

d. Mean ~~genuineness~~ (warmth, ~~openness~~) scores for the high
and low 1st session groups, for the 1st and 5th sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
Hi 1st ses. warmth	118.625	119.250	237.875
Lo 1st ses. warmth	36.625	101.875	138.500
Total	155.250	221.125	376.375

Table 13.—Summary of Analysis of Variance for Warmth
Classified by Sex, 1st Session Amount
of Warmth, and by Session

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Sex	1	8.27	< 1
1st Session amount of warmth	1	9,875.08	9.47*
Sex X 1st session amount of warmth	1	11.70	< 1
Error	28	1,042.19	
Session	1	4,339.52	10.67*
Sex X Session	1	1,080.76	2.66
1st session amount of warmth X Session	1	4,176.70	10.26*
Sessions for hi warmth	1	1.19	< 1
Sessions for lo warmth	1	17,030.25	41.85*
Warmth for 1st session	1	26,890.00	25.81*
Warmth for 5th session	1	1,207.57	< 2
Sex X 1st ses. amount of warmth X Session	1	140.71	< 1
Error	18	406.96	

*$p < .01$

but the increase for the $\underline{S}$s who were high originally was not. The explanation of the originally high $\underline{S}$'s failure to increase significantly in warmth is probably related to the failure of $\underline{S}$s originally high on genuineness to increase. This is suggested by the fact that the correlation between high amounts of warmth and high amounts of genuineness was significant on the 1st session ($r = .40$). These $\underline{S}$s were probably playing a more passive role in the 5th session; having demonstrated their genuineness, and communicated their warmth in earlier sessions, by the 5th session they may have been just sitting back and listening, as suggested above.

Sex.--As expected, no significant differences in warmth were attributable to sex differences.

Openness

Openness scores were classified by first session amount of openness, by session, and by sex (cell means are presented in Table 14). The data were subjected to an analysis of variance, which is summarized on Table 15. These results are discussed below in terms of the hypotheses.

First session amount of openness.--There was a significant main effect for degree of openness on the 1st session ($\underline{F} = 22.39$, $\underline{df} = 1,28$; $\underline{p} < .01$). Moreover, there was a significant First session amount of openness X Session interaction, as expected ($\underline{F} = 11.93$, $\underline{df} = 1,28$; $\underline{p} < .01$). The simple effects analysis showed that there was, as predicted, a very significant difference between $\underline{S}$s high and low on openness for the 1st session ($\underline{F} = 78.20$, $\underline{df} = 1,28$; $\underline{p} < .01$). In addition, as hypothesized, this difference between $\underline{S}$s was reduced such that there was no longer any difference between them on the 5th session.

Table 14.--Mean Openness Scores Classified by
Sex, First Session Amount of
Openness and by Session

a. Overall classification.--Mean ~~genuineness (table 12, warmth;
table 14,~~ openness) scores of male and female Ss, divided
into groups for those who showed high and those who showed
low amounts of ~~genuineness (warmth,~~ openness) in the 1st
session, and the mean scores of those groups on the 5th
session.

		Session 1	Session 5	Total
Male	High 1st ses. open.	7.25	4.50	11.75
	Low 1st ses. open.	1.12	1.38	2.50
Female	High 1st ses. open.	13.38	4.61	17.99
	Low 1st ses. open.	2.38	6.13	8.51
Total		24.14	16.62	40.75

b. Mean ~~genuineness (warmth,~~ openness) of males and females,
divided into groups for those who showed high and those
who showed low amounts of ~~genuineness (warmth,~~ openness)
on the 1st session.

	High 1st ses. open.	Low 1st ses. open.	Total
Male	11.75	2.50	14.25
Female	18.00	8.50	26.50
Total	29.75	11.00	40.75

Table 14.--Continued

c. Mean ~~genuineness (warmth,~~ openness) scores for males and females on the 1st and 5th sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
Male	8.37	5.88	14.25
Female	15.75	10.75	26.50
Total	24.12	16.63	40.75

d. Mean ~~genuineness (warmth,~~ openness) scores for the high and low 1st session groups, for the 1st and 5th sessions.

	Session 1	Session 5	Total
Hi 1st ses. openness	20.63	9.12	29.75
Lo 1st ses. openness	3.50	7.50	11.00
Total	24.13	16.62	40.75

Table 15.--Summary of Analysis of Variance for Openness
Classified by Sex, 1st Session Amount of
Openness, and by Session

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Sex	1	150.07	10.03**
1st Session amount of openness	1	351.57	22.39**
Sex X 1st ses. am't of openness	1	.05	<1
Error	28	15.03	
Session	1	56.25	2.64
Sex X Session	1	6.25	<1
1st session amount of openness X Session	1	240.25	11.93**
Sessions for high openness	1	592.00	26.27**
Sessions for low openness	1	128.50	6.40*
Openness for 1st session	1	1,173.00	78.20**
Openness for 5th session	1	10.57	<1
Sex X 1st session openness X Session	1	90.25	4.48*
Sex for hi 1st ses. openness	1	150.07	10.00**
Sex for lo 1st ses. openness	1	3,704.13	2.46
Sex for hi 1st ses. group in 5th session	1	1.08	<1
Sex for lo 1st ses. group in 5th session	1	95.25	6.34*
Openness for males on 1st ses.	1	150.07	10.00**
Openness for fem. on 1st ses.	1	484.00	32.27**
Openness for males in 5th ses.	1	39.07	2.70
Openness for fem. in 5th ses.	1	10.57	<1
Sessions for males high on openness in 1st session	1	30.25	2
Sessions for females high on openness in 1st session	1	306.25	15.21**
Sessions for males low on openness in 1st session	1	.25	<1
Sessions for females low on openness in 1st session	1	56.25	2.79
Error	28	20.14	

*p<.05
**p<.01

There was also a significant sex X First session amount of openness X Session interaction (F = 4.48, df = 1,28; $p < .05$). The analysis of simple effects indicated that there was a significant difference between men who were high and low on openness during the first session (F = 10.00, df = 1,28; $p < .01$). Similarly there was a significant difference between women who were high and low on openness during this session (F = 32.27, df = 1,28; $p < .01$). Further discussion of the Sex X First session amount of openness X Session interaction will be taken up in the following paragraphs for Session and Sex.

Session.--Contrary to expectation, the session effect was not unconditionally significant. However, as noted above, there was the expected First session amount of openness X Session interaction. Analysis of simple effects revealed that as hypothesized, Ss originally low on openness increased significantly from the 1st to the 5th session (F = 6.40, df = 1,28; $p < .05$). On the other hand, contrary to expectation, Ss originally high on openness decreased significantly (F = 26.27, df = 1,28; $p < .01$). A simple effects analysis for the noted Sex X First session amount of openness X Session interaction further indicated that the decrease in openness by originally high Ss was attributable to the significant decrease in openness by originally high women (F = 15.21, df = 1,28; $p < .01$). This may indicate that people high on openness early in the acquaintance process run out of things to be open about later. Since women originally high on openness were significantly more open than men originally on openness (see below), it makes sense that it is the women who account for the decrease in openness of the originally high Ss.

Sex.--Contrary to expectation, there was a significant main effect attributable to sex differences (F = 10.03, df = 1,28; $p < .01$). Moreover, there was, as mentioned above, a significant Sex X First session amount of openness X Session interaction (F = 4.48, df = 1,28; $p < .05$). The analysis of simple effects revealed that during the 1st session, females high on openness were significantly more open than males who were high on openness (F = 10.00, df = 1,28; $p < .01$). During the 5th session, there was a sex difference between $\underline{S}$s who had started low on openness: women were significantly more open than men (F = 6.34, df = 1,28; $p < .05$).

Differences in openness attributable to sex differences were not predicted. Possibly these results reflect the fact that it is more socially acceptable for women to openly express feelings in our culture than it is for men. It is also possible that female college students are more mature than college men, and are therefore more ready to be open.

Correlational Analyses

Correlations Between Self Scores for Empathy, Genuineness, and Warmth

Hypothesis Five from Chapter I (p. 6) will be discussed in this section, in light of the results obtained. To do so, this section is divided into subsections for empathy and genuineness, discussed in relation with themselves, with each other, and with warmth (see Table 16).

According to Hypothesis Five, in a given session $\underline{S}$'s amounts of empathy, genuineness, and warmth, should show significant inter-correlations. For example, a $\underline{S}$ showing a high amount of high empathy was expected to display similarly high amounts of high genuineness and warmth; $\underline{S}$s displaying high amounts of low empathy were expected to be similarly low on genuineness and warmth. It was expected that a $\underline{S}$'s amount of high empathy would correlate negatively with his amount of low empathy, and so on for the other variables. The remainder of this section is a discussion of the results of the correlational analyses performed to test this hypothesis.

Empathy with empathy.--During the 5th session, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of high and low empathy were positively correlated ($r = .77$), contrary to the hypothesis. This result may reflect the fact that a $\underline{S}$'s empathy scores were to some extent a function of the number of times his partner was open. This is so because a $\underline{S}$ was rated for empathy only when his partner had expressed a feeling: the more expression of feelings, the more empathy ratings, irrespective of direction.

Table 16.—Correlation Coefficients of Self Scores for Empathy, Genuineness, and Warmth

	Low Empathy		High Empathy		Low Genuineness		High Genuineness		Low Warmth		High Warmth	
	1st Ses	5th Ses	1st Ses	5th Ses	1st Ses	5th Ses	1st Ses	5th Ses	1st Ses	5th Ses	1st Ses	5th Ses
Low Empathy												
High Emp.	(-.11)[a]	.77										
Low Gen.	-.42	-.39	-.34[b]	-.30[b]								
High Gen.					-.34[b]	-.53						
Low Warmth	(.10)	.54	(-.13)	.63								
High Warmth	.41	(.14)					.40	(-.16)				

Note.—Empty cells indicate that neither coefficient was significant.

[a]Parentheses are used throughout this table to indicate a correlation that is not significant.

[b]One tailed test since a priori hypothesis was directional.

Thus a person whose partner made many open statements would tend to have a greater number of both high and low empathy ratings than a person whose partner made few open statements.

This explanation is supported by the fact that in the 5th session, a S's amount of high and low empathy both correlated positively with partner's openness at the "self" end of the continuum. However, since this effect of a partner's openness on a S's empathy seemingly did not hold for the 1st session, it can only be concluded that the relationship between these variables is more complex than was previously supposed, and thus warrants further investigation.

Empathy with genuineness.--As hypothesized, a high degree of empathy did correlate negatively with low genuineness for both sessions (session 1, r = -.34; session 5, r = -.30). However, lack of empathy also correlated negatively with low genuineness for both sessions (session 1, r = -.42; session 5, r = -.39). This unexpected result may be explained by the relationship between amount of low empathy displayed and partner's openness, discussed above. This is suggested by the fact that low genuineness also correlated negatively with partner's amount of openness at the "self" end of the continuum for both sessions.

Empathy with warmth.--Contrary to the hypothesis, low empathy had a positive correlation to high warmth on the 1st session (r = .41). As before, this is presumed to be the result of empathy being in some way an artifact of partner's openness, since on the 1st session a S's high warmth correlated positively with partner's amount of openness, as well as with the S's own low empathy score. Since on the 5th session, low warmth correlated with partner's amount of openness, the same reasoning probably accounts for the fact that both high and low degrees of

empathy correlated positively with a S's amount of low warmth on the 5th session (with low empathy, r = .54; with high empathy, r = .53).

Genuineness with genuineness.--As hypothesized, high and low genuineness were negatively correlated for both sessions (session 1, r = -.34; session 5, r = -.53).

Genuineness with warmth.--As expected, high genuineness and high warmth were correlated for the 1st session (r = .40). This correlation was not significant, but slightly negative for the 5th session. This change from the 1st to the 5th session may indicate that in the initial phase of the acquaintance process, people were more concerned with communicating warmth to their partners, even at the expense of not being genuine. The lack of a significant correlation between genuineness and warmth for the 5th session, however, may indicate that by the 5th session Ss were more genuine, and less concerned with communicating what may have been a false warmth in the 1st session.

Warmth with warmth.--Contrary to expectation, high and low warmth were not negatively correlated for either session. In fact they did not correlate at all. A possible explanation of this lack of correlation is that Ss were not necessarily consistent in degree of warmth displayed.

Correlations of Self Scores for Empathy,
Genuineness, and Warmth with Self
Scores for Openness

In this section Hypothesis Six from Chapter I (p. 6) will be discussed in light of the results obtained. To do so, this section is divided into subsections for empathy, warmth, and genuineness. In each subsection, the correlations between the variable under consideration and the openness variables (see Table 17), is discussed.

Hypothesis Six was that $\underline{S}$s displaying high amounts of high empathy, genuineness, and warmth, would also be high on sum and/or proportion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum. Similarly, low empathy, genuineness, and warmth were expected to correlate with openness at the "miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics" end of the continuum. The remainder of this section is a discussion of the results of the correlational analyses performed to test this hypothesis.

Empathy

High empathy did correlate as expected with sum of openness at the "self" end of the continuum during the 5th session (r = .31). This correlation did not hold for the 1st session. This result may be explained by the fact that most $\underline{S}$s showed very little empathy, either high or low, on the 1st session.

Contrary to the hypothesis, empathy did not correlate with any of the other openness variables. This indicates that empathy is not related to openness to the extent that was first supposed. The initial reasoning behind this hypothesis was that while responding empathically to his partner's openness, a $\underline{S}$ would also respond by being more open

Table 17.--Correlation Coefficients of Self Scores for Empathy, Genuineness, and Warmth with Self Scores for Openness

	Sum "self" Openness		Proportion of "self" Openness		Sum "misc." Openness		Proportion of "misc." Openness	
	Session		Session		Session		Session	
	1st	5th	1st	5th	1st	5th	1st	5th
Low Empathy								
High Empathy	(-.19)[a]	.31[b]						
Low Genuineness	(-.16)	-.36	(-.15)	-.39	.33[b]	.35		
High Genuineness	.62	.45	.53	(.19)			-.51	(-.22)
Low Warmth	(-.06)	.52	(-.07)	.35				
High Warmth			.37	(.09)			-.34[b]	(.05)

Note.--Empty cells indicate that neither coefficient was significant.

[a]Parentheses are used throughout this table to indicate a correlation that is not significant.

[b]One tailed test since a priori hypothesis was directional.

about himself. In line with this reasoning, a S's openness at the "self" end of the continuum did correlate positively with partner's openness at the "self" end of the continuum. However, since empathy did not correlate with other openness scores, the supposition of a relationship between these variables must remain tentative.

Genuineness

As expected, high genuineness correlated with sum of openness at the "self" end of the continuum for both sessions (session 1, $r = .62$; session 5, $r = .45$). For the 1st, but not for the 5th session, high genuineness correlated as well with proportion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum ($r = .53$), and also correlated negatively as expected, with proportion of openness about miscellaneous topics ($r = -.51$).

As hypothesized, low genuineness had a negative correlation with sum of openness at the "self" end of the continuum for the 5th session ($r = -.36$), and also with the proportion of such openness for that session ($r = -.39$). These correlations were negative for the 1st session also, but not significant.

For both sessions, low genuineness correlated as expected with sum of openness about miscellaneous topics (session 1, $r = .33$; session 5, $r = .35$).

In sum, this aspect of the hypothesis was substantially confirmed. This evidence that there is, in fact, a relationship between genuineness and openness indicates that trust in oneself, and in the other, might be important determinants of these modes of relating. Having this trust, a person is not unduly afraid of rejection because he is being himself, and is being open about his more intimate feelings.

Lack of such trust presupposes the fear that to be oneself, and to disclose more intimate feelings, will result in rejection by others.

Warmth

High warmth correlated positively, as expected, with proportion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum for the 1st session (r = .37). Also as expected, during the 1st session high warmth showed a negative correlation with proportion of openness about miscellaneous topics (r = -.34). Neither of these correlations held true for the 5th session. This may be due to the fact that there were no significant differences in high warmth shown by Ss on the 5th session (as indicated by the analysis of variance for warmth classified by sex, 1st session amount of warmth, and by session).

Contrary to the hypothesis, low warmth correlated positively with sum and proportion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum during the 5th session (sum, r = .52; proportion, r = .35). Since this was true only in the 5th session, it may be that by the 5th session, being open about one's feelings was of more concern than communicating warmth to one's partner. Communication of warmth is probably a way of reassuring one's partner that one is not predisposed to be hostile or antagonistic. By the 5th session, this basic reassurance had probably been accomplished. This explanation could also be applied to the fact that a S's amount of high warmth correlated with his openness at the "self" end of the continuum only during the 1st session.

Correlations Between Self Scores for Empathy,
Genuineness, and Warmth with Partner's
Scores for Empathy, Genuineness,
and Warmth

Hypothesis Seven from Chapter I (p. 6) will be discussed in

this section, in light of the results obtained. To do so, this

section is divided into subsections for self scores on empathy,

genuineness, and warmth. In each subsection, the correlations of

the variable under consideration will be discussed in terms of it's

correlations with partner's scores on these variables (see Table 18).

To avoid duplication, after genuineness has been discussed in relation

to empathy in the empathy subsection, empathy will not be discussed in

the genuineness subsection, and so on.

According to Hypothesis Seven, in a given session a $\underline{S}$'s amounts

of empathy, genuineness, and warmth would all correlate with each of

partner's scores for empathy, genuineness, and warmth, respectively.

The remainder of this section is a discussion of the results of the

correlational analyses performed to test this hypothesis.

Self Scores for Empathy

As expected, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of high empathy correlated with his

partner's amount of high empathy for the 5th session (r = .44).

This correlation was not significant for the 1st session, probably

indicating that it takes several sessions for people to attain the

symmetry hypothesized by Newcomb.

A $\underline{S}$'s amount of high empathy correlated, as expected, with partner's

high genuineness on the 5th session (r = .48). This correlation was

not significant for the 1st session, probably due to the fact that on

Table 18.--Correlation Coefficients of Self Scores for Empathy, Genuineness, and Warmth with Partner's Scores for Empathy, Genuineness, and Warmth

Partner / Self	Low Empathy Session 1st	5th	High Empathy Session 1st	5th	Low Genuineness Session 1st	5th	High Genuineness[b] Session 1st	5th	Low Warmth Session 1st	5th	High Warmth[b] Session 1st	5th
Low Emp.							(.20)	.60				
High Emp.			(.26)	.44			(.10)	.48				
Low Gen.							-.38	-.75			(.00)	.37
High Gen.	(.20)[a]	.60	(.10)	.48	-.38	-.75	.66	.66	(-.10)	.38	(.00)	.38
Lo Warmth							(-.10)	.38	.41	.47		
Hi Warmth					(.00)	.37	(.00)	.38			(.07)	

Note.--Empty cells indicate that neither coefficient was significant.

[a] Parentheses are used throughout this table to indicate a correlation which is not significant.

[b] The entries in these columns are duplicated elsewhere in the table, because each correlation can be reversed so that the partner score becomes a self score, and the self score becomes a partner score.

the 1st session all Ss displayed about the same amount of high empathy, which is to say, they displayed very little.

A S's score for low empathy also correlated on the 5th session with partner's high genuineness ($r = .60$). The fact that self scores for both high and low empathy correlated with partner's high genuineness on the 5th session, is probably due to the fact that on that session, self scores for high and low empathy were positively correlated.

Self Scores for Genuineness

As hypothesized, there was a correlation between a S's amount of high genuineness and his partner's amount of high genuineness for both sessions (session 1, $r = .66$; session 5, $r = .66$). This supports Newcomb's theory and findings that people strive for symmetry in interpersonal relationships.

Also as expected, a S's amount of high genuineness correlated negatively with his partner's amount of low genuineness for both sessions (session 1, $r = -.33$; session 5, $r = -.75$). Thus the less high genuineness displayed by a S, the more low genuineness is displayed by his partner, again supporting Newcomb's theory of balance.

While a S's high genuineness correlated, as hypothesized, with his partner's high warmth on the 1st session ($r = .38$), on the 5th session, a S's high genuineness correlated with his partner's low warmth ($r = .38$). These results may be due to the fact that the Ss displaying the most high genuineness on the 5th session were those who had originally shown relatively little high genuineness (as shown by analysis of variance). The social discomfort presumably felt by these

Ss who displayed little high genuineness in the 1st session may be
symptomatic of a personality to which partners did not respond warmly,
even when these Ss became more genuine with time. This same explana-
tion could be applied to the fact that in the 5th session a S's low
genuineness correlated positively with his partner's high warmth
(r = .37).

Self Scores for Warmth

Correlations between a S's warmth and his partner's empathy and
genuineness has already been discussed (note: each correlation between
a self score and a partner score can be reversed so that the partner
score becomes a self score, and the self score becomes a partner score).
In addition, a S's low warmth correlated, as hypothesized, with his
partner's low warmth (session 1, r = .41; session 5, r = .47). Thus,
as with empathy and genuineness, Newcomb's theory of balance was also
supported for warmth.

Correlations of Self Scores for Empathy,
Genuineness, and Warmth with Partner's
Scores for Openness

In this section, Hypothesis Eight from Chapter I (p. 6) will
be discussed in light of the results obtained. To do so, this
section is divided into subsections for self scores on empathy, genu-
ineness, and warmth. In each subsection, the variable under consider-
ation will be discussed in terms of it's correlations with partner's
openness scores, (see Table 19).

Hypothesis Eight was that a $\underline{S}$'s amounts of high empathy, genuine-
ness, and warmth would correlate with his partner's sum and/or pro-
portion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum. Similarly,
a $\underline{S}$'s amounts of low empathy, genuineness, and warmth were expected to
correlate with partner's sum and/or proportion of openness at the "mis-
cellaneous, noncontroversial topics" end of the continuum. The remain-
der of this section is a discussion of the results of the correlational
analyses performed to test this hypothesis.

Self Scores for Empathy

As expected, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of high empathy correlated with his
partner's sum of openness at the "self" end of the continuum during
the 5th session (r = .37), but not for the 1st session. This result
for the 1st session was probably due to the fact that there was little
difference in amount of high empathy displayed by $\underline{S}$s during that session.

For the 5th session, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of low empathy also correlated
positively with partner's sum of openness at the "self" end of the
continuum. As explained earlier, these apparently contradictory

Table 19.--Correlation Coefficients of Self Scores for Empathy,
Genuineness, and Warmth with Partner's Scores
for openness

Partner / Self	Sum "self" Openness		Proportion of "self" Openness		Sum "misc." Openness		Proportion of "misc." Openness	
	Session 1st	5th	Session 1st	5th	Session 1st	5th	Session 1st	5th
Low Empathy	(.23)[a]	.44			.46	(.00)		
High Empathy	(-.05)	.37						
Low Genuineness	-.38	-.40			-.53	(-.18)		
High Genuineness	.48	.42	.44	.34[b]			-.43	(-.23)
Low Warmth	(-.08)	.61	(-.06)	.46			(-.07)	-.43
High Warmth	.37	(.19)	.38	(-.24)			-.31[b]	.21

Note.--Empty cells indicate that neither coefficient was significant.

[a] Parentheses are used throughout this table to indicate a correlation that is not significant.

[b] One tailed test since a priori hypothesis was directional.

correlations of empathy are probably due to empathy's being partly an artifact of partner's openness. Thus what these results really seem to indicate is that during the 5th session a $\underline{S}$'s empathy was not consistent, but was evenly distributed in response to partner's openness. This inconsistency may reflect the use of empathy as a "selective reward" in the acquaintance process.

A $\underline{S}$'s amount of low empathy did correlate, as hypothesized, with sum of openness about miscellaneous topics during the 1st session (r = .46), but not during the 5th. This might indicate that during the 5th session $\underline{S}$s who displayed high openness about miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics were impervious to the lack of empathy with which their partner's were responding.

Self Scores for Genuineness

A $\underline{S}$'s amount of high genuineness correlated, as expected, with partner's sum of openness at the "self" end of the continuum for both sessions (session 1, r = .48; session 5, r = .42). A $\underline{S}$'s amount of high genuineness also correlated, as expected, with proportion of partner's openness at the "self" end of the continuum (session 1, r = .44; session 5, r = .34).

A $\underline{S}$'s high genuineness also correlated negatively, as hypothesized, with partner's proportion of openness about miscellaneous topics during the 1st session (r = -.43). Since this correlation was not significant for the 5th session, it may be that during the 5th session, high genuineness displayed by a $\underline{S}$ encouraged all types of partner's openness.

As hypothesized, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of low genuineness had a negative correlation with partner's openness at the "self" end of the continuum for both sessions (session 1, r = -.38; session 5, r = -.40). However,

on the 1st session, low genuineness also correlated negatively with partner's sum of openness about miscellaneous topics, ($r = -.53$), contrary to the hypothesis. Since a $\underline{S}$'s amount of low genuineness correlated negatively with partner's openness of both types, presumably low genuineness discouraged partner's openness altogether in the 1st session. During the 5th session, low genuineness did not correlate negatively with partner's sum of openness about miscellaneous topics, probably as a result of the fact that by the 5th session less low genuineness was being shown.

Self Scores for Warmth

As expected, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of high warmth correlated with partner's sum and proportion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum during the 1st session (sum, $r = .37$; proportion, $r = .38$). Also during the 1st session a $\underline{S}$'s amount of high warmth showed a negative correlation, as hypothesized, with partner's proportion of openness at the "miscellaneous topics" end of the continuum ($r = -.31$). On the 5th session, a $\underline{S}$'s high warmth did not correlate with either type of partner's openness. High warmth did not correlate with partner's openness on the 5th session probably because all $\underline{S}$s were displaying relatively high degrees of warmth: $\underline{S}$s who originally showed little high warmth attained the same level of warmth by the 5th session as originally high $\underline{S}$s (as revealed by analysis of variance).

Contrary to the hypothesis, a $\underline{S}$'s amount of low warmth correlated positively with partner's sum and proportion of openness at the "self" end of the continuum, during the 5th session (sum, $r = .61$; proportion, $r = .46$). During the 5th session, low warmth also showed a negative correlation to partner's proportion of openness about miscellaneous

topics (r = -.43). It may be that after the initial acquaintance procedures were over, Ss felt freer to respond in an unwarm way to personal and controversial things about which their partners were being open. The negative correlation on the 5th session between a S's low warmth and his partner's openness about miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics may reflect the fact that Ss found such openness less provocative.

In sum, the results of this study tended to support the hypothesis that high amounts of empathy, genuineness, and warmth displayed by a S would correlate with partner's openness at the "self" end of the continuum. Though empathy and warmth seem to bear a more complex relation to other's openness than was originally hypothesized, the hypothesis was substantially confirmed for genuineness.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SPECULATIONS

In this chapter the results of this study will be summarized, and their implications for the acquaintance process will be discussed.

In this study it was found that regardless of differences in Dogmatism, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism scale, couples increased in empathy, genuineness, and warmth displayed from the 1st to the 5th acquaintance session. Though male and female Dogmatism failed to interact as hypothesized, couples in which the male was a high Dogmatic displayed more warmth on both sessions than couples in which the male was a low Dogmatic. Also, couples in which the woman was a high Dogmatic displayed significantly more empathy on the 5th session than couples in which the woman was a low Dogmatic.

When individual $\underline{S}$s (rather than couples) were considered, according to whether or not they were high or low on genuineness, warmth and openness in the 1st session, it was found that $\underline{S}$s beginning low increased significantly. $\underline{S}$s beginning high on genuineness and warmth maintained their 1st session level during the 5th session. $\underline{S}$s beginning high on openness decreased significantly from the 1st to the 5th session. During the 5th session, $\underline{S}$s originally low on genuineness surpassed originally high $\underline{S}$s, while for warmth and openness there were no significant differences between $\underline{S}$s originally high and low.

The hypothesized intercorrelations among a $\underline{S}$'s empathy, genuineness, and warmth, were substantially confirmed for genuineness, but

only partially confirmed for empathy and warmth. The hypothesis
that a S's high empathy, genuineness, and warmth would correlate with
his sum and/or proportion of openness at the "self" end of the openness
continuum was confirmed only for genuineness.

Correlations between self scores on empathy, genuineness, and warmth,
with each of partner's scores for empathy, genuineness, and warmth showed
that the greatest number of expected correlations were those between self
and partner scores on the same variable.

Finally, the correlations between a S's empathy, genuineness, and
warmth scores, and his partner's openness scores, showed that a S's genu-
ineness was the variable most related to his partner's openness.

The results of this study seem to support Newcomb's theory that
people strive for balance in interpersonal relationships: a S's amounts
of empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness often correlate with amounts
of these variables displayed by his partner; and it was also found that
significant differences in amounts of warmth, openness and genuineness
in the first session, disappeared in the 5th session for warmth and open-
ness, and became less in that session for genuineness.

However, the question still remains as to what factors influence
whether the person lowest in empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness
will meet the higher person on the latters level, or vice versa, or
whether the lower person comes up and the higher comes down, achieving
a sort of average. Factors influencing which of these alternatives will
be the case probably include, among many, dominance, attraction, loneli-
ness, and common interests.

Since much of psychotherapy as usually practiced could be considered
a special case of the acquaintance process, the question must be asked

as to the place of the striving for balance in psychotherapy. Perhaps one aspect of the process of successful psychotherapy is that in an effort to achieve balance, clients attempt to match their therapists at least in genuineness. Since displaying empathy and warmth toward the therapist is not usually part of the clients role, the client may attempt to balance high degrees of therapist empathy and warmth by being more open about his self related feelings. That the client is more likely to match himself to (or model himself on) the therapist's behavior than vice versa, may indicate that if one person in a dyad has more "authority" than the other, it is his behavior that is more likely to be used as the standard for the balance to be achieved.

It might also be asked whether or not the "honeymoon" period in psychotherapy occurs as an expression of the client's effort to allay anxiety by achieving an early balance, no matter how unstable. Similarly, it would be interesting to know if the balance achieved by $\underline{S}$s by the 5th session of this study reflects a relatively permanent stabilization of the relationship, or if it reflects a "honeymoon" effect, as found often in the initial stages of psychotherapy. Insecure, and perhaps high Dogmatic people, might have a greater need than more secure people to establish some kind of balance, even if it is premature and artificial. According to this reasoning, older people who are presumably more settled in life than the average college student, might be more reluctant to achieve a hasty balance during the early phases of an acquaintanceship.

Returning, however, to some of the hypotheses tested in this study, the failure of male and female Dogmatism to interact significantly must be explored. The question must be raised as to an alternate personality variable which would have produced maximal differences in the display of

empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness. "Basic trust" might be such an alternative personality variable. Basic trust presumably makes it easier for a person to be interested in, and to accept others whose thoughts, feelings, and attitudes are different from his own. Thus basic trust might be conducive to high degrees of warmth (interpersonal attraction being equal--see below). To be empathic with another, it is also necessary to trust oneself to the extent that it is not threatening to recognize another's feelings. In order to be _receptive_ to another's empathy, one must also be able to trust him enough to believe that his empathy is genuine. Trust is necessary if a person is to be undefensive, which is an essential aspect of high genuineness. Similarly, the self-disclosure involved in openness at the "self" end of the continuum presupposes that trust that one will not be rejected when one reveals oneself as one is.

The fact that interpersonal attraction (though related to numerous personality variables) may have an effect on acquaintance interactions which is equal to that produced by any one personality variable, must also be considered.

Thus when two people are attracted to each other, and both have an adequate degree of basic trust, it might be expected that high degrees of empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness would be displayed by both parties. Similarly, a person lacking in trust, but who feels attracted toward another, would probably show less empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness, and would probably express his attraction in other ways. One also wonders if people strive for balance in their attraction for one another, as well in their expressions of empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness.

The importance of trust in interpersonal interactions is supported by the fact that couples originally low on empathy, and individuals low on genuineness, warmth, and openness during the 1st session all increased significantly by the 5th session. Presumably with time, the originally low Ss experienced a "warm up" effect as they came to know their partners better, and thus to feel more at ease: as the partner becomes more predictable, one at least knows in what areas he is trustworthy.

It would be interesting to know if psychotherapy clients who are originally quite low in empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness in their private lives, increase on these variables as a function of time, as well as of psychotherapy itself. By the same token, a client's progress in therapy with a therapist originally low on empathy, genuineness, and warmth, may reflect a "warm up" effect on the therapist as he gets to know his client.

In fostering trust, time is apparently a factor in affecting the increase of empathy, warmth, genuineness and openness for people originally low on these variables. But one must also ask which one of these variables themselves is most efficacious in creating trust, whether or not the time factor is operative. This study indicates that genuineness is the variable most related both to a person's empathy, warmth, and openness, and to his partner's empathy, genuineness, warmth and openness. Thus the results of this study support the findings of Truax and Carkhuff (1967) that in therapy, a therapist's genuineness is prerequisite for the effectiveness of his warmth and empathy. In other words, empathy and warmth are not simply therapist techniques to be learned, nor in the acquaintance process will they always be effective if used

expediently and instrumentally rather than genuinely. They must be to some extent genuine expressions of regard, interest, and understanding.

In considering why one person's genuineness might cause another person to trust him, both in the acquaintance process, and in therapy, it would seem that one's genuineness is a promise that one's use of warmth and empathy will at least be lawful. Thus in therapy, the efficacy of genuineness is probably due in part to the security it gives.

Genuineness might further encourage trust because high genuineness (as defined in the Truax scales) cannot be used defensively, as can warmth and empathy to some extent. In fact, high genuineness is marked by undefensiveness, and self-congruence. Thus genuineness is more self disclosing than warmth and empathy by themselves. For the latter are primarily other directed, and thus can be used to avoid discussing one's own feelings by focusing on those of the other.

In view of the self disclosing nature of genuineness, it is not surprising that in this study, $\underline{S}$s displaying a lot of high genuineness also displayed high openness about self related topics, on both the 1st and the 5th sessions. For both high genuineness, and openness about self related topics, presuppose a degree of trust that one will not be rejected if one is known as one is. Thus as with genuineness, openness may also engender trust. This might indicate that in therapy, it is important for the therapist to be open about his feelings, just as it is important for him to be genuine.

Though basic trust is not an easily measurable variable, trust has nonetheless been offered as an alternative, though not unrelated, variable to Dogmatism. However, while the interaction of male and female Dogmatism

in this study was not significant, by themselves Dogmatism of the male, and Dogmatism of the female did have a significant effect on the increase in amount of high warmth and empathy displayed, respectively. As suggested in Chapter III, it may be that highly Dogmatic men elicited more warmth from their partners than did low Dogmatic men. High Dogmatic men are presumed to be less secure than low Dogmatic men, and may have needed more reassurance from their partner's, such as might be provided by the other's warmth. The female partner's of these high Dogmatic men probably responded to this need by being warmer than usual. Since high Dogmatic women did not have this effect of eliciting more warmth from their partner's, probably it is because the situation with a high Dogmatic male plays into the cultural roles of male dominance and female nurturance.

The fact that the expected correlations between warmth and other self and partner variables were found largely on the 1st session might support such a theory of the reassurance function of warmth in the acquaintance process. When people first meet in a "forced" situation such as an experimental setting, it is essential that they demonstrate their goodwill toward one another. People who meet freely, outside of an experimental situation, probably go through such a reassurance procedure only when they are really interested in making each other's acquaintance.

Given the design, the unexpected increase in empathy for couples in which the woman scored high on Dogmatism could have been due to the fact that either high Dogmatic women or their partner's were giving more empathic responses. The former is presumed to be the case: this study may have been a new and positive experience for these high Dogmatic women, a positive experience to which they were overreacting.

It is also possible, however, that either the high Dogmatic women or their partner's were using empathy as a defense, that is, to keep the

conversation focused on the other person. Presumably high Dogmatic women would be afraid to open up too much themselves, and thus to keep the conversation from dwelling too much on them, they might have used empathy to keep the other person talking about himself. In this case, empathy would be expected to be accompanied by low genuineness, since overt or implied defensiveness are what distinguish low genuineness. It would probably also be accompanied by a lack of openness about self related topics.

The contradictory results of the correlational analyses for empathy certainly tend to support the idea that empathy may be the expression of genuine understanding, or it may be used defensively, or it may be used as a selective reward or punishment. In combination with genuineness, warmth, and openness the ability to be consistently empathic is pro-bably a decisive factor in determining with whom one becomes really close friends. In situations such as this study, however, where people are placed together and expected to get acquainted, empathy may be used with more expediency than consistency and genuineness. That is, it might be used defensively, as suggested; or it might even be used to selectively turn off or reinforce certain topics of conversation. Certainly in therapy, therapist empathy is a factor in keeping the focus on the client's feelings, particularly his deeper feelings. In the acquaintance process however, particularly among peers, it would probably be indicative of an unhealthy relationship if one person did all the empathising, without disclosing much of himself.

While this study did not assess the degree to which partner's liked one another, an important question still to be researched is whether warmth, empathy, genuineness, and openness are in fact characteristics of what

most psychologist's could agree is a healthy relationship. If disturbed relationships are distinguished by a lack of empathy, genuineness, warmth, and openness, then clients must be helped to overcome this lack. In helping them to do so, modelling themselves in these respects on the example of the therapist might be of crucial importance.

Obviously there is a great deal of fruitful research yet to be conducted on the acquaintance process. It is hoped that this thesis will suggest ideas for such research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashby, J., Ford, D., Guerney, B. Jr., Guerney, L., and Snyder, W. "Effects of Reflective and Leading Psychotherapy." Psychotherapy Research. Edited by Gary Stollak, Bernard Guerney, Jr., and Meyer Rothberg. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

Izard, Carrol. "Personality similarity and friendship." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960. Vol. 61, pp. 47-51.

Newcomb, Theodore. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Plant, W. T., Telford, C. W., and Thomas, J. A. "Some personality differences between dogmatic and nondogmatic groups." Journal of Social Psychology. 1965. Vol. 67, pp. 67-75.

Rogers, Carl. "A tentative Scale for the Measurement of Process in Psychotherapy." Research in Psychotherapy. Edited by Eli Rubenstein and Morris Parloff. Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: A.P.A. Inc., 1959.

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1960.

Secord, Paul, and Backman, Carl. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Thibaut, J. W., and Kelley, H. H. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

Truax, Charles, and Carkhuff, Robert. Towards Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Winch, R. F. Mate Selection: A Study of Complementary Needs. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1958.

APPENDIX A

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

D-Scale

Name_____   Age_____   Date_____ __ ...

Major_____   Telephone No._____ __ ..

Student Number_____   Address_____ __

Instructions

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE	-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

Score

_____1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

_____2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

_____3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

_____4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

_____5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

_____6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

_____7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

_____8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

_____ 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

_____ 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

_____ 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

_____ 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several ₁times to make sure I am being understood.

_____ 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

_____ 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

_____ 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

_____ 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

_____ 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

_____ 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

_____ 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

_____ 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

_____ 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

_____ 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

_____ 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

_____ 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

_____ 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

_____ 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

_____ 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

_____ 28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

_____ 29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

_____ 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

_____ 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

_____ 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

_____ 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

_____ 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

_____ 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

_____ 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

_____ 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

_____ 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

_____ 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

_____ 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX B

Truax Scales to Measure Accurate Empathy,
  Nonpossessive Warmth, and Genuineness

SCALES TO MEASURE ACCURATE EMPATHY, NONPOSSESSIVE WARMTH AND GENUINENESS SCALES, derived from Charles B. Truax and Robert R. Carkhuff. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy, Aldine Publishing Co. 1967, Pg. 46-72.

The measurement of accurate empathy

Accurate empathy involves more than just the ability of an S (therapist, teacher, parent, student, trainee, etc.), to sense the other's (client, child, supervisor, pupil, etc.) "private world" as if it were his own. It also involves more than just his ability to know what the other means. Accurate empathy involves both the S's sensitivity to current feelings and his verbal facility to communicate this understanding in a language attuned to the other's current feelings

It is not necessary for the S to share the other's feelings in any sense that would require him to feel the same emotions. It is instead an appreciation and a sensitive awareness of those feelings. At deeper levels of empathy, it also involves enough understanding of patterns of human feelings and experience to sense feelings that the other only partially reveals. With such experience and knowledge, the S can communicate what the other clearly knows as well as meanings in the other's experience of which he is scarcely aware.

At a high level of accurate empathy the message "I am with you" is unmistakably clear--the S's remarks fit perfectly with the other's mood and content. His responses not only indicate his sensitive understanding of the obvious feelings, but also serve to clarify and expand the other's awareness of his own feelings or experiences. Such empathy is communicated by both the language used and all the voice qualities, which unerringly reflect the S's seriousness and depth of feeling. The S's intent concentration upon the other keeps him continuously aware of the other's shifting emotional content so that he can shift his own responses to correct for language or content errors when he temporarily loses touch and is not "with" the other.

At a low level of accurate empathy the S may go off on a tangent of his own or may misinterpret what the other is feeling. At a very low level he may be so preoccupied and interested in his own intellectual interpretations that his is scarcely aware of the other's being.   The S at this low level

of accurate empathy may even be uninterested in the other, or may be concentrating on the intellectual content of what the other says rather than what he "is" at the moment, and so may ignore or misunderstand the other's current feelings and experiences At this low level of empathy the S is doing something other than "listening", "understanding", or "being sensitive": he may be evaluating the other, giving advice or sermonizing.

Levels of Accurate Empathy

Level 1:

The S seems completely unaware of even the most conspicuous of the other's feelings: his responses are not appropriate to the mood and content of the other's statements. There is no determinable quality of empathy, and hence no accuracy whatsoever. The S may be bored and disinterested or offering advice without communicating an awareness of the other's current feelings.

Level 2:

The S shows an almost negligible degree of accuracy in his responses, and that only toward the other's most obvious feelings. Any emotions which are not clearly defined he tends to ignore altogether. He may be correctly sensitive to obvious feelings and yet misunderstand much of what the other is really trying to say. By his response he may block off or may misdirect the patient. Level 2 is distinguishable from Level 3 in what the S ignores feelings rather than displaying an inability to understand them.

Level 3:

The S often responds accurately to the other's more exposed feelings. He also displays concern for the deeper, more hidden feelings, which he seems to sense must be present, though he does not understand their nature or sense their meaning to the other.

Level 4:

The S usually responds accurately to the other's more obvious feelings and occasionally recognizes some that are less apparent. In the process of this tentative probing, however, he may misinterpret some present feelings and anticipate some which are not current. Sensitivity and awareness do exist in the S, but he is not entirely "with" the other in the <u>current</u> situation or experience. The desire and effort to understand are both present, but his accuracy is low. This level is distinguishable from level 3 in that the S does occasionally recognize less apparent feelings. He may also seem to know how or why the other feels a particular way, but he is definitely not with" the other.

Level 5:

The S accurately responds to all of the S's more readily discernible feelings. He also shows awareness of many less evident feelings and experiences, but he tends to be somewhat inaccurate in his understanding of these. However, when he does not understand completely, this lack of complete understanding is communicated without an anticipatory or jarring note. His misunderstandings are not disruptive by their tentative nature. Sometimes in Level 5 the S simply communicates his awareness of the problem of understanding another person's inner world. This level is the midpoint of the continuum of accurate empathy.

Level 6:

The S recognizes most of the other's present feelings, including those which are not readily apparent. Although he understands their content, he sometimes tends to misjudge the intensity of these veiled feelings, so that his responses are not always accurately suited to the exact mood of the other. The S does deal directly with feelings the other is currently experiencing although he may misjudge the intensity of those less apparent. Although sensing the feelings, he often is unable to communicate meaning to them. In contrast to Level 7, the

S's statements contain an almost static quality in the sense that he handles those feelings that the other offers but does not bring new elements to life. He is "with" the other but doesn't encourage exploration. His manner of communicating his understanding is such that he makes of it a finished thing.

Level 7:

The S responds accurately to most of the other's present feelings and shows awareness of the precise intensity of most of the underlying emotions. However, his responses move only slightly beyond the other's own awareness, so that feelings may be present which neither the other nor the S recognizes. The S initiates moves toward more emotionally laden material, and may communicate simply that he and the other are moving towards more emotionally significant material. Level 7 is distinguishable from Level 6 in that often the S's response is a kind of precise pointing of the finger toward emotionally significant material.

Level 8:

The S accurately interprets all the other's present, acknowledged feelings. He also uncovers the most deeply shrouded of the other's feelings, voicing meanings in the other's experience of which the other is scarcely aware. Since the S must necessarily utilize a method of trial and error in the new uncharted area, there are minor flaws in the accuracy of his understanding but these inaccuracies are held tentatively. With sensitivity and accuracy he moves into feelings and experiences that the other has only hinted at. The S offers specific explanations or additions to the other's understanding so that underlying emotions are both pointed out and specifically talked about. The content that comes to life may be new but it is not alien.

Although the S in Level 8 makes mistakes, these mistakes are not jarring, because they are covered by the tentative character of the response. Also, this S is sensitive to his mistakes and quickly changes his response in midstream, indicating that he has recognized what is being talked about and what the other is

seeking in his own explorations. The S reflects a togetherness with the other in tentative trial and error exploration. His voice tone reflects the seriousness and depth of his empathic grasp.

Level 9:

The S in this stage unerringly responds to the other's full range of feelings in their exact intensity. Without hesitation, he recognizes each emotional nuance and communicates an understanding of every deepest feeling. He is completely attuned to the other's shifting emotional content; he senses each of the other's feelings and reflects them in his words and voice. With sensitive accuracy, he expands the other's hints in a full scale (though tentative) elaboration of feeling or experience. He shows precision both in understanding and in communication of this understanding, and expresses and experiences them without hesitancy.

The measurement of nonpossessive warmth

The dimension of nonpossessive warmth or unconditional positive regard, ranges from a high level where the S warmly accepts the other's experience as part of that person without imposing conditions; to a low level where the S evaluates the other or his feelings, expresses dislike or disapproval, or expresses warmth in a selective and evaluative way.

Thus, a warm positive feeling toward the other may still rate quite low in this scale if it is given conditionally. Nonpossessive warmth for the other mean accepting him as a person with human potentialities. It involves a nonpossessive caring for him as a separate person and, thus, a willingness to share equally his joys and aspirations or his depressions and failures. It involves valuing the other as a person, separate from any evaluation of his behavior or thoughts. Thus, an S can evaluate the other's behavior or his thoughts but still rate high on warmth if it is quite clear that his valuing of the individual as a person is

uncontaminated and unconditional. At its highest level this unconditional warmth involves a nonpossessive caring for the other as a separate person who is allowed to have his own feelings and experiences: a prizing of the other for himself regardless of his behavior. Nonpossessive warmth is present when the S appreciates such feelings or behaviors and their meaning to the other, but shows a nonpossessive caring for the person and not for his behavior. The S's response to the other's thoughts or behaviors is a search for their meaning or value within the other rather than disapproval or approval.

Levels of nonpossessive warmth

Level 1:

The S is actively offering advice or giving clear negative regard. He may be telling the patient what would be "best for him" or in other ways actively approving or disapproving of his behavior. The S's actions make himself the locus of evaluation; he sees himself as responsible for the other.

Level 2:

The S responds mechanically to the other, indicating little positive regard and hence little nonpossessive warmth. He may ignore the other or his feelings or display a lack of concern or interest. The S ignores the other at times when a nonpossessively warm response would be expected: he shows a complete passivity that communicates almost unconditional lack of regard.

Level 3:

The S indicates a positive caring for the other, but it is a semipossessive caring in the sense that he communicates to the other that his behavior matters to him. That is, the S communicates such things as "It is not all right if you act immorally," "I want you to get along at work," or "It's important to me that you get along with the ward staff." The S sees himself as responsible for the other.

Level 4:

The S clearly communicates a very deep interest and concern for the welfare of the other, showing a nonevaluative and unconditional warmth in almost all areas of his functioning. Although there remains some conditionality in the more personal and private areas, the other is given freedom to be himself and to be liked as himself. There is little evaluation of thoughts and behaviors. In deeply personal areas, however, the S may be conditional and communicate the idea that the other may act in any way he wishes--except that it is important to the S that he be more mature or not regress in therapy or accept and like the S. In all other areas, however, nonpossessive warmth is communicated, The S sees himself as responsible to the other.

Level 5:

At Level 5, the S communicates warmth without restriction. There is a deep respect for the other's worth as a person and his rights as a free individual. At this level the other is free to be himself even if this means that he is regressing, being defensive, or even disliking or rejecting the S himself. At this level the S cares deeply for the other as a person, but it does not matter to him how the other chooses to behave. He genuinely cares for and deeply proves the other for his human potentials, apart from evaluations of his behavior or his thoughts. He is willing to share equally the other's joys and aspirations or depressions and failures. The only channelling by the S may be the request that the patient communicate personally relevant material.

The measurement of S's genuineness of self-congruence

This scale is an attempt to define five degrees of S genuineness, beginning at a very low level where the S presents a facade or defends and denies feelings; and continuing to a high level of self-congruence where the S is freely and deeply himself. A high level of self-congruence does not mean that the S must overtly express his feelings but only that he does not deny them. Thus, the S may be actively reflecting, interpreting, or analyzing, but this functioning must be self-congruent, so that he is being himself in the moment rather than playing a role. Thus the S's response must be sincere rather than phony; it must express his real feelings or being rather than defensiveness.

"Being himself" simply means that at the moment the S is really whatever his response denotes. It does not mean that the S must disclose his total self but only that whatever he does show is a real aspect of himself, not a response growing out of defensiveness or a merely "role" response that has been learned and repeated.

Levels of therapist genuineness

Level 1:

The S is clearly defensive in the interaction, and there is explicit evidence of a very considerable discrepancy between what he says and what he experiences. There may be striking contradictions in the S's statements, the content of his verbalization may contradict the voice qualities or nonverbal cues (i.e. the upset S stating in a strained voice that he is "not bothered at all" by the other's anger.)

Level 2:

The S responds appropriately but in an impersonal rather than a personal manner, giving the impression that his responses are said because they sound good from a distance but do not express what he really feels or means. There is a some- what contrived or rehearsed quality or air of role playing" present.

Level 3:

The S is implicitly either defensive or impersonal, although there is no explicit evidence.

Level 4:

There is neither implicit nor explicit evidence of defensiveness or the presence of a facade. The S shows no self-incongruence.

Level 5:

The S is freely and deeply himself in the relationship. He is open to experience and feelings of all types-both pleasant and hurtful-without traces of defensiveness or retreat into impersonalism. Although there may be contradictory feelings, these are accepted or recognized. The S is clearly being himself in all of his responses, whether they are personally meaningful or trite. At Level 5 the S need not express personal feelings, but whether he is giving advice, reflecting, interpreting or sharing experiences, it is clear that he is being very much himself, so that his verbalizations match his inner experiences.

APPENDIX C

Shortened, Summarized Version of the Truax Scales
to Measure Empathy, Warmth, and Genuineness

Shortened, Summarized Version of the
Truax Scales for Empathy, Genuineness,
and Warmth

Empathy.--response to a feeling expressed by the other, and degree
of understanding of other's feelings.

Level 1

A. Completely unaware of feeling expressed by other,

B. Response inappropriate to the mood and content
of what the other is saying.

C. Bored and/or disinterested.

D. Offering unsolicited advice.

Level 2

A. Ignores rather than misunderstands feelings
expressed by other.

B. Blocking further expression of feeling by
the other.

Level 3

A. Responds accurately to obvious feelings
expressed by other.

B. While responds accurately to obvious feelings,
displays an inability to understand deeper feelings.

Level 4

A. Sensitivity and awareness of deeper feelings,
as yet unexpressed by the other.

B. Despite increased sensitivity, is still not entirely
with the other in the current situation or experience.

Level 5

   A. Responds accurately to readily discernable
       feelings.

   B. Deep interest in, and awareness of less evident
       feelings and experiences.

   C. Understanding may not be completely accurate,
       but misunderstandings are not anticipatory
       or jarring.

   D. Communicates difficulty of understanding
       another's inner world.

<u>Genuineness</u>.--defensiveness versus self-congruence

Level 1

    A. Clearly defensive.

Level 2

    A. Rehearsed quality.

    B. Manner and tone of voice are impersonal rather than personal.

Level 3

    A. <u>Implicitly</u> either impersonal or defensive.

Level 4

    A. No implicit or explicit evidence of impersonality or defensiveness.

    B. Shows no self-incongruence.

Level 5

    A. Freely and deeply himself.

Warmth.--

Level 1

    A. Giving clear negative regard.

    B. Actively giving unasked for advice.

    C. Communicates approval or disapproval of other's opinions or behavior.

Level 2

    A. Mechanically responding.

    B. Lack of concern and/or interest in the other.

    C. Neither positive nor negative regard; indifferent.

    D. Passive.

Level 3

    A. Shows mild interest, but not deeper caring for the other.

    B. Curiosity about other.

Level 4.

    A. Communicates that other's opinions and behavior matter to him, but with conditionality.

    B. Conditional, but definitely positive regard.

Level 5

    A. Conditionality with respect to private and personal matters discussed by the other.

    B. Makes little attempt to evaluate the other's thoughts, opinions, or behavior.

    C. Feels responsible to, rather than for, the other.

APPENDIX D

Openness Scale

Openness Scale

Openness is defined as direct and unqualified expression of
present feelings. These feelings may be either positive or negative.
Thus openness indicates a S'willingness "to expose himself to possibel
criticism, to expose himself to the prospect of modifying his self con-
cept, without at the same time feeling the need to defend himself as
he is"[1] in his own, or in the other's eyes. One can expose oneself
to a possible "wet blanket" reaction from the other by expressing
one's positive feelings about oneself, about one's partner, about con-
troversial situations and issues, significant others, and about mis-
cellaneous noncontroversial topics. In frankly expressing negative
feelings, one may similarly be risking loss of the other's interest,
regard, or affection. But in being open about one's feelings, one is
also making intimacy a possibility. One is making it easier for the
other to be warm, empathic, and genuine, if the other is so inclined.

The openness continuum: openness about self, partner, controversial
issues, significant others, and miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics.

Openness about self refers to a S's direct and unqualified ex-
pression of present feelings about himself.

    Open statements about oneself would include statements like,
    "Gee, that makes me feel great", or "I feel more sure of myself
    these days", or "I feel kind of confused right now", or "I'm
    not much good at making conversation", or "I wish I was like that".

---

[1]Ashby, Ford, Guerney, Guerney, and Snyder. "Effects of Reflective
and Leading Psychotherapy." Psychotherapy Research. Edited by
G. Stollak, B. Guerney, and M. Rothberg.

Openness about the partner refers to statements expressing direct and unqualified feelings about the partner.

> Such open statements might include: "You know, I really
> dig you", or "I think you must be very understanding", or
> "I think you're being obnoxious", or "I'm sorry you feel that
> way" (said unapologetically), or "I feel like you don't under-
> stand what I'm trying to communicate to you".

Openness about controversial situations and issues refers to direct and unqualified feelings about a group of people (e.g. minorities), the state of the world, politics, the meaning of life, opinions about education, child rearing, abortion, religion, etc. This category is for openness about topics which imply controversy or potential controversy. It is concerned with attitudes and opinions.

> Such open statements would be like: "We've got to stick
> out the war in Viet Nam", "I think basically man is making
> progress", or "I think abortion is really the only humane way
> out sometimes", or "As far as I'm concerned, the world is going
> to the dogs", or "I think birth control pills are just encourag-
> ing promiscuousness".

Openness about significant others refers to statements express-ing direct and unqualified feelings about an acquaintance (including relatives) other than the partner.

> Open statements in this category would be like: "She's really
> a groovy girl", or "I feel like Dr. B is really interested in
> students", or "My father means well", or "He strikes me as
> being very sensitive, not in the sense of being easily hurt,
> but in the sense of knowing what's going on inside others",
> or "God, I can't stand Anderson", or "I don't like my mother very
> well".

Openness about miscellaneous, noncontroversial topics refers to direct and unqualified feelings about things like football, cars, cloths,

classes, a favorite book or movie. If relative merits of one type

of literature or art over another is being discussed, statements

should be scores as openness about controversial situations and

issues, since it suggests controversy.

> Such open statements might include: "I love this necklace of
> yours", "dig the gorgeous weather we're having", "I really like
> rock and roll", "I think baseball's a great sport", "I hate big
> cars", "I don't like spectator sports", "These mini skirts are
> for the birds", "Mood music turns me off".