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This article discusses the development of an instrument for assessing interpersonal schemas called the Interpersonal Schema Questionnaire (ISQ). The ISQ is based on Kiesler's 1982 Interpersonal Circle and appears to be a fairly valid representation of the circumplex ordering of interpersonal behavior. The questionnaire requires individuals to imagine themselves exhibiting certain interpersonal behaviors and then to anticipate how various significant others would respond. Anticipated responses are coded on three indices: Desirability, Affiliation, and Control (the latter two representing the two major axes of the circumplex). The Desirability and Affiliation indices showed good internal consistency and test-retest reliability, as well as significant correlations with the Symptom Checklist-90 and the Beck Depression Inventory. The Control index showed lower levels of reliability, but may provide useful information regarding the interpersonal schemas of specific individuals and populations.

The internal representation of the interpersonal world has been a central theme in clinical theory dating back to the early days of psychoanalysis (e.g. Freud, 1917; Abraham, 1924). This topic, typically dealt with under the rubric of internalization, has been the focus of considerable speculation, and various theories have been advanced regarding the nature of the psychological processes involved and the impact that they have on normal and abnormal development. Over the years, as mainstream psychoanalytic theory has evolved in an interpersonal direction (cf. Eagle, 1984; Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983) there has been a growing
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interest in understanding the way in which the relationship between self and others is represented rather than focusing on the self or other in isolation. This trend is reflected in the tendency of contemporary object relations theorists to speak about the "representation of internalized object relations" rather than the "representation of internal objects." It is also captured in Bowlby's (1969) concept of the "working model of attachment relationships," and more recently in Stern's (1995) notion that children learn to predict interactions with others by developing what he calls RIGs (Representations of Interactions that Have been Generalized).

In contrast to this trend, research by mainstream social cognition researchers has, for the most part, focused on the cognitive representation of either the self or the other in isolation (for reviews of the social cognition literature, see Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Markus & Zajonc, 1985; Sherman, Judd, & Park, 1989). Recently, a number of theorists have argued for the importance of expanding research on self and other schemas in a more interpersonal direction (Baldwin, 1992; Horowitz, 1991; Safran, Segal, Hill, & Whiffen, 1990). To this end, Safran (1986; 1990a) has advanced the notion of the interpersonal schema. An interpersonal schema is conceptualized as a generalized representation of self-other relationships. The interpersonal schema is initially abstracted on the basis of interactions with attachment figures, permitting the individual to predict interactions in a way that increases the probability of maintaining relatedness with these figures (see Baldwin, 1992 for a review of related concepts). In theory, an interpersonal schema contains information of the form: "if I do x, others will do y" (e.g. "if I am angry, others will retaliate," or "if I am vulnerable others will abandon me").

At the present time there are a number of clinical rater based procedures that permit the researcher to develop reliable formulations of core interpersonal themes associated with a person's interpersonal schema (e.g. Horowitz, 1989; Luborsky & Crits-Christoph, 1989). While these approaches have proved useful for certain research purposes, they are time consuming to implement, and do not lend themselves easily to quantification. From a research perspective it would be useful to have a self report instrument that is relatively easy to administer, can capture the content of subjects' interpersonal schemas, and is more nomothetic in nature. In what follows, we will outline the development of such a method.

We began with the idea of generating a series of interpersonal scenarios with significant others that would allow for the assessment of subjects' generalized expectations of self-other interactions, and the inference of the rules and strategies employed in these interactions. Although ideally subjects would generate their own scenarios relevant
to their own experiences, for purposes of comparison we felt it necessary to impose some constraint on the nature of the interpersonal interactions. In an attempt to systematically sample the domain of interpersonal behaviors we turned to the circumplex as a model of the universe of potential behaviors.

The circumplex model of interpersonal behavior is a well-investigated, theory based model that lends itself well to research (Fo¨a, 1961; Kiesler, 1983; Wiggins, 1979; Wiggins & Broughton, 1985; Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1981). Since Leary's (1957) publication of Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality the circumplex has undergone various revisions; we have chosen the 1982 Interpersonal Circle (Kiesler, 1983) as most appropriate for our purposes (see Figure 1). The reason for choosing this model is that Kiesler has developed systematic and extensive descriptions of each of the sixteen segments of the circle. Thus we were able to adhere closely to the terminology of this circumplex in developing the Interpersonal Schema Questionnaire (ISQ).

In the 1982 Interpersonal Circle the vertical axis is called the Control axis, and is represented by dominant interpersonal behavior at the top of the axis, and the opposite (submissive) behavior at the bottom of the axis. The horizontal axis is called the Affiliation axis, with hostile behavior to the left and the opposite (friendly) behavior to the right. There are eight axes with opposite behaviors at the ends of the poles, creating 16 segments. "Each of the 16 segments is a blend of the two axis dimensions reflecting mathematically weighted combinations of Control (-4 through
to +4) and Affiliation (-4 through 0 to +4)” (Kiesler, 1983, p. 186). These two axes, are, in a sense, the anchors of the circumplex, based on research that “convincingly demonstrates that interpersonal behavior represents the joint expression of these two underlying dimensions” (Kiesler, 1983, p. 186).

One feature of the circumplex is that it allows for a prediction of behaviors in interpersonal interactions, based on the theory of complementarity (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957). Affiliative interpersonal behaviors are considered complementary when they are corresponding (i.e. friendly behavior is complementary to friendly behavior) and behavior on the Control index is complementary when it is reciprocal (i.e. submissive behavior is complementary to dominant behavior). The arrows in Figure 1 indicate which behaviors are considered complementary with each other.

The ISQ consists of 16 scenarios based on the 16 segments of the 1982 Interpersonal Circle. For each scenario the subjects are asked to imagine themselves behaving in a way that matches the behavior description from the circumplex (see Appendix 1). So, for example, for the segment labeled “friendly” subjects are asked to “Imagine yourself being friendly and helpful with ____.” Subjects are to fill in the blank with the name of a significant other, according to instructions.

Following this, subjects are asked how they think the significant other would respond to their behavior. They are asked to choose from among eight responses, which are derived from the octant version of the interpersonal circle (the octant version is formed by collapsing together adjacent segments of the circle). While use of octants means perfect complements to the situations are not possible, this version was employed because subjects had found the full sixteen segment version of the circle unwieldy in pilot research. Finally, subjects are asked to rate the desirability of the expected response.

Because the ISQ can provide both global quantitative information that can be used in group comparisons, as well as finely detailed descriptive information regarding an individual’s interpersonal expectations, it should prove to be useful in a number of contexts. First, it could be used to test hypotheses about specific differences that would be expected on theoretical grounds in the interpersonal schemas of different clinical groups. Second, it allows for discovery oriented research regarding the type of interpersonal schema that may be associated with particular personality styles. Third, it could provide a fairly detailed description of the type of interpersonal schema associated with a particular person, as well as changes in the schema over time.

The present study is limited to three objectives. The first of these is to assess the validity of the ISQ as a representation of the 1982 Interpersonal
Circle and the inherent properties of the circumplex. The second is to test the reliability of three indices that can be derived from the ISQ. The third objective is to assess the ability of the ISQ to discriminate groups on clinical measures.

**METHOD**

**SUBJECTS**

University students enrolled in lower level psychology and social science classes served as the subjects. The psychology students \( n = 204 \) received course credit for their participation, while the social science students \( n = 140 \) were volunteers. There were a total of 344 subjects: 228 women, and 116 men. Subjects ranged in age from 17 to 60, with a mean age of 22. Not all subjects completed all measures; numbers used in the various analyses are reported in the tables.

**MATERIALS**

*Interpersonal Schema Questionnaire (ISQ).* The 16 situations and 8 responses of the ISQ are listed in Appendix 1. Subjects responded to the situations with three significant others. First, subjects were to imagine themselves in interaction with their mother (or mother figure), then with their father (or father figure), then with a "friend" (romantic partner or close friend). In each situation they were asked how their significant other would be likely to respond, and to rate the desirability of this response (on a scale of 1 to 7).

The 16 situations on the ISQ correspond to the 16 poles on the 1982 Circle (Kiesler, 1983). For responses, adjacent poles were combined to create eight choices. There are four Situation subscales on the ISQ (which serve as repeated measures) representing Dominant, Friendly, Submissive, and Hostile situations. Each subscale includes the pole from the 1982 Circle with the same label, and the adjacent response to the left and right.

There are three response indices: Control, Affiliation, and Desirability. The first two indices represent, respectively, the vertical and horizontal axes of the circumplex. Each response is recoded (see Appendix 2) to reflect the amount of Control by assigning positive scores for responses at or near the top of the circumplex (representing dominance), negative scores for responses at or near the bottom of the circumplex (representing more submissive responses) and scores at or near zero for responses that are more orthogonal to the Control axis (the Affiliation responses). The Affiliation index uses the same coding system, except it uses essentially,
turned on its side, so that positive scores represent responses near the friendly pole of the circumplex, and negative scores represent responses near the hostile pole of the circumplex. The Desirability index simply uses the scores subjects give when asked to rate the desirability of each response.

**Symptom Check List 90 (SCL-90).** The SCL-90 (Derogatis, 1983) is a wide ranging list of 90 symptoms. Subjects indicate whether they have experienced these symptoms over the last month, and if so, rate the severity of the symptom on a scale of 1 to 4. The SCL score used for this study was the Global Severity Index (GSI).

**Beck Depression Inventory (BDI).** The BDI (Beck, 1978; Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979) is a list of 21 symptoms commonly experienced by depressed people. Subjects rate whether they experience the symptoms on a scale of 0 to 3.

**PROCEDURE**

Subjects were given the questionnaires in their classrooms, along with a brief description of the study, and the investigator returned one to two weeks later to retrieve the questionnaires. On the back of some of the questionnaires was included a form that subjects could complete if they wished to earn further credit. Subjects who completed this form filled out a second ISQ in a laboratory approximately four weeks later.

**RESULTS**

No analyses involving sex of subject were significant.

**VALIDITY OF THE ISQ IN RELATION TO THE CIRCUMPLEX**

The validity of the ISQ in relation to Kiesler's circumplex model of interpersonal behavior was assessed in the following way. First, the assumption that the Control and Affiliation vectors are orthogonal to one another was tested by correlating subjects' scores on these two indices. The resulting correlation coefficient was .07, indicating no relationship between Control and Affiliation.

Second, the assumption of complementarity was examined through tabulating the frequencies of each response in each situation (see Table 1, which presents the data for expected responses from Mother; the patterns of results with Father and Friend were similar). The observed frequencies were compared with expected frequencies calculated by averaging the total number of each response across the 16 situations.
TABLE 1. Frequency of Each Response in Each Situation With Mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>P-A</th>
<th>B-C</th>
<th>D-E</th>
<th>F-G</th>
<th>H-I</th>
<th>J-K</th>
<th>L-M</th>
<th>N-O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 457 484 325 450 606 630 1197 971

"Chance": 29 30 20 28 38 39 75 61

Chi-square: 675 362 517 329 186 444 1286 399

Notes. Critical value for chi-square at alpha = .005 is 32.8. Situations and Responses are represented by their letters on the circumplex; see Figure 1 for corresponding segment descriptions. Intersections of complementary Situations-Responses are underlined. (N = 320).

Chi-square tests showed a significant difference between the expected and observed frequencies for all eight responses.

Inspection of Table 1 shows that in all cases, responses occurred with a greater frequency than would be expected by chance in complementary situations. In six cases the highest response frequency occurred in a complementary situation, while for responses B-C and H-I the highest response frequency was within two segments of the complementary situation.

Figure 2 displays the scores for the three indices in the four subscales for expected interactions with Mother. A clear pattern of complementarity can be seen for the Affiliation index, with high scores (representing the expectation of friendly responses) in Friendly situations, negative scores (representing the expectation of more hostile responses) in Hostile situations, and scores near to zero in Dominant and Submissive situations (representing the expectation of somewhat friendly responses). For the Control index there is a similar, but much weaker pattern of complementarity, with the
FIGURE 2. Scores on the Control, Affiliation, and Desirability indices within Situation subscales in expected interactions with Mother. Note that scores for Control and Affiliation (which must be read down the left side) could theoretically range from +14 (if only response 1 or only response 7, respectively, were endorsed) to -14 (if only response 5, or only response 3, respectively, were endorsed). Scores for the Desirability Index (which must be read down the right side) could range from 1 to 7 (averaged over the sixteen situations).

highest expectation of dominant responses in Submissive situations, and the highest expectation of submissive responses in Dominant situations. The Desirability ratings are highly correlated with the Affiliation index \( r = .71 \), but not with the Control index \( r = -.07 \).

RELIABILITY OF THE ISQ

Internal consistency of the three indices was calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. Including all 48 items in the analysis, the reliability coefficients were as follows: for the Control index, .62; for the Affiliation index, .81, and for the Desirability Index, .90. Thus, the Affiliation and Desirability indices appear to be internally consistent scales, while the Control index does not.

Thirty-four subjects completed a second ISQ. The test-retest correlation coefficients were .44 for the Control index, .88 for the Affiliation index, and .87 for the Desirability index. Again, the figures are high for the Affiliation and Desirability indices, but not for the control index.
**TABLE 2. Correlations of the Three ISQ Indices with SCL and BDI Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCL&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>BDI&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>SCL&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Situations: .02 .07 -.28* -.27 -.40* -.37**

<sup>a</sup> n = 215  
<sup>b</sup> n = 62  
*p < .001 two-tailed  
**p < .025 two-tailed

**SYMPTOMATOLOGY AND DEPRESSION**

Table 2 shows the correlations of the three ISQ indices with SCL and BDI scores. The index that correlates most strongly with both SCL and BDI is Desirability, indicating that people with lower general symptomatology and/or lower depression scores rate the expected responses of others as more desirable than those with higher scores. There is a similar, though weaker, overall trend with Affiliation scores. While the correlations between BDI and Affiliation are not significant, they follow a similar pattern to the SCL-90 scores, and it is important to note that this was a small and fairly non-depressed sample (of the 62 subjects, only 7 had a BDI score of 17 or greater).

For the Control index there is no correlation with SCL scores, and no overall correlation with BDI scores. However, there are significant correlations within two subscales, such that subjects scoring higher on the depression scale score higher on expectations of dominant responses, within Dominant situations, and higher on expectations of submissive responses in Submissive situations.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of this study suggest that the ISQ is a reasonable representation of the circumplex model proposed by Kiesler (1983). The indices of Affiliation and Control appear to be orthogonal, indicating that, for instance, knowledge of whether a person tends to expect dominant or submissive responses from significant others does not predict whether they tend to expect friendly or hostile responses. A fairly clear pattern of complementarity also emerged from the data.

Given the notion of interpersonal behavior as an "invitation" or "pull"
for the other person to behave in a complementary fashion, and the assumption that a complementary interaction is a satisfying one (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957) one would expect the Desirability of expected responses to correspond with their complementarity. This was not the case; in fact, Desirability correlated strongly with Affiliation scores, suggesting that regardless of the interpersonal behavior displayed by an individual, the most desired response is generally a friendly one. This may be an important factor to consider in future research on complementarity.

It might also be interesting to assess the frequency with which subjects perceive themselves behaving at each pole of the circumplex; perhaps complementarity is influenced by familiarity with particular interpersonal styles. This is a question raised by Orford (1986) in his review of the complementarity research literature. Because the ISQ samples a wide domain of interpersonal behaviors, with a number of interactants, it may prove useful in addressing some of the questions regarding complementarity. Depending on the research objectives, there are various methods of analyzing data from the ISQ. For instance, comparisons could be made between groups on all eight responses, in various combinations of the 16 situations. Comparisons could also be made across significant others, or in terms of the genders of the various interactants. Responses can be scored for their loading on other poles of the circumplex beside: Control or Affiliation, and responses can also be scored for complementarity.

For the purposes of this study, we chose to focus on indices representing the two major poles of the circumplex (Control and Affiliation), as well as examining the Desirability index. For both the Affiliation and Desirability indices, internal consistency and test-retest correlation coefficients were reasonably high. For the Control index, both of these coefficients were unacceptably low. However, upon reflection, it seems that consistency on the Control index might actually be indicative of psychological problems. Common sense indicates that a psychologically healthy individual would likely expect fairly consistently Friendly responses from significant others, but the individual who expected consistently Dominant or consistently Submissive responses would probably have some interpersonal difficulties. Thus, consistency on the Control index might be expected only for certain populations. Unfortunately, this study did not include a large enough sample of depressed individuals (for whom the Control index may be quite meaningful) to assess consistency.

The results of the analyses correlating symptomatology (as measured by the SCL-90) and depression (as measured by the BDI) with the three indices give an indication of how the ISQ can be used in discerning the nature of problematic interpersonal schemas. The negative correlations
between SCL-90 scores and Desirability and between BDI scores and Desirability are consistent with the hypothesis derived from interpersonal theory that psychologically healthy individuals are more likely to have interpersonal schemas anticipating positive responses from others, while people with psychological problems are more likely to have interpersonal schemas predicting negative responses from others (Safran, 1990a; Safran & Segal, 1990).

On the Affiliation index, the negative correlations suggest that the more symptomatic or depressed a person rates him/herself, the less likely he/she is to expect friendly responses from significant others. On the Control index, there is no overall correlation with either SCL-90 or BDI scores. However, within the Dominant and Submissive subscales the correlations with BDI scores suggest the expectation of anticomplementary responses. In other words, depressed individuals seem to be more likely than non-depressed individuals to expect dominant responses when they behave in a dominant fashion, and submissive responses when they behave submissively. This suggests an interpersonal schema in which neither attempts to dominate interpersonal situations, nor attempts to elicit dominant responses are successful. One might hypothesize that this pattern would be associated with both experiences of interpersonal impotence and with the anticipation of abandonment in the face of interpersonal need. For example, imagine the way it would feel to receive response H (unassured, submissive) to situation H. "Imagine not feeling very confident or sure of yourself, and feeling dependent on your mother."

To understand more fully the nature of interpersonal schemas, it would be necessary to examine more closely the particular responses individuals expect in reaction to their various behaviors. The data presented here are preliminary in nature, and meant to demonstrate the general utility of the ISQ. The SCL-90 covers a broad range of symptoms, and high scorers undoubtedly represent a range of problematic interpersonal schemas. The sample of depressed subjects was very small, but points in some interesting directions for future research.

One advantage of the ISQ is that it is equally well suited to simple and easily presented research utilizing such indices as Control, Affiliation, and Desirability, and to more complex endeavors assessing such factors as relationship of interactant, complementarity, and the particular content of interpersonal schemas in various situations. Future research might, for example, examine differences in expectations of the eight responses in various homogenous groups of subjects (such as axis II diagnoses).

The ISQ may also prove useful in assessment for psychotherapy, and in measuring change resulting from therapy. From an interpersonal
perspective (Safran, 1990b) patterns of interactions which have been useful in maintaining relatedness with attachment figures may be repeated inappropriately in other relationships, including the therapeutic relationship. These problematic interpersonal schemas could be assessed via responses to the ISQ, and the generalizability and stability of therapeutic changes could also be monitored.

In summary, the ISQ is a flexible instrument, with a wide range of research and clinical potential. It appears that reliable and valid indices can be derived from it, although additional research is needed to verify its utility in illuminating the internal representation of the interpersonal world. The advantage of the ISQ for this type of research is that it samples a theoretically guided domain of interpersonal interactions and offers a fairly detailed and differentiated window into the particulars of an individual's interpersonal schema, while maintaining the benefits of a nomothetic instrument.
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**APPENDIX 1: SITUATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE ISQ**

**SITUATIONS** (letters correspond to the letters on the 1982 Interpersonal Circle—see Figure 1)

A Imagine that you and ___ are collaborating on something. You have more knowledge and expertise in this area than ______, so you take the lead in making decisions.

B Imagine yourself feeling angry and argumentative towards ___.

I Imagine yourself feeling weak or passive and wanting ____ to take the lead.

M Imagine yourself being friendly and helpful with ___.

B Imagine yourself in a game (tennis, scrabble, etc.) with ___. You act very competitive and work hard to win the game.

F Imagine yourself being preoccupied with your own thoughts, and detached with ___.

J Imagine yourself in an unmotivated or lazy mood, where you feel like just going along with whatever ___ is doing.

N Imagine yourself expressing genuine interest and concern for ___.

C Imagine a situation where you feel ___ has disappointed you.

G Imagine yourself in a serious mood, where you are reserved and not sociable with ___.

K Imagine yourself confiding in ____ something that is important to you.
Imagine feeling uninhibited and spontaneous with ___.

Imagine that you have had a terrible day and are feeling peeved off with the whole world. You are definitely not feeling affectionate or cordial toward anyone.

Imagine feeling not very confident or sure of yourself, and feeling dependent on ___.

Imagine yourself feeling warm and affectionate towards ___.

Imagine yourself acting independently and confidently about something you have never done before, and not feeling that you need assistance from ___.

RESPONSES (letters correspond to the letters on the 1982 Interpersonal Circle—see Figure 1)

PA Would take charge, or try to influence me.

BC Would be disappointed, resentful, or critical.

DE Would be impatient, or quarrelsome.

FG Would be distant, or unresponsive.

HI Would go along with me, or act unsure.

JK Would respect me, or trust me.

LM Would be warm, or friendly.

NOW Would show interest, or let me know what he/she thinks.

APPENDIX 2: RECODING OF RESPONSES TO REFLECT THE AMOUNT OF CONTROL (CON) AND AFFILIATION (AFF) THEY REPRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Aff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>- .375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>- .875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>- .375</td>
<td>- .625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>- .875</td>
<td>- .125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>- .625</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>- .125</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>