A woman in her thirties reveals that she is depressed. Her therapist responds with empathy and gently queries about her feelings and the events related to her feelings. She elaborates about how helpless and inadequate she is, how her failures lead to numerous problems, how poorly others treat her, and how her husband is exacting and demanding. After exploring the difficulties she has experienced, the therapist states his admiration for her responsible and self-sacrificing devotion to her husband. He admires how she, by taking responsibility for their problems, enables her husband to feel confident and competent. She responds with dismay and more extreme demonstrations of helplessness. The therapist persists with his construction of her situation. He notes many instances in which she protected her husband by taking responsibility for problems through self-sacrificing acts of helplessness and inadequacy. He admires her responsible and altruistic concern for her husband’s fragility.

In their next meeting, the client hesitatingly suggests that she does take responsibility for the difficulties she and her husband experience. She expresses doubt that her husband is as fragile as she apparently has believed. In the remaining sessions, time is devoted to working out how she can take responsibility in ways that are more respectful of her husband as a mature adult and of herself as a person of worth. Each session begins with a review of her experiences in trying new ways of exercising responsibility and ends in planning ways to meet challenges that she expects to arise in the next week. The client emerges from therapy no longer depressed and with different ways of behaving in many aspects of her life.

While many theoretical perspectives offer cogent accounts of the processes involved in the client’s change in thinking and acting in the above case summary, the interpersonal perspective stresses the role played by social influence. The therapist presented and steadfastly elaborated a view of the client’s situation that was highly discrepant from the view she presented to him. She accepted the view, albeit after strenuous efforts to dissuade the therapist of his unexpected view. The
client's change is an example of social influence. When one person affects another's behavior, social influence has occurred.

Social influence is one of the most pervasive facts of human experience. People spend much of their time in behavioral exchanges with others. The exchanges are marked by striking evidence of social influence as seen in the coordination of the responses interactants exchange with one another (Strong et al., 1988). Social influence in the exchanges frequently results in changes in interactants' constructions of social reality and of themselves, changes that affect participants' behavior in future interactions (Strong, 1984).

In the above brief description of the behavioral exchange between client and therapist, the client's presentation of herself as depressed influenced the therapist to listen sympathetically. The therapist's empathic responses and queries influenced the client to elaborate on her experiences and feelings. The therapist's interpretation was followed by strenuous efforts by both client and therapist to influence each other's views. The therapy sessions were continuous streams of reciprocal influences that resulted in profound changes in the client's views of herself and others, and in her behavior.

The purposes of this chapter are to present a theory of the dynamics of social influence and to apply the theory to how change is achieved in therapeutic relationships.

INTERPERSONAL INFLUENCE IN RELATIONSHIPS

The scientific study of social influence can be traced to Kurt Lewin, to his topological and vector psychology and his concept of group dynamics (Cartwright, 1959a; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). To Lewin, and to Ernst Cassirer, the philosopher of science under whom Lewin studied, observed events are symptoms of underlying dynamic processes. The job of the scientist is to posit theories of the underlying dynamic processes that account for and find expression in observed events (Cassirer, 1923; Lewin, 1935, pp. 1-42). To them, the purpose of science is to explain the known with the unknown and thus push back the frontiers of the unknown.

Lewin and Cassirer proposed that the first step in constructing a theory is to determine the phenomenon for which the theory is to account. The scientist then develops theoretical constructs, identifies relations among the constructs, and identifies connections between the constructs and potentially observable events. The theory should suggest how the theoretical constructs and potentially observable events are to be measured. A theory is a representation model of an unseen reality posited to underlie and account for observed events. What follows is a representational model of the unseen reality of social influence.

Key Social Influence Concepts

The phenomenon for which the theory of interpersonal influence is intended to account is the coordination of the responses people exchange as they interact in interpersonal relationships. Not only are we interested in accounting for moment to moment response exchanges, but also for changes in the relations among the responses exchanged over time. Change over time indicate developmental effects that reflect changes in the participants' interpersonal characteristics, changes of the sort therapeutic relationships are intended to foster.

The coordination of responses between people in interpersonal interactions is readily observed in the everyday exchanges we have with others. Goffman (1959) proposed that people coordinate their social behavior with one another to construct the social realities that define them as social beings. Laboratory studies have demonstrated that how one person responds to another profoundly affects how the other responds to the person on a moment-to-moment basis (Strong et al., 1988). As social beings, we are heavily invested in how others behave with respect to us. This investment reflects our dependence on other people for many of the substances and conditions we need for daily sustenance and growth, substances and conditions that are embedded in or controlled by others' responses. Dependence, a state induced by our needs for substances and conditions another controls, is the basic theoretical construct of social influence.

Dependence renders us responsive to the other in social exchanges. We are inclined to respond to the other in ways that encourage him or her to behave in ways that serve our needs. We also are inclined to be responsive to the other's needs for substances and conditions we control. The other's willingness to serve our needs is based fundamentally on our ability and willingness to serve the other's needs, to exchange benefit for benefit. Traditionally, social influence has been viewed in terms of the responsiveness to another's needs that
dependence on the other generates. Dependence on another gives the other the ability to influence us, an ability labeled social power. Lewin conceived of social influence in terms of social power (Lewin, 1951, pp. 228–304 & 335–337), as did the pioneers who initially construed the dynamics of social influence (Cartwright, 1959a, 1959b; French & Raven, 1959; Emerson, 1962).

Early formulations of the dynamics of social influence regarded social influence as a one-way process. While theorists acknowledged that members of a relationship are dependent on each other and thus that both possess social power, they conceived of the outworkings of these dynamics in terms of imbalances in power, with the more powerful demanding concessions and the less powerful haplessly complying. Moscovici and his colleagues (Moscovici, 1985; Moscovici & Mugny, 1983) have shown that this conception of social influence is inadequate. A theory of social influence must account for the simultaneous effects of both participants’ dependence on both participants’ ongoing behavior: Interdependence must be the central construct.

Lewin defined a group in terms of the interdependence of its members (Lewin, 1948, p. 84). In a discussion of how the behavior of a marital dyad might be studied, he noted that, because of their interdependence, the behavior of each spouse was heavily influenced by his or her conceptions of the other’s situation, character, needs, intentions, perceptions, and likely responses (Lewin, 1951, pp. 195–199). Kelley and Thibaut, who have developed a complex and fruitful theory of interdependence (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), pointed out that interdependence profoundly affects the motives and behaviors of people in relationships. In order to maintain the other in the relationship and thus ultimately realize the potential benefits available through the other, both parties must delay personal gratification and serve the other’s needs. Interdependence generates the motives and behaviors denoted by the concepts of altruism, loyalty, fairness, trust, equality, and equity, as well as competition and egocentrism.

Categorizing and Measuring Interpersonal Responses

In an interpersonal interaction, a person’s behavior at a given time is a function of the person’s psychological situation at that time. Interpersonal responses are conceived of as tools for affecting the other’s psychological situation and thus the other’s behavior. Interpersonal interactions are construed as processes of exchanging resources (substances and conditions related to needs) and information about resources and needs that could be exchanged and met in the interactions. Interpersonal responses are assumed to convey resources and information about resources and needs. In pursuit of their interests in interpersonal interactions, people are assumed to select and employ interpersonal responses in terms of the anticipated effects of the resources and information the responses convey on the other’s psychological situation.

Categorizing Interpersonal Responses

The Strong et al. (1988) interpersonal circle categorizes interpersonal responses in terms of the resources and information they convey. Timothy Leary and his colleagues at the Kaiser Foundation introduced the interpersonal circle in the 1950s (Leary, 1957). It organizes interpersonal responses in terms of their loadings on two dimensions: status (dominant to submissive) and affiliation (friendly to hostile). The Strong et al. circle, patterned after Leary’s circle, is presented in Figure 27.1. The Strong et al. circle divides interpersonal response space, defined by orthogonal status and affiliation dimensions, into eight categories: leading, self-enhancing, critical, distrustful, self-effacing, docile, cooperative, and nurturant. The responses in each category are organized in four levels of intensity, with the least intense responses occurring near the center of the circle and the most intense near the perimeter of the circle. Figure 27.1 presents representative interpersonal responses in each category and level of the Strong et al. circle.

Several other versions of the interpersonal circle have been published (Benjamin, 1974; Chance, 1966; Foa, 1961; Kiesler, 1983; Lorr & McNair, 1966; Perkins, Kiesler, Anchin, Chirico, Kyle, & Federman, 1979; Wiggins, 1979). The versions are intended to correct perceived inadequacies in Leary’s circle and/or modify it for some specific use (Kiesler, 1983). Most of the models, including Leary’s, are intended for interpersonal diagnosis of personality, and are linked to personality inventories. Psychometric studies of the structural properties of circle-based inventories support the two-dimensional structure of personality attributes and the general order of personality types.

Within the circle (Wiggins, 1979; Perkins et al., 1979; Lorr & McNair, 1966).

Numerous efforts to empirically identify the psychometric structure of personality traits, emotions, and social behaviors have found circular structures and/or primary dimensions similar to Leary’s circle (Becker & Krug, 1964; Conte & Plutchik, 1981; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Russell, 1980; Schaefer, 1961; Stiles, 1980). Studies of self-reports of “how I get my way” in relationships have derived categories of influence strategies that are similar to the response categories of the Strong et al. circle (Buss, Gomes, Higgins, & Lauterbach, 1987; Cowan, Drinkard, & MacGavin, 1984; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Howard, Blumstein, & Schwartz, 1986). The categories and dimensions of Bales’ SYMLOG (Bales, Cohen, & Williamson, 1979) are also similar to those of the Strong et al. circle.

Strong et al. (1988) assessed the validity of the structure of their interpersonal circle in a study of the perceptual and behavioral effects of the eight types of responses in interactions between pairs of women working on a laboratory task. One of the women in each pair was a confederate trained to enact a high percentage of one type of response
while she and a subject constructed and reached consensus about the best stories for two pictures. The eight response types defined eight conditions in the study. After the 16-minute interactions, subjects indicated their impressions of their partner’s characteristics using the Impact Message Inventory (Perkins et al., 1979). The items of the inventory are scored on 15 personality scales that are organized in a circle along status and affiliation dimensions.

Differences on the personality scales due to conditions reflected the expected effects of response types on the subjects’ impressions of the confederates. Strong et al. derived vectors in the interpersonal impression space defined by the inventory’s status and affiliation dimensions to identify the response types’ overall relative effects or impressions. The placement of the vectors in the interpersonal impression space closely corresponded to the placement of the response categories in the Strong et al. circle.

Responses in each category of the Strong et al. circle communicate specific information about resources, needs, and perceptions. The information the responses communicate is presented in Figure 27.2. Along the vertical axis of the model, information varies from the assertion of possession of dominant resources to the assertion of possession of submissive resources. Along the horizontal axis, information varies from the assertion of an altruistic focus on the other’s needs to the assertion of an egotistic focus on own needs. The information communicated by responses in each category reflects the interpersonal significance of a particular combination of values on the two dimensions. The two diagonal axes in Figure 27.2 describe the overall thrust of the information communicated by responses that lie along them. One diagonal axis extends from “asserts resources” to “denies resources.” The other extends from “asserts needs” to “denies needs.” The specific resources the responses in each category assert are presented toward the center of the circle in Figure 27.2. The overall meanings of the information that the responses in each category communicate are presented inside the circle near the perimeter, whereas the attributions that the responses in each category encourage are presented outside the circle near the perimeter.

Leading and self-enhancing responses assert the possession of dominant resources, while docile and self-effacing responses assert the possession of submissive resources. Leading responses inform the other that the person has good resources and is considering the other's needs: They encourage attributions of competence and equitableness. Docile responses inform the other that the person has few resources and is looking to the other to consider the person's needs: They encourage attributions of deference and low involvement. Self-enhancing responses inform the other that the person has superior resources and that the other is in need of the person's consideration: They encourage attributions of superiority and autonomy. Self-effacing responses inform the other that the person has poor resources and is dependent on the other to consider his or her needs: They encourage attributions of helplessness and dependence.

Nurturant and cooperative responses assert an altruistic orientation in the exchange with the other, while critical and distrustful responses assert an egotistic orientation. Nurturant responses inform the other that the person believes the other to have resources of value and to be worthy of having his or her needs considered: They encourage attributions of trustworthiness and fairness. Cooperative responses inform the other that the person believes that the other values the person's resources and is considerate of the person's needs: They encourage attributions of trust and loyalty. Critical responses inform the other that his or her responses have no value and that he or she is not worthy of consideration: They encourage attributions of strength and dangerousness. Distrustful responses inform the other that the person feels that he or she is not being appreciated and that the other is not considering his or her needs: They encourage attributions of victimization and martyrdom.

**Measuring Interpersonal Responses**

The Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale (Strong, Hills, & Nelson, 1988) is a system for coding all of the responses enacted in an interpersonal interaction into the categories and levels of the Strong et al. circle. Coding the responses participants employ in an interaction into the categories of the scale provides a direct measure of the responses that participants exchange. While the percentages of total responses that fall into each category are useful in describing an interaction, hypotheses about relationship processes are better tested using continuous measures derived from the systematic arrangement of the categories in the circle.

A response is conceived of as a vector in inter-
Figure 27.2. Information communicated by interpersonal responses.

A personal response space that is described by its coordinates on the status and affiliation dimensions, and by its magnitude, the radius of the circle. The vector for responses coded in each category is the radius of the circle that bisects the category. The degrees of the arcs on the circle between the response vectors and radii perpendicular to the midpoint of the dimensions identify the degrees of the categories' central angles on the dimensions, as shown in Figure 27.3. The angles on the submissive and hostile sides of the dimensions are given minus (−) signs to distinguish them from angles on the dominant and friendly sides. Thus, the range of angles on each dimension is from $-67.5^\circ$ to $67.5^\circ$. The status and affiliation dimension coordinates of the response vectors are derived from the trigonometric functions of the categories’ central angles on the dimensions, as illustrated in Figure 27.4.

This scoring method collapses the eight categories into two continuous measures: the status and affiliation coordinates. Using these measures, response differences can be directly assessed between participants in the same or different interactions or between time periods. In addition, the pattern of an individual's responses over time can be assessed using time series analysis.

The systematic relations of response categories
to each other in the interpersonal circle led Carson (1969) to propose the "principle of complementarity." The principle asserts that response categories that are reciprocal to one another on the status dimension and correspondent on the affiliation dimension are complements of each other (complementary category pairs are nurturant and cooperative, leading and docile, self-enhancing and self-effacing, and critical and distrustful). As seen in Figure 27.2, the messages of responses in the category pairs complement each other. For example, the message of responses in the critical category is, "You do not have resources of value. You are not worthy of consideration." The message of responses in the distrustful category, the complement of critical, is, "You do not value my resources. You do not consider my needs." The principle of complementarity posits that employing a particular response potentially encourages an interactant to reciprocate with its complement, an assertion in keeping with relations among the messages interpersonal responses convey.

Interpersonal responses have the potential to

Figure 27.3. Degrees of the response category arcs on the status and affiliation dimensions.

Figure 27.4. Derivation of response vector coordinates.
generate pressure on an interactant to respond with their complements. The principle of complementarity thus identifies the instrumental value of responses in potentially influencing the other's subsequent response. When a participant responds to another with the complement of the other's previous response, he or she communicates acceptance of the other's assertions about each other's characteristics and of the momentary state of their relationship, and potentially asserts pressure on the other to maintain the current pattern of exchange. When a participant responds to another with a noncomplementary response, he or she reveals a different understanding and potentially asserts pressure on the other to change his or her subsequent response in the direction of the complement of the received response.

How another responds to a specific influence attempt depends on the psychological significance of the received message to the other; that is, on its impact on the other's psychological situation. For example, the other may find the person's assertion that he or she is victimizing the person consistent with how he or she wants to be viewed or abhorrent to his or her self-image. The influence pressures that responses potentially arouse in an interactant, both in terms of direction and magnitude of pressure, are presented in Figures 27.5 and 27.6.

Using the continuous scoring method and the pythagorean theorem, vectors can be calculated that describe the influence pressure (both magnitude and direction) that one participant's response potentially arouses in the other to maintain the current exchange pattern (convergence) or to change the pattern (divergence) in the next exchange. A vector depicting the extent to which the first party changes in response to the influence attempt also can be calculated. From these two measures, magnitudes of conformity, anticonformity, innovation, unresponsiveness, and other indices of relationship behavior can be calculated. Using these measures, the dependencies acting on participants can be inferred from how they attempt to influence each other and from how they respond to each other's attempts to influence. The measures are functions of the relations between the responses of the two participants, and thus they provide indices of the ongoing process of relationship negotiation in the dyad. The indices provide ways of assessing and comparing the relationship processes of different dyads and the relationship behaviors of members within a dyad. In addition, the pattern of relationship negotiation in a dyad over time can be assessed using time series analysis.

**Interpersonal Life Space**

Behavior at a given time is a function of a person's psychological situation at that time. A person's psychological situation is composed of the psychological realities experienced by the person that arise from the interaction of the characteristics of the person with the characteristics of the person's environment. Thus, a person's psychological situation is the joint product of the characteristics of the person and of his or her environment, the meaning of Lewin's famous formula $B = f(P,E)$. The life space was Lewin's method of representing a person's psychological situation at a given time. In discussions of the life space, Lewin often used analogies to physical space, but he included in the life space anything that was real for the person, such as behaviors and perceptions of possible future events.

To conceptually represent the facts of social interaction, let us conceive of the life space as consisting of the ongoing response exchange between the person and the other and the response exchanges the person perceives to be possible in the future. A response exchange is a person's ongoing response and the context in which it is being enacted, including the other's immediately preceding response. A response exchange is labeled an event. The interpersonal life space is composed of the ongoing event and all events the person perceives to be possibilities in the future of the interaction with the other. Events are the regions of the interpersonal life space. To provide a concrete link between the theoretical representation of the person's psychological situation at a given time and the person's behavior at that time, the regions (events) of the interpersonal life space are represented as interpersonal circles.

The interpersonal life space is composed of two kinds of events: the ongoing event and potential events. The ongoing event is the region of the interpersonal life space in which the person is currently located. It contains the other's immediately preceding response, the response possibilities available to the person, and the factors acting on the person to which he or she is in the process of responding. Potential events are the person's concepts of possible future response exchanges in the relationship. Potential events are regions in the
interpersonal life space that surround the ongoing event. Each potential event contains the facts of the situation as the person currently conceives they would be if he or she were located in the potential event. Thus, potential events contain the other’s immediately preceding response, the responses available to the person, and the factors acting on the person, all as the person anticipates they would be if he or she were currently located in the event.

Potential events are arranged in the interpersonal life space in terms of what the person conceives to be their connection to the ongoing event. Potential events adjacent to the ongoing event are those that the person believes are immediately accessible as a function of which response he or she chooses to enact in the ongoing event. Adjacent events are potential events that the person anticipates could be realities in the immediate future, depending on how he or she responds to the ongoing event. Potential events not adjacent to the ongoing event are those that the person conceives not to be immediately accessible from the ongoing event. These distant events are connected to the ongoing event through adjacent events. One or more potential event may lie between a distant event and the ongoing event. The potential events that lie between the ongoing event and some distant event are elements of a path through which the person believes he or she can access the distant

**Figure 27.5.** Direction and magnitude of the convergent (curved arrows) and divergent (→) influence pressures P’s dominant responses potentially arouse in O.
event from the ongoing event. Paths are one or more potential events that the person believes must be sequentially accessed to achieve some distant event.

Through his or her responses, the person transforms an adjacent event into the ongoing event. In Lewin's terms, the person's response is a form of locomotion by which the person moves from the ongoing event into an adjacent event. Because the regions in the interpersonal life space are behavioral events rather than physical locations, conceiving of the results of a person's response as transforming the event seems more suitable than moving the person. To access a distant event, the person must sequentially transform into ongoing events the potential events that lie on the path between the ongoing event and the distant event. This process is analogous to pulling on a chain. To lay my hands on some distant link, I must pull the chain toward me by grasping each successive link that lies between the link currently in hand and the desired distant link. When a person transforms a potential event into an ongoing event, that event becomes the center of the life space, and the life space is restructured around its new center. A person's response and the other's subsequent response are time units that mark the transition of the person's life space from one state to another.

Figure 27.7 presents an interpersonal life space. The center circle in Figure 27.7 is the ongoing event. The person is represented in the ongoing event with the “P” in the distrustful category, the

---

**Figure 27.6.** Direction and magnitude of the convergent (curved arrows) and divergent (→) influence pressures P's submissive responses potentially arouse in O.
Figure 27.7. An interpersonal life space.

response the person is in the process of enacting. The eight categories of the circle are the response possibilities available to the person. The other's immediately preceding response to which the person is in the process of responding is indicated by the "O" placed in the self-enhancing category. The lines drawn from the eight response possibilities available to the person connect the ongoing event to adjacent events. These are the potential events that the person believes to be immediately available for transformation into the ongoing event by his or her response. The lines connect the person's possible responses in the ongoing event to the response they are expected to generate from the other in the adjacent events. One distant event, in which the other is expected to have enacted a cooperative response, is presented in Figure 27.7. This distant event is connected to the ongoing event through an adjacent event in which the other is expected to have enacted a nurturant response. By enacting a distrustful response in the ongoing event, the person expects to embark on a path leading from the ongoing event, in which the other enacted a self-enhancing response, to a distant event, in which the other is expected to have enacted a cooperative response.

Dependence

Dependence is a psychological force. It is generated by a valence located in a response that another is expected to have enacted in a potential event. The valence is a result of the co-occurrence of two facts in the person's interpersonal life space, a need of the person and the response potentially available from the other that conveys or
controls resources related to the need. The other’s valenced response is a goal, a resource potentially available from the other. The response may be rewarding or punishing in itself, or it may control access to some other rewarding or punishing environmental feature. The strength of the valence is a function of the need and the extent to which the potential response offers satisfaction or arousal of the need. The valence generates a dependency force that acts on the person. The direction of a dependency force is a function of the location of the potential event that contains the valence relative to the ongoing event. The magnitude of the force is a function of the magnitude of the valence and the number and nature of potential events that lie on the path from the ongoing event to the potential event that contains the valence. A positive dependency force inclines the person to respond to the other in the ongoing event in a way intended to transform it into an event that contains, or is on the path to, the other’s valenced response. A negative dependency force has the opposite effect.

In Figure 27.7, the plus (+) sign in the cooperative category of the distant event indicates that the person’s goal is to receive a cooperative response from the other. The dependency force acting on the person as a function of the positive valence in the distant event inclines the person to embark on the path toward this goal. By enacting a distrustful response, the person expects to transform the ongoing event into one in which the goal is immediately accessible. The minus (−) signs in the leading and self-enhancing categories of several adjacent events indicate negative valences for receiving leading and self-enhancing responses from the other. The dependency forces acting on the person as a function of these valences incline the person to avoid transforming adjacent events that contain the negative valences into the ongoing event.

Several dependency forces are acting on the person simultaneously. The forces combine according to the principles of vector algebra into a resultant force. The direction of the resultant force determines the direction of the person’s response (toward potential events containing positive valences and away from those containing negative valences). A vector (an arrow) in the center of the ongoing event in Figure 27.7 indicates the resultant force acting on the person. The resultant force is the combined effect of the several dependency forces acting on the person. Due to the resultant force, the person is in the process of enacting a distrustful response. The person expects the distrustful response to bring the positively valenced potential event closer and avoid the negatively valenced events.

Dependency forces may have conflicting directions and thus incline the person to embark on different paths. Conflict among forces generates stress. Stress is manifest as negative affect, which is experienced as frustration, anxiety, anger, or fear. Its magnitude is the sum of the magnitudes of dependency forces that cancel one another and thus are not represented in the resultant force. Stress functions as a need. It motivates efforts to restructure the interpersonal life space. When a restructuring plan is believed to offer significant stress reduction, it becomes a goal. The psychological force the goal generates inclines the person to cognitively restructure his or her life space, a form of locomotion (Lewin, 1938). A high level of conflict among dependency forces generates high stress. High stress generates strong negative affect and persistent efforts to restructure the life space in a way that reduces conflict among forces and thus reduces stress.

Interdependence

The dependency forces acting on the other are functions of valences imparted to the person’s potential responses by their relations to the other’s needs. The other’s dependencies determine how the other will respond to the person’s behaviors and thus define the transformation values of the person’s responses. To achieve desired potential events efficiently, the person must have accurate concepts of the nature of the dependency forces acting on the other. The person’s concepts of the dependency forces acting on the other determine the person’s perceptions of the transformation values of his or her responses. These concepts define the paths the person perceives to be available to transform desired potential events into the ongoing event. Concepts of the other’s dependencies define the structure of the person’s interpersonal life space. Likewise, the other’s concepts of the nature of the person’s dependencies define the other’s perceptions of the paths to his or her goals. The person’s response in the ongoing event affects the other’s concepts of goals and the paths that lead to them, and thus influences the other’s subsequent response.
In Figure 27.7, lines connect the person’s available responses to the responses the person expects them to generate from the other. These lines reflect the person's concepts of the nature of the other's dependencies on the person. Overall, the person believes that the other wishes to receive cooperative responses (which convey admiration and accordace) or docile responses (which convey deference and compliance) from the person. This concept of the other's dependencies is reflected in the anticipation that six of the person's available responses will generate dominant responses from the other: leading (which conveys advice and suggestions), self-enhancing (which conveys certainty and self-laudation), or critical (which conveys disdain and criticism). On the other hand, the person perceives that the other is greatly concerned about being seen as fair and considerate. The person anticipates that enacting a distrustful response (which conveys disappointment and resentment) will motivate the other to enact a nurturant response (which conveys sympathy and reassurance), an effort to appear fair and considerate. The person anticipates that he or she will then be able to generate a cooperative response from the other by enacting a self-enhancing response.

The person's dependencies on the other determine the goals and thus direction of the person's behavior. The person's concepts of the other's dependencies determine the paths that lead to goals, and thus the responses the person employs in the interaction. The same is true for the other. Thus, interdependence renders the parties in a relationship responsive to each other's needs. Each is inclined to emit valenced responses (both positive and negative) to the other to influence the other to conform his or her responses to needs. Interactants' perceptions of the nature of their interdependence determine the behavioral content of their relationship.

Alternative Relationships

The magnitude of dependency forces acting on a person in a relationship is a function of (a) the strength of underlying needs, (b) the quality of the other's resources and their distance from the ongoing event and, (c) the extent to which the resources potentially available from the other are superior to those potentially available in alternative relationships. The availability of alternative relationships powerfully affects the strength of dependency forces. A lack of alternatives creates profound dependencies and, as a result, profound social influence. Young children have no alternative relationships to those with their parents. As a result, their parents have profound influence on them. The emergence of alternative relationship possibilities is an important factor in psychological development. With the emergence of alternatives, the possibility of choice of relationships emerges. With choice, how the exchange of resources is coordinated becomes more important than the quality of the resources that could be exchanged.

Perceptual and Cognitive Processes

The dependency forces acting on a person, and the paths the person sees as leading to goals, are functions of the person's cognitive construction of the relationship with the other. The person generates a construction of the relationship by observing facts about the circumstances of the relationship and the events that transpire within it and deducing the meanings of the facts. The person attends to what he or she considers to be the most important features of ongoing events. The observed facts are then processed according to rules of evidence to determine their underlying causes. Underlying causes are construed as demand properties of the situation, the dispositions of the other, or the dispositions of the self. The person's conclusions generate new or confirm or contradict previous concepts of the features of the relationship. The person's construction of the relationship is embellished with new conclusions and revised when conclusions about the meaning of events are at variance with previous concepts. What the person attends to and the attributional principles and conventions he or she applies to determine underlying causes are crucial determinants of the cognitive construction of the relationship.

The person's cognitive construction of a relationship is composed of the following concepts:

1. The demand properties of the situation, including the restraints and demands the person expects to affect conduct in the relationship.

2. The dispositions that underlie the other's behavior. They are revealed in how the other's behavior departs from what the person expects as a function of the demand properties of the situation. They include the other's personal goals for the relationship, the other's needs and capabili-
ties, and the other's interpersonal values that underlie his or her strategy for taking the person's needs into consideration. This constellation of characteristics defines the opportunity structure the person believes that the other presents for meeting the person's needs (McCall & Simmons, 1966; Swann, 1987).

3. The dispositions that underlie the person's behavior. The person reveals his or her dispositions in, as well as deduces them from, how his or her behavior departs from the demand properties of the situation. They include personal goals for the relationship, needs and capabilities, and interpersonal values which underlie strategies for taking the other's needs into consideration. This constellation of characteristics defines the opportunity structure the person believes that he or she presents to the other.

4. Opportunity structures potentially available to self and other in alternative relationships. These concepts limit the strengths of the dependency forces that are perceived to be acting on self and other in the relationship.

5. Concepts of congruencies and discrepancies between obtained and desired resources and between achieved and desired impressions in the relationship. The person immediately experiences the consequences of the other's responses in terms of needs met or aroused. These experiences may or may not conform to the person's concepts of resources available in the relationship. Discrepancies between obtained and desired resources identify variances between reality and the person's construction of the opportunity structure the other presents.

Concepts of the other's impressions of the person are derived from observations of how the other seeks to influence the person. Discrepancies between achieved and desired impressions indicate variances between the other's impressions and the opportunity structure the person intended to present to the other.

Discrepancies between obtained and desired resources and between achieved and desired impressions generate changes in the person's concepts of goals and paths in the relationship.

Sources of Change

Behavior is the relationship between stimulus and response (Kllir & Valach, 1967). Behavior change is a change in that relationship. Behavior change is a function of changes in the person's conceptions of the goals and paths available in the relationship. Change in conceptions of goals and paths is a function of changes in the person's construction of the relationship. Changes in construction of the relationship result from the following:

1. New or discrepant information about one or more concepts of the features of the relationship.
2. Cognitive restructuring of the interpersonal life space motivated by conflicts among dependency forces.
3. Alterations in (a) what the person attends to in relationships, (b) how the person processes the "facts," or (c) the information the person believes responses convey.

Changes of all three types, and especially in conceptions of the self, are most likely to occur in relationships in which the person has strong dependencies. Change is fostered when the person finds that his or her construction of the relationship does not predictably generate desired behavioral events.

Research Support for the Theory

From the perspective of interpersonal influence theory, a relationship is a dynamic and evolving social entity. Partners actively seek to conform their relationship to their needs. Through their behaviors, they construct its realities. In turn, their psychological constructions of its realities shape their behaviors. The evolving characteristics of a relationship are functions of the partners' characteristics. In turn, the evolving characteristics of the partners are functions of the relationship's characteristics. Social psychological research has accumulated a good deal of evidence that is consistent with this picture of relationships. Some of the evidence is reviewed below in terms of the reciprocal effects of social cognition and social behavior on each other.

Demand Properties of the Situation

According to the theory, people's understanding of the demand properties of the situation in which a relationship occurs affects behavior and determines baseline expectations for behavior. Characteristics of the other and of the self are deduced from how behavior deviates from these expec-
tations. McClintock and Liebrand (1988) and Gruszkos (1986) have shown that demand properties of the situation affect behavior. McClintock and Liebrand had subjects play four dyadic decision games that had different outcome matrices. They found that the differences in outcome structures, which were explained to subjects before the games began, systematically affected the subjects' choice behaviors in interactive effects with the subjects' interpersonal values and their partners' game strategies. Gruszkos (1986) varied the demand properties of the situation by assigning leader or assistant roles to subjects in an experiment similar to the Strong et al. (1988) study. These differences in demand properties generated systematic differences in how subjects responded to confederate stimulus behaviors overall and in interactive effects with the types of responses the confederates enacted.

In the classic demonstration of how the perceived demand properties of a situation affect attribution, Jones, Davis, and Gergen (1961) found that observers made correspondent inferences to account for job applicants' behaviors in selection interviews only when the applicants' self-presentations violated the expectation that applicants would present themselves as personally suited to the demands of the job. Jones et al. (1981) have shown that when people observe themselves behaving in ways that they perceive to deviate from situational demands, they change their self-concepts. Festinger and Carlsmith's (1959) original demonstration of dissonance can be construed as the same effect. The subjects' protestation of enjoyment of an experimental task that was clearly boring, without some clear situational demand that could justify their behavior, led to self-concept change (Bem, 1974; Tedeschi, Schlenker, & Bonoma, 1971).

**Dispositions of the Other**

According to the theory, people's construction of the other's dispositions affects their behavior. McClintock and Liebrand (1988) systematically varied how the other responded to subjects in the decision games. They found that, as the games progressed, subjects increasingly and systematically varied their choices in accord with the dispositional implications of the others' choices. Strong et al. (1988) analyzed the relations among confederate and subject responses in two time periods corresponding to the women's work on two pictures. They found that changes over time in the relations among responses varied systematically by condition. As shown by the personality measures, each response style generated distinct conceptions of the confederates' characteristics. These conceptions emerged as subjects gained experience with the confederates. The systematic behavior changes in time reflected the emerging conceptions. Similarly, Swann and Ely (1984) found that the questions subjects asked of another were initially a function of prior information they had about the other, but changed over time as the information the other provided contradicted the dispositional implications of the prior information.

The impression a person believes another has formed about the person's characteristics is an aspect of the person's conception of the other. Baumeister and Jones (1978) found that subjects' initial presentations of self to another systematically varied as a function of the impressions subjects believed their partners had about them. Swann's research, described below, also demonstrates the effects of behavior of conceptions of the other's impressions of one's characteristics.

**Dispositions of the Self**

According to the theory, people's constructions of their dispositions affect their behavior. McClintock and Liebrand (1988) selected groups of subjects on the basis of personal values for cooperation, competition, or individualism in relationships. They found that the self-concepts systematically affected subjects' choices in the games. In a post hoc analysis of subjects' self-ratings of dominance and affiliation in the Strong et al. (1988) study, Strong (in press) found that these self-concepts systematically affected how subjects responded in the various conditions. Swann and his colleagues (Swann, 1987; Swann & Ely, 1984; Swann & Hill, 1982) have shown that responses to feedback from another about the other's impressions of the person are largely a function of the correspondence of the feedback to the person's self-concept. When feedback was inconsistent with self-concept, Swann's subjects behaved in ways that contradicted the feedback and affirmed the self.

**Discrepancy, Dependency, and Change in Self-Concept**

The theory proposes that change in construction of a relationship is a function of discrepant information, and that change in the self-concept component of that construction is most likely
when the person has strong dependencies in the relationship. Swann's (1987) research on identity negotiation in relationships has shown that feedback that is discrepant from a person's self-concept results in changes in self-concept only when the person is uncertain of his or her views and the other is certain of his or her feedback (Swann & Ely, 1984), or when the subject's intimate other agrees with the feedback (Swann & Predmore, 1985). Otherwise, discrepancy leads to conceptions of the other as a source of inaccurate information.

The effect of the strength of dependencies on how discrepancies are resolved is suggested in laboratory studies in which subjects are led to believe that they have no alternative but to continue a relationship with a specific other. According to the theory, perceptions of the availability of alternative relationships affect the strength of dependency forces acting on the person. In such studies (Kiesler, Zanna, & DeSalvo, 1966; Pellak & Heller, 1971; Wolf, 1979), subjects who believed that they must continue relationships with disagreeable others ingratiated the others with opinion conformity more than did subjects who did not anticipate subsequent contact. Similar effects of anticipated future contact have been found on interpersonal behavior (Gergen & Wishnow, 1965) and accounts for group failures and successes (Forsyth, Berger, & Mitchell, 1981; Norvell & Forsyth, 1984). Field studies of committed couples have found that the level of commitment and the presence of children, both of which suggest the degree to which alternative relationships are psychologically available, are systematically related to self-reports of behavior in the relationships (Howard et al., 1986).

Voluntary clients enter therapy because of stress. Their current understandings of the features of important relationships are generating high levels of conflict among the dependency forces acting on them. Their current behaviors serve their strongest needs but frustrate other important needs. They turn to therapists in the hope of receiving help in cognitively restructuring problematic interpersonal life spaces in ways that reduce the stress they are experiencing. Relationships with therapists are sought because they are socially sanctioned as legitimate sources of expert help on interpersonal problems. Clients will maintain the relationships as long as they continue to experience high stress and perceive the relationships to offer some hope of receiving help. They give therapists the ability to influence them as long as they perceive that doing so is to their ultimate benefit.

Clients expect therapists to offer opportunity structures that contain (a) an overall goal of aiding them with their problems; (b) a need to be seen as competent, trustworthy, and likeable; (c) resources of acceptance, reassurance, help, encouragement, suggestions, confidence, ideas, and advice; and (d) a dedication to their ultimate welfare. The resources clients anticipate to be available from therapists define the avenues initially open to therapists to influence them. As clients' trust and confidence in their therapists as sources of help grow, a greater range of resources becomes available to therapists to influence them. Therapists expect clients to offer opportunity structures that contain (a) a goal of restructuring one or more interpersonal life spaces; (b) stress from conflicts among forces, a need to be seen as people of worth and integrity, and needs to protect themselves from dangerous interpersonal events; (c) resources of acceptance, accordace, and capabilities; and (d) an inclination to be somewhat considerate of the therapists' needs in the situation.

Therapists' notions about the resources available from clients are drawn from models of mental health. Anticipated client resources are goals in the distant events that therapists seek to generate in therapy. Models of psychological health champion flexible interpersonal functioning and emphasize resources conveyed in leading, nurturant, and cooperative responses. Therapists believe that clients are capable of such functioning even if there is little evidence to support this belief in initial ongoing events. At first, therapists do not know the paths to desired potential events. As a
result, they seek to gain information about the opportunity structures clients present, a strategy they carry out by enacting nurturant and leading responses to whatever responses clients enact (Friedlander, Siegel, & Brenock, 1989). As therapists deduce paths that may lead to their goals, their behavior becomes more variable.

Therapists' single-minded dedication to achieving distant therapeutic goals is crucial to the success of therapy. If therapists allow clients' responses to generate reactions not directed at these goals, the objectives of therapy are not likely to be achieved. Therapists must not allow themselves to be influenced to respond nontherapeutically by responses that convey opinions, advice, self-absorption, commands, anger, criticism, resentment, skepticism, helplessness, acquiescence, admiration, accord, or sympathy. Personal (non-therapeutic) responsiveness to such resources will confirm rather than contradict clients' concepts of the features of relationships, and thus will diminish rather than enhance the possibility of achieving the objective of therapy (Kell & Mueller, 1966).

Typically, clients manifest rigid, inflexible, and stodgy behavior patterns. Dynamically, these repetitive patterns are the behavioral effects of powerful negative valences located in potential responses from others. The stress clients are experiencing usually is a function of conflict among forces generated by the strong negative valences and weaker positive valences. The powerful negative valences are the result of clients' constructions of the meaning of some painful past and/or current experiences. In these experiences, clients have found that being seen by another as asserting the possession of certain resources has disastrous consequences, such as depreciation, rejection, abandonment, abuse, exploitation, bitterness, or martyrdom. Clients studiously avoid enacting responses that are anticipated to lead to these consequences. The inflexible behavior patterns in ongoing events represent attempts to avoid transforming dangerous potential events into the ongoing event.

Therapists' strategy for aiding clients to cognitively restructure problematic interpersonal life spaces includes the following:

1. Encourage clients to enact in therapy the inflexible and rigid behavior patterns associated with the conflict among forces in problematic relationships. This task must be carried out in a way that fosters trust and belief in the therapists' usefulness.

2. Deduce from the symptom pattern (a) the impressions clients are striving to create, (b) the impressions clients are striving to avoid creating, (c) the responses from others that are negatively valenced, (d) the responses from others that are positively valenced but are not being sought due to the effects of the negative valences, and (e) the cognitive concepts that are generating the valences.

3. Enact responses that convey information that is inconsistent with the concepts generating the valences. This task must be carried out in a way that (a) maintains clients' participation in therapy, (b) decreases the strength of negative valences, and (c) increases the strength of positive valences.

4. Aid clients in the task of extending and integrating new or altered concepts and resulting behavior patterns into problematic relationships.

Encouraging Symptomatic Behavior

Clients enter therapy expecting to describe their problems and receive insight into how they can be solved. Clients expect therapists to show interest in their difficulties and to help them focus on the most important features of the problems. They also are concerned that therapists view them in a positive and sympathetic light. They are reluctant to reveal actions and thoughts that they believe are morally unacceptable and are inclined to present their problems as due to others' inequitable and egotistical dispositions and actions or to personal dispositions over which they have little voluntary control.

Clients' self-presentations intended to secure positive and sympathetic hearings from therapists are driven by the same motivational factors that underlie their behaviors in problematic relationships. Therapist responses that convey receptiveness, acceptance, sympathy, and comfort encourage clients to enact the symptom pattern in therapy. These responses also encourage trust and kindle hope that the therapist may prove useful.

Therapists direct clients' disclosures to the most important features of problems by focusing on and responding to indications of negative affect. Stress generates negative affect, such as fear, anger, anxiety, and frustration. Responses with affectively negative components identify circum-
stances in which the underlying motivational structure contains conflicting forces. Empathic responses to the affectively negative components of responses direct clients' disclosures to the circumstances that are generating stress. Clients' reactions to their therapists' interest in the affective components of responses, both in terms of responses enacted and responses studiously avoided, are the basic facts from which therapists deduce the nature of the forces acting on clients, the concepts that are generating them, and the paths to therapeutic goals.

**Diagnosis**

The first step in deducing the causes of symptoms is to identify the impressions clients are striving to achieve in therapy. The responses clients enact are attempts to convey these impressions. Therapists note the impressions they are forming of clients and note how they are inclined to respond to clients. The most frequent impressions clients attempt to generate are those of being victims of unscrupulous others, martyrdom, helplessness, and dependence (Strong, 1986). These impressions are conveyed by distrustful and self-effacing responses. They generate inclinations in therapists to sympathize, reassure, and advise (nurturant and leading responses) and to show irritation, impatience, self-assertion, and self-laudation (critical and self-enhancing responses).

Psychological forces combine according to the principles of vector algebra. Therefore, strident efforts to generate a particular impression suggest that the impression being avoided is conveyed by responses located in the category opposite the enacted responses in the interpersonal circle. When clients enact self-effacing and distrustful responses, they maximally avoid impressions conveyed by leading and nurturant responses (see Figure 27.2).

Conflicting negative and positive valences are located in potential responses likely to be encouraged by the avoided impression. Leading and nurturant responses are most likely to generate self-enhancing and critical responses from others who are competitive or dissatisfied in the relationship and cooperative and docile responses from others who are affiliative or satisfied (Nutall, Strong, & McIlag hart, 1988; Strong, in press). This suggests that the stress probably is a function of negative valences located in others' potential self-enhancing and critical responses and positive valences located in other's potentially cooperative and docile responses. The enactment of distrustful and self-effacing responses probably reflects convictions (based on painful experiences) that enacting leading and nurturant responses will lead to exploitation, disregard, or worse yet, rejection and abandonment.

The valences generating the conflicting forces stem from concepts of the features of relationships, such as the attributes of others and the self. The strength of the negative valences in others' potential self-enhancing and critical responses suggest that clients believe that self-absorption, criticism, and rejection from others are likely to occur and would be disastrous. On the other hand, the weaker positive valences located in potential cooperative and docile responses suggest that clients believe that the resources they have to convey in leading and nurturant responses are of little value to others. Such beliefs could stem from a number of concepts including (a) others are pernicious, dangerous, and egocentric, (b) I do not have dominant resources of much value to others, (c) others have resources superior to mine and, (d) I do not have good alternative relationships while others do.

**Generating Change**

The identification of concepts that may be generating the valences that underlie stress allows therapists to formulate and implement plans of how to foster changes in concepts. Change is stimulated by conveying information that (a) contradicts the impressions and behavioral effects clients expect their responses to generate and (b) implies how interpersonal concepts should be changed. One of many methods to foster changes is to enact cooperative responses that positively reframe symptomatic behaviors (i.e., paradoxical reframing; Strong, 1984, 1987a, 1987b; Swann, Pelham, & Chidester, 1988). These cooperative responses convey admiration and trust. They assert that symptomatic behaviors are motivated by desires to be responsible and to serve others through self-sacrificing acts. The responses convey highly discrepant information to clients. When clients enact self-effacing and distrustful responses, they intend to appear helpless and victimized and to solicit help. They are dismayed to learn that they conveyed impressions of responsibility and altruism and solicited admiration.
The cooperative responses imply that clients have valuable dominant resources to impart to others and altruistic motives to use them to benefit others. The responses assert that clients have achieved the impression they most feared to convey. But their therapist's response to the impression is admiration and trust, not the expected criticism and rejection. The responses imply that clients are attractive potential partners to others and thus that they have good alternatives to current relationships. In terms of the forces that underlie clients' symptomatic behaviors, the responses convey information that simultaneously attacks the concepts that are generating the predominant negative valences and reinforces the concepts that are generating the weaker positive valences. Because of clients' needs to be seen as people of worth and integrity, they are inclined to accept the implications of the responses, but only after strenuous efforts to test therapists' sincerity and confidence in their assertions.

Extending Change

Initial acceptance of the positive reframe of symptoms initiates a process of aiding clients' efforts to integrate its meaning into cognitive constructions of relationships and to enact responses that reflect its meaning in problematic relationships. This process may take considerable effort. Partners in problematic relationships seldom appreciate changes in clients' behaviors and often strive to influence them to return to the more predictable and familiar patterns. Therapists become their clients' coaches on how to encourage partners to change. Therapists become sources of encouragement and admiration for the clients' hard work. When clients master the interpersonal skills necessary to conform important relationships to their new concepts and when they achieve stability in them, they no longer need their therapists. The therapeutic relationship dissolves.

From the perspective of interpersonal influence theory, clients carry primary responsibility for the therapeutic relationship. Clients seek out the professional services of therapists in the responsible pursuit of solutions to interpersonal problems and accompanying personal distress. Clients decide at all points in the process whether the relationship is to be continued. Clients decide how much influence to allow therapists to exert on their thinking and acting. Clients are continually engaged in conforming personal relationships to their needs before, during, and after therapy. The therapist's job is to assist clients to become more effective in these life-defining efforts.

Research on Change Processes in Therapeutic Relationships

Therapists pursue the job of enhancing clients' interpersonal effectiveness by guiding the therapeutic relationship through three developmental stages: (a) developing trust, (b) stimulating change, and (c) extending change. Distinctive patterns of interaction between therapist and client mark these developmental stages in successful therapeutic relationships (Strong & Claiborn, 1982; Tracey, 1985; Tracey & Ray, 1984). Research in counseling and clinical psychology has focused on some aspects of the processes of each stage. Some of this research, and needs for further research, are noted below.

Developing Trust

The therapist's objectives in the first stage of therapy are to increase the client's trust and confidence in the therapist, identify the relationship aspects generating stress, and diagnose the dynamics underlying interpersonal problems. Carl Rogers and his colleagues (Rogers & Dymond, 1954; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, & Truax, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967) have shown that therapist enactment of nurturant responses that express empathy, unconditional regard, and nonpossessive warmth accomplishes the first two objectives of the first stage. These responses facilitate the client's depth of experiencing (expression of emotionally laden material through self-effacing, distrustful, and critical responses). The therapist's nurturant responses reassure the client of the therapist's positive regard for and understanding of him or her, and thus encourage the client to accept influence from the therapist. By focusing on stress-induced negative affect, empathic responses direct the client's attention to the issues creating problems in his or her relationships. Rogers and his colleagues have documented that, with continued assistance of this kind, clients can sort out many of their problems. This approach is a sufficient, though not an efficient, method of helping clients change (Rogers, 1957).

The least developed aspect of the first stage is diagnosis. Virtually no research has addressed how symptoms (rigid response patterns and emo-
tional manifestations of stress) relate to the underlying dynamics identified in interpersonal influence theory.

Stimulating Change

The objective of the second stage of therapy is to stimulate change in the client's symptomatic behavior and in the dynamics that underlie it. The therapist accomplishes this objective by presenting information to the client that is discrepant with the client's concept of the therapeutic relationship. A large body of research has accumulated that addresses this process (Garfield & Bergin, 1986). However, surprisingly little systematic knowledge has emerged from the vast effort that has been expended. The paucity of attention to the development of adequate theories of change in relationships has greatly hampered research on, and the accumulation of systematic knowledge about, this process (Forsyth & Strong, 1986).

Interpersonal influence theory is an attempt to identify key aspects of the change process in therapeutic relationships. Systematic and theory-driven research on its concepts is needed, research that uses experimental methodologies such as those Ascher, Strong, and their colleagues have introduced (Ascher, 1981; Ascher & Turner, 1980; Beck & Strong, 1982; Feldman, Strong, & Danser, 1982; Strong, Wambach, Lopez, & Cooper, 1979), and controlled methods of field investigation such as Heppner and Claiborn (1989) have proposed. Crucial to the success of such efforts is a theoretically meaningful method of categorizing therapist and client responses. The Interpersonal Communication Rating Scale (Strong, Hills, & Nelson, 1988) was developed for this purpose.

Extending Change

The objective of the third stage of therapy is to extend the changes stimulated in therapy into the client's ongoing relationships. As Swann (1987) has noted, if changes generated in therapy are to survive, clients must implement them in ongoing relationships. The task is not easy. Partners usually act to counter and eliminate the changes. This fact probably accounts for Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles' (1973) finding that changes stimulated in group therapy survived best when the groups actively focused attention on extending changes into ongoing relationships. The growing popularity of family therapy is due largely to the growing recognition that therapeutic change must be supported by changes in clients' personal relationships. Little if any research has addressed how therapists equip and support clients to accomplish this crucial task.
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