

**The Impact of PAIRS, a Psychoeducational Group Intervention,
on Marital Discord, Adult Interaction Style,
Projective Identification and Perceptive Identification**

Lynn Turner, PhD, LCSW
A Center For Relationships

The destructive outcomes of marital discord have been well documented, but studies of the underlying processes which contribute to marital discord and effective ameliorative interventions have not been clearly identified. This study assessed the impact of PAIRS, a psychoeducational group model for couples, on individual outcomes, mediated by social support, of decreased destructive adult interaction styles, decreased marital discord and decreased use of projective and perceptive identification. Utilizing a multi-method approach of outcome embedded with process, this study included 75 participants with 45 controls and coded video-tapes of three couples from the experimental group. Quantitative results supported the thesis that PAIRS has a significant positive impact on adult interaction styles, marital discord and social support. However, correlation analyses revealed that positive changes in marital discord were significantly related to positive changes in social support, but not to changes in adult interaction styles. Qualitative observations supported the notion that there is improvement during PAIRS in adult interaction styles for couples evidencing perceptive identification but not for those evidencing projective identification.

Author's Note: Correspondence may be addressed to Lynn Turner, A Center For Relationships, 316 Commerce St. Alexandria, VA 22314-2802. This study was first presented at the Tenth National Symposium on Doctoral Research on Social Work, May, 1998, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Statement of the Research Problem

Marital discord is one of society's most common and urgent problems. The destructive outcomes of marital discord have been documented with the 50 percent (Cherlin, 1992) to 67 percent (Martin & Bumpass, 1989) divorce rate for first married couples. Evidence also exists that many couples, who do stay married, continue their marriages in distressed and abusive relationships (Smith, Vivian & O'Leary, 1990), so that marital discord is experienced by approximately 20 percent of all married couples at any given time (Beach, Arias, & O'Leary, 1987).

From 1988 to 1993, thirteen marital discord studies evaluating 1392 participant couples and 428 control couples, and an article (Tolman & Molidor, 1994) reviewing 54 social work studies of group work over 10 years revealed that: (1) conjoint therapy using cognitive behavioral treatments for 10-18 hours has been the predominant mode of marital therapy; (2) group and/or psychoeducational treatments have been primarily used with premarital couples; and (3) every type of marital intervention was an improvement over no treatment with little difference shown between outcomes of the various treatments. For marital issues, thirty-eight studies from the meta-analysis were based on combinations of behavioral, cognitive and behavioral-exchange theories while only three studies included emotionally focused or affective

treatments. Cognitive-behavioral time-limited, structured groups were preferred for all target populations, while psychoeducation was used for issues of divorce, pre-marriage, child abuse, substance abuse and parenting.

This study attempted to identify destructive processes contributing to marital discord and to assess the ameliorative impact of a psychoeducational couples group model on this problem. The study postulated that internal and external patterns of destructive relational reactions developed in childhood are processes of adult interaction styles associated with marital discord. Each adult interaction style is comprised of three learned or internalized coping responses: the protective behaviors, the underlying cognitive framework, and the aversive emotions related to childhood experiences. Together they form a largely unconscious, integrated interaction style that emerges under stress in relationships.

Storaasli & Markman (1990) studying relationship problems in the early stages of marriage found that the progression through stages was marked by increasing problems with communication, intimacy and conflict management. Longitudinal research points to contempt/disgust and defensiveness in relational interactions as the two most corrosive negative marital behaviors leading to discord and dissolution (Gottman, 1994). These reactions or behavioral responses under stress are examples of destructive adult interaction styles in marital interactions.

Two processes in adult interaction styles were of particular interest to this study: perceptive identification and projective identification. Perceptive identification, a researcher-authored term, contains both external and internal properties explained by systems and psychodynamic theory and is a secondary defense mechanism associated with neuroses. In perceptive identification the person unconsciously responds to the partner as if the partner were an internal representation of the parent or care giver in an earlier negative interaction. Projective identification is primarily an internal process explained by psychodynamic theory and denotes a primary defense mechanism associated with personality disorders. In projective identification the person attempts to induce in his or her partner the self-representation from the original negative interaction.

Research Questions

The study proposed that both the internal processes of intra-psychoic personality development and the external processes of the social context of that development are important dimensions in the understanding of human behavior. Further, that destructive adult interaction styles, created during negative childhood interactions, could be ameliorated in a psychoeducational couples group utilizing cognitive, behavioral and affective techniques. Support developed in a group format may aid clients in the development, awareness and integration of behavioral changes (Toseland & Siporin, 1986). The psychoeducational group provides a social context for reconstruction of meaning and emotion with the practice of ameliorative or constructive adult interaction styles.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to evaluate and understand the possible decreases in destructive adult interaction processes leading to decreases in marital

discord over treatment. While cognitive, behavioral, and affective techniques have been used in six to eight week groups, it became interesting to evaluate their benefits along with the social support aspects of a four month group format.

Quantitative Hypothesis Controlling for age, gender, times married, education, marital status and attendance in therapy, mediated by increased social support inside and out of the group interaction format, individuals who participate in a psychoeducational group model will achieve greater decreases in destructive adult interaction styles and greater decreases in marital discord than will individuals who do not participate.

Qualitative Questions Can destructive adult interaction styles, particularly those using projective and perceptive identification processes, be observed in a dyadic skill training session where couples use a conflict resolution technique? Does observation reveal the destructiveness of projective and perceptive identification as processes of adult interaction styles? Do these destructive processes decrease over treatment?

Intervention Model: PAIRS, a psychoeducational group

Roles and patterns of behavior exhibited in adult interaction styles are learned through a lifetime of interactional processes in groups beginning with the family. It seems appropriate then to use an educational group setting with cognitive, behavioral, and affective techniques to instill new ways of relating. PAIRS (Practical Application of Intimate Relationship Skills), (Gordon, 1992B) is a 120 hour model of therapy using psychoeducation in a group format to elicit change in destructive adult interaction styles and marital discord.

The intervention teaches couples cognitive understanding of how their communication patterns or adult interaction styles interfere with their relationship and contribute to marital discord. Couples are given behavioral tools for practicing positive communication and conflict resolution. They are also given the opportunity to understand not only their own but their partner's affective reactions, which emanate from or are recreated by past events. As empathy is developed for themselves, as well as for their partner, new interpretations and responses are created. As adult interaction styles become more constructive, marital discord decreases. In addition, the learning takes place in an interactive group setting emulating earlier contexts for meaning.

Treatment consists of 120 hours of psychoeducation taught on weekday evenings and on weekends over four months. Groups include 15 to 30 participants averaging 2 singles and 10 couples. The intervention included a manual for participants (Gordon, 1992A) and a therapist's curriculum guide (Gordon, 1992,B). Sessions begin with humor and a didactic presentation of theory and skills. Relationship skills are then practiced or issues discussed in the group setting with chairs turned to the congruent (knee to knee) position for dyads or for sets of four or six. Participants are invited but not required to share experiences, insight, and feelings with the group.

Participants are taught new ways to relate and resolve conflict (behavioral adjustments) before they are led to increased awareness of self (cognitive techniques). They then learn to

release anger, hurt and fear (affective processes), take responsibility for their own needs cognitively and behaviorally, and develop the ability to understand, hear and give to their partner. Later they are able to work on sensuality and sexuality issues. In the final weeks and weekend, participants are given a format (using behavioral, cognitive and affective techniques) for confronting their most difficult issues as a necessary step toward a better relationship contract.

The PAIRS course is divided into five sections:

Section 1. Communication: Effective communication skills are taught to promote problem solving and increase intra-personal awareness in participants. Satir's stress styles (1988) form the basis for didactic and humorous experiential material whereby participants learn that the problem is how they communicate rather than what they communicate. Gordon's Love Knots (1990) are introduced as hidden assumptions which can cause problems in a relationship.

Section 2. Conflict Resolution: Participant's are taught to identify destructive and constructive fight styles (Bach, 1968) and learn to use Bach's Fair Fight for Change to reach a negotiated conclusion. Dirty fighting techniques, power struggles as well as caring behaviors are among the areas covered.

Section 3. Self Understanding: Participants are taught to understand themselves by identifying how early messages about their lovability, acceptability and competence affect their self-esteem. Participants are taught that bonding, emotional openness and physical closeness, is a biological need for all adults and a requirement for intimacy in a relationship (Casriel, 1972). Emotional release techniques are practiced in a safe environment followed by attitude groups.

Section 4. Sensuality and Sexuality: This section covers the range of physical pleasuring from tenderness, affection and bonding through sensuality and sexuality. It includes early learnings and decisions about sexuality: sexual turn-ons and turn-offs; common sexual practices and preferences; and a sexually explicit one hour film.

Section 5. Contracting: The final section of PAIRS builds on all that has been learned and practiced in the first four sections. Using Sager (1976) contracting concepts and the Fair Fight for Change (Bach, 1968) couples have the opportunity to assess and clarify their expectations of themselves, their spouses, and the areas of their marriage they would like to celebrate, improve or change.

Homework assignments for all sections include practice exercises for improving relationship skills and reading, specifically the detailed step-by-step manual (Gordon, 1992A) and eight texts which illuminate specific sections of the course. Examples of recommended texts include Satir's (1988) New Peoplemaking, Brandon's If you could hear what I cannot say (1985), and Bach's (1968) The Intimate Enemy, as well as Sexual Awareness by the McCarthy's (1984). Sessions allow time for journaling observations about self.

Cognitive techniques include didactic and experiential treatments which create awareness of attitudes, emotions and behavior patterns which interfere with positive adult interaction. Couples are taught to recognize their destructive adult interaction styles. Treatments to promote

empathy such as role-playing allow couples to put themselves in the place of the other in order to understand how their projection or perception patterns create distress.

Behavioral techniques give couples an opportunity to experience positive interactions by trying new roles and behavioral patterns even before positive emotions or cognitions are integrated into their awareness. While behavioral techniques may not be sustained when used without cognition or affect, they can create an atmosphere of hope whereby couples come to recognize the possibility for optimistic perceptions of attributions, a necessary component of marital satisfaction.

Affective techniques allow couples to experience emotions associated with present events which have been triggered by relationship interaction in the past. By identifying the association between childhood interactions and present affective reactions, participants can begin to distinguish between emotions from the current situation and those from the past. In addition they begin to identify which responses are projections onto or inaccurate perceptions of the partner. When the partner (or second person) witnesses the first person's deep emotion from a past event, empathy for the first person often develops.

Methodology

Utilizing a multi-method approach of outcome embedded with process, this study included: (1) 75 participants with 45 controls and large scale quantitative methodology for the outcome study; and (2) coded video-tapes of three couples from the experimental group and qualitative methodology for the in-depth exploration of projective and perceptive identification associated with conflict resolution. Experimental subjects were drawn from PAIRS classes taught to ten groups in eight cities: Washington, D.C. (3 groups), Vancouver, Canada; Asheville, NC; Virginia Beach, VA; Lanham, MD; Maui, Hawaii; Cary, NC; and Boulder, CO. Control subjects were couples seeking treatment for marital discord issues with no PAIRS class available in their area.

The quantitative instrumentation included the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) for marital discord, the Ways of Coping Scale (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) for adult interaction styles and the Social Support Scale (Telleen, 1985) to measure social support. All quantitative measures contained adequate reliability and validity.

Projective and perceptive identification were operationalized with coded observations of three couples using a PAIRS conflict resolution tool in video taped sessions from the beginning and from the end of the course. The researcher-authored coding measure, the Couple Interaction and Identification Coding Instrument, was adapted from the Revised Couples Interaction Scoring System, RCISS (Gottman, Notarius, & Markman, 1977), the Projective Identification-Collusion Index (Sheagren, 1987), and author-generated questions. The task analysis format developed by Greenberg (1992) was used to design the qualitative evaluation.

PAIRS, the psychoeducational program used in this project includes a 285 page manual and a 395 page curriculum guide. Each 3 hour session is specifically outlined with lecture or exercise for uniformity of presentation. PAIRS classes are taught in 35 states and 16 countries

with classes averaging 15 participants. Leadership training and certification includes 40 hours over two weeks with a lecture/experiential format for licensed therapists in social work, counseling, psychology, or psychiatry. Program reliability was monitored with a standard self-report measure administered to all PAIRS participants upon termination of the course. Audio tapes of presentations are sent to the PAIRS Foundation for review.

Univariate, bivariate and multivariate analyses were calculated to determine socio-demographic distribution, group differences at pretest, changes in variables over treatment time, relationships between variables, predictors of change in the dependent and mediating variables and testing of study theory using path analysis. Analyses examined relationships between the independent, dependent and mediating variables using pre and posttest scores and change scores.

Results

The effectiveness of the group intervention to change adult interaction styles as well as marital discord was supported with t-tests of pre-posttest and change scores comparing controls and participants. Reported perception of social support also changed significantly over treatment for participants compared to controls. However, the hypothesized correlation of changes in marital discord related to changes in adult interaction styles was not supported.

The experimental and control groups were similar in age, averaging early forties; gender slightly more females than males; religion, pre-dominantly Catholic or Protestant; education, more than three quarters with a BA degree or more; and times married, more than half married once and more than one quarter married more than once. The two groups differed statistically significantly at pretest in pre-marital and post-marital status with more participants dating or living together and more non-participants separated. Non-participants were also significantly less likely to have attended therapy during or shortly before the intervention time.

Quantitative results used independent samples t-test comparisons of group change scores as well as paired samples t-tests of pre-posttest scores (see Tables 1 & 2). Analyses showed that the intervention had a statistically significant positive impact on marital discord, adult interaction style and social support for experimentals but not for controls. Independent samples t-tests comparing participant and control change scores showed statistically significant differences in marital discord subscale changes for consensus ($t=2.433$, $p=.017$), affection ($t=3.063$, $p=.003$), and total score ($t=1.935$, $p=.056$). Paired samples t-tests of participants showed statistically significant positive changes for the subscale consensus ($t=2.222$, $p=.030$) and not for cohesion ($t=-1.890$, $p=.064$).

-insert Tables 1 & 2-

Changes in adult interaction styles subscales, escape-avoidance and distancing, improved statistically significantly for the participants but not for the controls over treatment time. Independent samples t-tests comparing participant and control group adult interaction style change scores showed statistically significant Ways of Coping subscale differences for subscales distancing ($t=-2.680$, $p=.009$) and escape-avoidance ($t=-2.164$, $p=.033$) but not for the other subscales.

The social support generated in the group intervention was shown to cause statistically significant changes in positive social support reported by the participants. At the same time the controls reported statistically significant increases in need for social support over treatment time. Independent samples t-tests comparing participant and control group social support change scores showed statistically significant differences in Social Support Scale subscales need ($t=-2.366$, $p=.020$), and network ($t=2.360$, $p=.020$). In addition paired samples t-tests of participant pre-posttest scores showed statistically significant improvement in Social Support Scale subscales network ($t=-2.331$, $p=.023$) and satisfaction ($t=-2.260$, $p=.027$). The same test for non-participants showed statistically significant increases in the Social Support Scale subscale need ($t=-2.132$, $p=.039$).

The positive impact of the group aspect of the intervention on marital discord was supported with multivariate analyses. Correlation and multiple regression analyses of change scores for participants revealed that positive changes in marital discord were statistically significantly related to positive changes in social support.

However, the notion was not supported that the intervention would activate positive changes in adult interaction styles leading to decreased marital discord. Correlation and multiple regression analyses showed that statistically significant relationships were not established between changes in adult interaction styles and changes in marital discord or social support. It is possible that an untested intervening variable exists between marital discord and adult interaction style, and/or the measure for adult interaction styles is inadequate for the task, or perhaps some components of adult interaction styles are unmutable functions of temperament.

Comparing changes in marital discord with attendance in therapy revealed that control group members all worsened while Pairs participants who attended therapy predominantly improved (60% got better while 26% got worse) (see Table 3). For those who did not attend therapy during treatment time, PAIRS participants were more likely to improve than controls. For controls who attended therapy 80% were in individual sessions while 20% were in couples therapy. This result, statistically significant for controls (Pearson chi-square=9.171, $p=.057$), suggests that therapy alone, particularly individual therapy, may not be beneficial for improvement of marital discord. This statistical analysis adds to the support of psychoeducational groups as appropriate treatment for marital discord.

Qualitative observations supported the notion that there was improvement during treatment in adult interaction styles and that this improvement was related to the intervention for couples evidencing the less pathological defense mechanism, perceptive identification. However, for those evidencing the more pathological defense mechanism, projective identification, there was no improvement over the time of treatment.

The Couple Interaction and Identification Coding Instrument appeared to be attuned to revealing self and object representations as well as identifying couple responses to issues and problem solving. The completed coding sheets showed that emotions and cognitions surrounding problem issues could be well described within the coding format. The phase sheets appeared well able to identify couple responses to issues and problem solving. Projective and

perceptive identification were revealed in the coding instrument when self-representations and object representations created emotional reactions in the person or the partner. Treatment possibilities became evident for comparing the three couples in their use of projective or perceptive identification as well as their response to the intervention.

The solution for projective and perceptive identifications appeared to be the individual's ability to see the problem as well as the solution belonging to both members of the couple partnership. Couples #1 & 2 who demonstrated perceptive identification were able to develop or maintain goodwill, see the problems as belonging to both partners and seek solutions which would take into account the needs of each partner. The members of couple #3 who displayed projective identification in both sessions were unable to maintain goodwill, see themselves as having any part of the problem and therefore could not agree on a solution which would take into account the needs of both. Instead, they continued their emotional disquietude concerning the issues raised, continued projecting their self-representations to get relief, and ended both sessions seeing each other as the enemy with only a little insight as to their own processes.

The study included threats to reliability and validity through lack of random sampling and multiple measures as well as limited generalizability due to sample demographics. Contamination effects were possible with control group exposure to literature and leader addition of non-program material. In the qualitative exploration, small sample size limited validity and lack of good inter-rater reliability among coders limited reliability.

Utility for social work practice

The study results suggest that psychoeducation can be appropriate for the amelioration of marital discord and that the social support generated in a group format is a contributive agent. In addition further research is recommended comparing individual therapy with psychoeducation as treatments for marital discord. Taking into account the constraints of managed mental health care, an effective short term group treatment for marital discord provides a much needed model of practice. The study results suggest the importance of developing psychoeducational group treatments for other interactional interpersonal problems such as stepfamily issues, adolescent issues and family issues. Psychoeducational interventions could be economically placed in mental health clinics or be court ordered for families or couples in need of ameliorative treatments concerning interactional issues.

The further establishment of criteria for constructive and destructive adult interaction styles is indicated. It might be found that some components in adult interaction styles are the result of temperament, existent at birth and unchangeable. Knowledge about inherent adult interaction styles might aid couples in acceptance of differences as well as assist in teaching moderation techniques for basic temperament styles.

Understanding projective identification and perceptive identification as separate processes requiring different treatments may help clinicians to create a more appropriate model in couples therapy. If further research shows that projective identification is related to personality disorders while perceptive identification is related to neurotic disorders, as hypothesized by the researcher, practitioners will have a fuller understanding of treatment

possibilities and limitations.

The use of video-taping and the Couple Interaction and Identification Index may assist clinicians in marital therapy. Participant couples have asked to view their video-taped sessions in order to understand their adult interaction styles. Clinicians, therefore, might use the videotapes as training tools in therapy sessions.

References

- Bach, G.R. & Wyden, P. (1968). The Intimate Enemy, How to fight fair in love and marriage. New York: Avon Books.
- Beach, S.R.H., Arias, I., & O'leary, K.D. (1987). The relationship of social support to depressive symptomatology. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 8, 305-316.
- Brandon, N. (1985). If you could hear what I cannot say. New York: Bantam Books.
- Casriel, D. (1972). A Scream Away from Happiness. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Cherlin, A.J. (1992). Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, L.H. (1992A) PAIRS handbook. Falls Church, VA: PAIRS Foundation Ltd.
- Gordon, L.H. (1992B). PAIRS curriculum guide and training manual. Falls Church, VA: PAIRS Foundation Ltd.
- Gordon, L.H. (1990). Love knots. New York: Dell Publishing.
- Gottman, J.M. (1994). What Predicts Divorce? The Relationship Between Marital Processes and Marital Outcomes. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Gottman, J.M., Markman, H. & Notarius, C. (1977). The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 461-477.
- Greenberg, L.S. (1992). Task analysis: identifying components of intra personal conflict resolution. In S.G. Toukmanian & D.L. Rennie (eds.), Psychotherapy Process Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, Appraisal, and Coping. New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- Martin, T.C., & Bumpass, L. (1989) Recent trends in marital disruption. Demography, 26, 37-51.
- McCarthy, B., & McCarthy, E. (1984). Sexual Awareness. New York: Carrol & Graf Publishers, Inc.
- Sager, C. J. (1976). Marriage contracts and couple therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Satir, V. (1988). New Peoplemaking. Mountain View, CA: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.
- Sheagren, J. (1987). The relationship between marital adjustment, degree of individuation of

partners, and marital interaction patterns. Dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree, Doctor of Social Work. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America.

Smith, D.A., Vivian, D. & O'Leary, K.D. (1990) Longitudinal prediction of marital discord from premarital expressions of affect. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58, 790-798.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.

Storaasli, R.D., & Markman, H.J. (1990). Relationship problems in the early stages of marriage: A longitudinal investigation. Journal of Family Psychology, 4, 80-98.

Telleen, S. (1985). Parenting Social Support Index reliability and Validity. Unpublished manuscript, U. of Illinois, School of Public Health: Chicago.

Tolman, R.M. & Molidor, C.E. (1994). A decade of social group work research: Trends in methodology, theory, and program development. Research on Social Work Practice, 4, 142-159.

Toseland, R.W. & Siporin, M. (1986). When to recommend group treatment: a review of the clinical and the research literature. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 36, 171-201.

" \ 3

TABLE 1

**PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST OF DEPENDENT AND
MEDIATING VARIABLE PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES**

MARITAL DISCORD		n	PRE-TEST mean s.d.		POST-TEST mean s.d.		t-test	Level of Significance
<i>DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE</i>								
COHESION	EXP	60	12.48	4.72	13.40	3.95	-1.890	.064
	CONTROL	42	14.36	4.29	13.60	3.56	1.706	.096
CONSENSUS	EXP	60	55.33	8.10	56.88	8.41	-2.222	.030
	CONTROL	42	57.36	9.61	57.52	6.16	-.140	.890
SATISFACTION	EXP	60	37.85	7.90	38.75	8.46	-.998	.323
	CONTROL	42	39.88	8.69	39.52	7.92	.487	.629
AFFECTION	EXP	60	8.67	2.60	9.70	2.57	-4.773	.000
	CONTROL	42	9.67	2.46	9.43	2.77	.613	.543
DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE TOTAL SCORE	EXP	60	114.33		118.73		-2.372	.021
	CONTROL	42	20.8		20.0		.538	.594
			5		5			
			121.26	21.7	120.07	16.1		
		3		0				
ADULT INTERACTION STYLE								
<i>WAYS OF COPING SCALE</i>								
CONFRONTIVE	EXP	65	6.97	3.18	6.28	3.42	1.348	.183
	CONTROL	41	6.46	3.72	6.90	3.41	-.640	.526
DISTANCING	EXP	63	4.07	3.51	3.21	2.98	2.640	.010
	CONTROL	40	3.37	2.92	4.07	3.37	-1.342	.187
SELF- CONTROLLING	EXP	64	8.77	3.50	8.28	4.08	1.011	.316
	CONTROL	41	7.83	3.83	8.59	3.92	-1.036	.306
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	EXP	65	7.23	4.53	7.03	4.58	.309	.758
	CONTROL	41	6.34	4.96	7.12	4.94	-.866	.391
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	EXP	63	4.16	2.68	3.94	2.62	.580	.564
	CONTROL	40	3.90	3.02	4.40	4.38	-.688	.496
ESCAPE AVOIDANCE	EXP	62	5.37	3.59	4.34	3.39	2.386	.020
	CONTROL	41	4.32	2.86	4.83	3.71	-.875	.387
PLANFUL PROBLEM SOLVING	EXP	64	6.94	2.99	7.34	4.02	-.768	.445
	CONTROL	41	6.88	4.06	7.68	4.02	-1.027	.310
POSITIVE REAPPRAISAL	EXP	65	6.43	4.52	6.91	3.84	-.816	.418
	CONTROL	40	7.0	5.43	7.55	5.10	-.637	.528

**TABLE 1 (cont'd)
PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST OF DEPENDENT AND
MEDIATING VARIABLE PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES**

SOCIAL SUPPORT		n	PRE-TEST mean s.d.		POST-TEST mean s.d.		t-test	Level of Significance
<i>SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE</i>								
NEED	EXP	65	17.15	2.90	16.58	3.84	1.305	.197
	CONTROL	43	14.90	3.44	15.88	3.21	-2.132	.039

NETWORK	EXP	65	10.74	4.31	11.94	4.63	-2.331	.023
	CONTROL	43	10.63	5.09	10.07	5.23	1.157	.254
SATISFACTION	EXP	65	22.25	5.57	23.73	4.36	-2.260	.027
	CONTROL	43	21.14	7.11	20.83	6.49	.388	.700
TYPE OF NETWORK	EXP	65	9.97	3.28	10.58	3.17	-1.460	.149
	CONTROL	43	9.86	3.08	9.53	3.65	.608	.546
CONFRONTATION	EXP	62	2.13	.76	2.18	.69	-.409	.684
	CONTROL	42	3.00	6.54	2.12	.80	.913	.366

TABLE 2
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST OF
VARIABLE CHANGE SCORES

MARITAL DISCORD			n	CHANGE SCORES		t-test	Level of Significance
				mean	s.d.		
<i>DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE</i>							
COHESION	EXP		60	0.9167	3.7565	2.433	.017
		CONTROL	42	-0.7619	2.8950		
CONSENSUS	EXP		60	1.5500	5.4038	1.063	.290
		CONTROL	42	0.1667	7.7426		
SATISFACTION	EXP		60	0.9000	7.8185	1.012	.314
		CONTROL	42	-0.3571	8.8784		
AFFECTION	EXP		60	1.0333	1.6770	3.063	.003
		CONTROL	42	-0.2381	2.5164		
DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE TOTAL SCORE	EXP		60	4.4000	14.3706	1.935	.056
	CONTROL		42	-1.1905	14.3480		
ADULT INTERACTION STYLE							
<i>WAYS OF COPING SCALE</i>							
CONFRONTIVE	EXP		65	-0.6923	4.1417	-1.1338	.184
		CONTROL	41	0.4390	4.3935		
DISTANCING	EXP		63	-0.8730	2.6243	-2.680	.009
		CONTROL	40	0.7000	3.2988		
SELF-CONTROLLING	EXP		64	-0.4844	3.8338	-1.484	.141
	CONTROL		41	0.7561	4.6732		
SEEKING SOCIAL SUPPORT	EXP		65	-0.2000	5.2178	-.904	.368
	CONTROL		41	0.7805	5.7685		
ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY	EXP		63	-0.2222	3.0398	-.961	.339
	CONTROL		40	0.5000	4.5965		
ESCAPE AVOIDANCE	EXP		62	-1.0323	3.4067	-2.164	.033
	CONTROL		41	0.5122	3.7491		
PLANFUL PROBLEM SOLVING	EXP		64	0.4063	4.2303	-.438	.662
	CONTROL		41	0.8049	5.0161		
POSITIVE REAPPRAISAL	EXP		65	0.4769	4.7140	-.073	.942
	CONTROL		40	0.5500	5.4629		

NOTE: Equal variances assumed.

TABLE 2 (cont'd.)
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST OF
VARIABLE CHANGE SCORES

SOCIAL SUPPORT			n	CHANGE SCORES		t-test	Level of Significance
				mean	s.d.		
<i>SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE</i>							
NEED	EXP		65	-0.5692	3.5177	-2.366	.020
		CONTROL	43	0.9767	3.0039		

NETWORK	EXP	CONTROL	65 43	1.2000 4.1503 -0.5581 3.1646	2.360	.020
SATISFACTION	EXP	CONTROL	65 43	1.4923 5.3242 -0.3023 5.1062	1.743	.084
TYPE OF NETWORK	EXP CONTROL		65 43	-11.66156.5581 -11.60476.0440	-0.046	.964
CONFRONTATION	EXP	CONTROL	62 42	4.8690 0.9308 0.88106.2516	1.154	.251

NOTE: Equal variances assumed.

**TABLE 3
 CROSS TABULATIONS AND CHI-SQUARE TESTS
 COMPARING THERAPY VARIABLE WITH TRICHOTOMIZED DAS TOTAL CHANGE
 SCORES
 FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP**

DA S TO TA L SC OR E	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP — SEEING THERAPIST NOW		
		YES	NO
	GOT WORSE	5 (26.3%)	15 (42.9%)
	STAYED SAME	2 (10.5%)	2 (5.7%)
GOT BETTER	12 (63.2%)	18 (51.4%)	

Pearson Chi-Square = 1.600

Sig (2-tailed) p = .449

DA S TO TA L SC OR E	CONTROL GROUP — SEEING THERAPIST NOW			
		0	YES	NO
	GOT WORSE	1 100%	10 100%	15 57.7%
STAYED SAME			3 9.7%	

	GOT BETTER			13 41.9%
--	------------	--	--	-------------

Pearson Chi-Square = 9.171
Sig (2-tailed) p = .05

