

## A Note on Terminology

Some research on Opposite Strengths uses terminology that refers to Opposite Strengths as either “Bi/Polar” or “Thomas Concept.” These two terms – “Bi/Polar” and “Thomas Concept” – were utilized in the years preceding the adoption of the current trademark of “Opposite Strengths.” “Bi/Polar” and “Thomas Concept” are synonymous with “Opposite Strengths.”

Tommy Thomas, PhD  
CEO, Thomas Concept

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR  
MEASURED AND IDENTIFIED

---

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY

JULIA G. RAMSEUR, BS

---

DENTON, TEXAS

JULY, 1978

## ABSTRACT

### INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR MEASURED AND IDENTIFIED

by Julia G. Ramseur, August 12, 1978

This investigation compares similarities and differences between FIRO-B and the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths. The FIRO-B enables specific measurement of interpersonal behavior. The Bi/Polar Inventory has implicit implications for identifying an individual's pattern of interpersonal behavior. 150 Bi/Polar Seminar graduates were requested to re-take the Inventory and complete the FIRO-B. Completing the instruments were 30 males and 34 females aged 21 to 63. A sample Pearson product-moment correlation was performed at the TWU Statistical Library. Of the FIRO-B categories, 14 of the 16 correlated with four of the six Bi/Polar categories at the .01 level of .245 or better. The strongest correlations were found between difference of Control and the polar pairs of Thinking/Risking and Dependent/independent Risking. Inferences made were: Risking strengths seem to enable inclusion, assertiveness, and affection, and Thinking strengths are not measured by the FIRO-B. Although these correlations show statistical significance, caution should be used when making clinical applications.

# Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

July 12 19 78

We hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under

our supervision by Julia G. Ramseur

entitled INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR

MEASURED AND IDENTIFIED

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of

Committee:

Robert E. Spelling  
Chairman  
Joseph P. F...  
James D. Cowdy

Accepted:

Dean of Graduate Studies

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The vision for the study came in Dr. L. E. Shilling's counseling class when he introduced the FIRO-B questionnaire. His enthusiasm for using this instrument to measure interpersonal behavior was catching. Dr. Shilling has been an inspiring advisor for the project with his eye for detail and gift for seeing possibilities.

Acknowledgment to Dr. J. W. Thomas would have to begin with gratitude for the Bi/Polar idea and the whole unique system of perceiving strengths in the human personality. His thoughts permeate the thesis and his insights into the possibilities for the study have proved invaluable.

Without the Bi/Polar staff there would be no study. Their assistance with the research was given in a spirit of helpfulness and genuine interest.

Finally, I acknowledge the strength and support of my family. I felt a sense of freedom to pursue my personal interest in the research of interpersonal behavior.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Acknowledgments . . . . .	iv
Table of Contents . . . . .	v
List of Tables . . . . .	vii
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of Problem . . . . .	2
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	2
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	6
FIRO Theory . . . . .	6
Bi/Polar . . . . .	15
III RESEARCH DESIGN . . . . .	26
Sample . . . . .	26
Instrumentation . . . . .	27
Procedure . . . . .	30
Hypothesis . . . . .	31
Statistical Treatment . . . . .	32
IV PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	33
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	36
Problem . . . . .	36
Procedure . . . . .	37
Findings . . . . .	37
Conclusions . . . . .	38

Implications . . . . .	44
Further Study . . . . .	44
REFERENCES . . . . .	47
REFERENCE NOTES . . . . .	51
APPENDIX . . . . .	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Eight Patterns of Polar Strengths	19
2	Correlation - FIRO-B and Bi/Polar Inventory	34

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

This study compares and correlates two theories that have to do with personal growth. Both theories deal with the nuts and bolts of everyday existence--interpersonal relationships. The scores are interpreted in encouraging, positive, and simple language. Emergence of new theories of interpersonal behavior bears witness to growing interest in human interaction. Two theories, Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO) (Schutz, 1966) and Bi/Polar (Thomas, 1978), explain dynamics of interpersonal behavior. Understanding of these theories enables people to develop interaction skills, understand and accept themselves and others, and understand relationships.

Each theory has a unique contribution to make toward understanding interpersonal behavior. Although each attacks the issue from a different viewpoint, similarities exist. Valid comparisons of these two theories will give members of the helping professions a basis for choosing reliable tools.

Both theories have much to say about relationships and interpersonal behavior. Bi/Polar Forms A and B

Inventory of Strengths identify eight patterns of strengths including patterns of relationship behavior (Thomas, 1978). FIRO-B, a questionnaire based on the FIRO theory, measures interpersonal behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection (Schutz, 1966). Ryan (1977) has interpreted these into styles of interpersonal behavior.

#### Statement of Problem

The FIRO theory instrument, FIRO-B, enables specific measurement of interpersonal behavior. Bi/Polar has implicit implications for identifying an individual's pattern of interpersonal behavior. This investigation seeks to compare similarities and differences.

#### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to perform a concurrent validation of the Bi/Polar Inventory, Form A, using the FIRO-B as the criterion.

#### Hypothesis

The similarities and differences between the FIRO and Bi/Polar were investigated by testing the following hy-

pothesis:

There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the measurements of interpersonal behavior in the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior test and the relationship tendencies of Bi/Polar patterns.

1. There are statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Thinking-Risking, and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

2. There are statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Practical-Theoretical Thinking and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

3. There are statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Dependent-Independent Risking and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

#### Assumptions

In order to test the hypothesis the following assumptions were made: (a) Measurements in FIRO-B combine to match the relationship tendencies of each Bi/Polar pattern. (b) The people responded to the questionnaires of their own free will. (c) The sample is sufficient to give a

valid measurement. (d) The instruments are reliable to test the hypothesis.

#### Definition of Terms

Bi/Polar Strengths. Bi/Polar strengths are styles or traits that enable people to function in the world. They are building blocks or basic characteristics that cannot be treated as superficial traits, or even response tendencies. These strengths exist in pairs and stand at opposite ends of a common bi/polar dimension. The two strengths in each pair are referred to as polar strengths and together they form a bi/polar strength which is conceived to be creative (Mayo & Thomas, 1978).

Bi/Polar Decay. Bi/Polar decay is the defensive use of one's strengths. When one is decaying instead of growing there is a tendency to experience despair and hopelessness. The concept of decay is similar to the use of defense mechanisms common to psychoanalysis (Mayo & Thomas, 1978).

FIRO. FIRO is a three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Understanding of the FIRO theory tends to increase understanding and enjoyment of interpersonal relations in order to make them more productive.

Inclusion (I). Inclusion assesses the degree to which a person moves toward or away from others.

Control (C). Control measures the degrees of dominance and responsibility one assumes.

Affection (A). Affection is the scope of a person's emotional involvement.

Expressed (e) and wanted (w) behavior. Every person expresses inclusion, control, and affection and wants them to be expressed in return. Expressed (e) behavior is more easily observable than wanted (w) behavior (Ryan, 1977).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### FIRO Theory

The FIRO theory explains interpersonal behavior of inclusion, control, and affection. Inclusion is the need to establish and maintain interaction and association at a satisfactory level with people (Schutz, 1966). A low score on expressed inclusion (Ie) means a person will tend to move away from others and try aloneness. He will have a select circle of associates with whom he chooses to relate. A high expressed score implies the person is comfortable in social settings and will tend to gather people around him (Ryan, 1977).

A high score on inclusion behavior refers to association with others and is described in terms such as "associate," "interact," "communicate," "belong," "join," "extravert." Low scoring inclusion behavior connotes "exclusion," "detached," "withdrawn," "abandoned," "ignored." The primary implications of inclusion behavior are status, prominence, and distinction from others. Inclusion behaviors have to do with attention, acknowledgment, prominence, recognition, prestige, status, identity, individuality,

understanding, interest, commitment and participation. Inclusion does not involve emotional attachment or dominance (Schutz, 1966).

Control behavior reflects the issue of decision making between people. This issue is described in such terms as "power," "authority," "dominance," "influence," "control," "superior officer," "leader." Low scoring control behavior refers to "rebellion," "resistance," "follower," "submissive."

The primary implications of control behavior are the desire or lack of desire for power, authority, responsibility, control over others and over one's life. A person with a high score in control can be relied on to take a responsible job. Expressions of independence and rebellion are reflected in the control scores as well as submission and compliance.

A low score in expressed control (Ce) indicates the individual avoids responsibility and decision making. He shuns a leadership position. A high score in expressed control indicates the person is willing to assume many responsibilities and make decisions (Ryan, 1977).

Control behavior does not require prominence or emotional closeness. A controlling person wants to get down to business while an affectional person wants to get to know you better. The inclusion person just wants to be there (Schutz, 1966).

Affection behavior refers to close personal emotional

feelings between only two people as opposed to inclusion and control behavior which can be directed toward one person or a group of people. Descriptive of affection behavior are words such as "love," "like," "emotionally close," "positive feelings," "personal," "friendship." Low scores in affection connote "lack of affection," "hate," "dislike," "cool," "emotionally distant." Affection behavior involves sharing anxieties, wishes, feelings, confidences, hate, hostility, and emotional rejection.

A low expressed score in affection (Ae) indicates hesitation to establish close, intimate relationships. A high expressed score indicates a desire to experience close relationships (Ryan, 1977). The affectional person wants to go steady while the inclusive person wants popularity with the group. Inclusion behavior is used to establish a relationship while control and affection behaviors maintain a relationship.

#### Types of Interpersonal Behavior

The low and high scores (0-9) express a continuum of behaviors ranging from deficient, ideal, excessive, to pathological. Inclusion types are described as undersocial, social, and oversocial. Control types are described as abdicat, democrat, and autocrat. Affection types range from underpersonal, personal, to overpersonal (Schutz, 1966).

Ryan (1977) has combined 100 expressed and wanted scores (0-9 in each of the 6 areas).

### Originating and Receiving Behaviors

In the inclusion area, originating behavior (Ie) ranges from preference for always being in interpersonal activities to not wanting to be asked by others. Receiving behavior (Iw) ranges from never actively participating to waiting to be invited to join.

In the control area, originating behavior (Ce) ranges from preference for always dominating and controlling the actions of others to strongly resisting their influence. Receiving behavior (Cw) ranges from always being influenced to never being influential.

In the affection area, originating behavior (Ae) is a preference for loving over being loved. Receiving behavior (Aw) is the passive role of being loved without loving.

### Competitive Behaviors

In the inclusion area competitive behavior is wanting to join the activities you wish to but not invite others to join you as opposed to wanting to be included but putting forth no effort to join. In the control area competitive behavior is wanting to be dominant but not be told what to do as opposed to not wanting to be in charge and taking no

action to initiate activity. In the affection area competitive behavior is wanting to pursue but not overtake as opposed to being secretly fond of someone but never telling them.

#### High and Low Levels of Interaction

In the inclusion area, interaction at a high level of desire is to associate with others and have them for associates as opposed to a low level of being separated and alone. In the control area a high level denotes a preference to be both influenced or controlled by others and to influence or control their actions as opposed to a low level of neither influencing nor being influenced by others. In the affection area a high level is a preference for close personal relations both toward people and from them toward the self as opposed to a low level of maintaining affectional distance.

#### Interactions of Conflict

In inclusion the introvert-extravert distinction is relevant. In control the conflict is between the authoritarian and the anarchist. In affection conflict is when one person wants to be intimate and the other does not want to discuss personal matters.

The sum of the scores are significant since they reveal

how much interaction a person prefers. A high score for inclusion ( $\Sigma I$ ) connotes high desire for contact with people while a low score implies a preference for aloneness. A high score for control ( $\Sigma C$ ) points to a high desire for structure while a low score indicates they neither want to give or receive orders. A high score for affection ( $\Sigma A$ ) expresses preference for exchange of warmth while a low score signifies a preference for impersonal relationships.

A high score of the sum of expressed behavior ( $\Sigma e$ ) implies high initiation of behavior. Low scores indicate no desire to initiate behavior toward people. A high score in wanted behavior ( $\Sigma w$ ) signifies desire for others to initiate behavior toward you. Low score means desire for others to not initiate behavior toward you. A high total sum ( $\Sigma$ ) points to a desire for a great deal of interaction while a low score indicates a desire for non-involvement.

The differences of the score are important also. A positive score on inclusion ( $dI$ ) signifies preference for initiating inclusion rather than receiving it. A negative score indicates desire to be the guest rather than the host. A positive score on control ( $dC$ ) means a preference for giving orders rather than receiving them. A negative score points to preference for receiving orders. A positive score on affection ( $dA$ ) connotes preference for initiating affection. A negative score implies you prefer to receive affection. A

positive sum of the differences ( $\Sigma d$ ) indicates a preference for having others initiate the behavior. The total sum ( $\Sigma$ ), if positive, means a desire to interact with, confront and embrace people. A negative score means a preference for avoiding human interaction (Schutz, Note 1).

### Support for FIRO Theory

Several studies are supportive of Schutz' viewpoint. One study by Baldwin, Kallhorn, and Vreese (1945) sees three areas operating in the lives of infants: indulgence (inclusion), democracy in the home (control), and acceptance of the child (affection). A previous study by Champney (1941) was verified by this work.

Champney observed six factors as the basis of parent-child behavior; freedom-control, stimulative-inactive, mal-adjusted-harmonious, approving-deprecating, emotional-rational, and socialized-individualized. According to Schutz (1966) the factor stimulative-inactive corresponds closely to inclusion because interaction is stressed. In the freedom-control area, independence, guidance, and decision making are issues. This corresponds to the control area. Approving-deprecating points to the affection area since positive feelings, encouragement, and facilitation are enumerated.

Fromm (1947) discusses withdrawal-destructiveness as experiencing distance from others, symbiotic relatedness as be-

ing dominated versus being independent, and love as caring and intimacy between two persons. These fit inclusion, control, and affection. Two FIRO areas, affection and control, relate to Leary's (1957) concepts of affiliation-hostility and dominance-submission.

Carter (1955), in group interaction studies noted three factors that seem to relate to the three FIRO areas. Factor I is individual prominence. This has to do with aggressiveness, leadership, confidence, and striving for individual recognition. Schutz interprets this as inclusion. Factor II, group goal facilitation, includes the elements of efficiency, adaptability, and cooperation. Schutz sees this as control. Factor III is group sociability. The traits are sociability, striving for group acceptance and adaptability. Schutz believes this corresponds to affection.

Benne and Sheats (1948) classified roles people play in groups into three types; individual roles where individual needs are met, group task roles where the task at hand is the central issue, and group building and maintenance roles where the function of the group is to strengthen and regulate itself. Schutz recognizes these three roles as corresponding to inclusion, control, and affection.

A summary of the broad lines of disagreement between Jung, Adler, and Freud is of interest at this point. According to Schutz (1966), Jung emphasized inclusion, Adler con-

trol, and Freud affection. Freud's narcissistic, ob-  
sessional, and erotic types correspond to the areas of in-  
clusion, control, and affection. Karen Horney (1945) devel-  
oped the ideas of moving away from people, moving against  
people, and moving toward people. These correspond to in-  
clusion, control, and affection.

#### Research using FIRO-B

According to Ryan (1977), research concerning FIRO has  
been largely limited to using the FIRO-B instrument to mea-  
sure interpersonal behavior. FIRO has been employed along  
with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Insel, Reese, & Alex-  
ander, 1968), Alpert-Haber Facilitating and Debilitating  
Anxiety Questionnaires, CPI, 16PF, and MMPI (Datta, 1967),  
16 PF and Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (Schlafer, 1974),  
Osgood Semantic Differential (Harvey, DiLuzio, & Hunter,  
1975; Lundgren, 1975) and the Personal Orientation Inven-  
tory (Harvey et al; Smith, 1975).

A survey of the literature revealed several studies on  
cohesion and compatability of groups using compatability of  
FIRO-B results as a criterion for group formation. Data  
support that groups composed of members with compatible  
FIRO-B scores proved to be superior in cohesion and mutual  
support for risk taking (Fromme & Close, 1976), manifest  
significantly more positive change (Pollack, 1971), and are

more productive (Fleischer & Levin, 1970). Lawlis and Klein (1973) discovered that cohesive ratings have a significant relationship to maximizing warm and positive relationships after group therapy.

The following authors conducted studies concerning sensitivity training: Harvey et al, Kaye (1973), Mumford (1974). These studies employed FIRO-B in order to measure behavior at intervals during research. Couple counseling is the focus of two studies utilizing the FIRO-B test. One delineates uses of the FIRO-B in the counseling process (Robbins & Toomer, 1976). The other concerns husband-wife compatibility and the management of stress (Burke, Firth, & McGrattin, 1974). FIRO-B has also been used to predict the effectiveness of executive professional leadership (Bellaver, 1974).

In summary, FIRO can be helpful in understanding individual personality dynamics and also in marital counseling, sensitivity training, encounter groups, or in any other form of group counseling or psychotherapy. In business, FIRO is useful in screening large groups of people for personnel assignment.

### Bi/Polar

Bi/Polar is a theory of how people grow or decay within themselves and in their relationships (Thomas, Note 2). It

is an approach that seeks to understand people in terms of their strengths. The originator of the system describes the basic concept of Bi/Polar in this way:

The word "Bi/Polar" points directly to the basic concept of the system. Life is conceived as being expressed creatively in pairs of strengths rather than single strengths. The two strengths in each pair are "polar" to each other in much the same way the north and south poles are at opposite ends of the earth--they are opposite yet both are essential parts of a common reality. Human strengths are viewed in a similar fashion--we have Bi/Polar strengths rather than single strengths. For example, we not only have a thinking strength that enables us to understand intellectually, but we also have a courage strength that enables us to do something in spite of the risks involved. These two basic strengths are "polar" to each other and together make up a Bi/Polar strength that exists within every person. (Thomas, 1978, p. 14)

Bi/Polar deals with only three pairs of human polar strengths. The basic pair of human strengths is Thinking/Risking. Thinking strength is expressed in terms like stable, head, reason, intellect, structure, or planning. Thinking strength is used when decisions are based on rational analysis and learning is cognitive and conceptual. Risking strength is expressed in terms like dynamic, heart, emotion, feelings, movement, or doing. Risking strength is used when decisions are based on intuition and feeling and learning is emotional through experience.

The two additional pairs are obtained by dividing the thinking strength into two kinds of thinking, practical and theoretical, and the risking strength into two kinds of risking, dependent and independent. Practical thinking enables

a person to see how things are and deal with facts, probabilities, and reality. Practical thinking is concrete and identifies problems. Theoretical thinking enables a person to see how things could be and deal with ideas, possibilities, and imagination. Theoretical thinking is abstract and sees possible solutions. Dependent risking enables a person to have courage to be dependent, rely on others, take advice from others, be cooperative, have confidence in others, and respect others. Independent risking enables a person to have courage to be independent, rely on self, follow his/her own convictions, be competitive, and to have self-confidence and self-respect.

These three pairs of strengths contribute equally to human existence including interpersonal relationships. These three pairs of strengths are constantly active but never in a perfectly balanced way. Individuals tend to be unbalanced or lopsided as they use their strengths; sometimes leading with thinking and sometimes with risking. The ratio changes but more than likely a person will naturally favor either thinking or risking (Thomas, 1978). One particular strength in each pair will be the major strength.

People with thinking as their major strength will feel and behave differently from people whose major strength is risking. A thinker will tend to say, "Let me read and think about it first, then I want to think about my experience and

see what it means" (Thomas, 1978). To find out a person's pattern of natural strengths, the major strength in each of the three pairs is identified. There are eight possible combinations of three major strengths and each combination is assigned a pattern number. This yields eight distinct patterns in total (See Table 1).

The Bi/Polar theory affirms four fundamental life forces of equal value and status that cause people to think and behave in unique ways. None is more important than the others. First, the basic pattern of strengths is a force within that demands expression. This pattern has to do with each person's unique balance of practical thinking, theoretical thinking, dependent risking, and independent risking. This pattern of strengths is a stable and structural part of each person and the individual will tend to behave in interpersonal ways in accordance with the basic patterns of strength (Thomas, 1978).

The second life force is innate potential, another stable and structural force that demands expression. Everyone feels a tug to live up to his or her potential. The innate potential may be limited but each person's potential differs widely. The gap between the potential of what one might become and what one is determines the quality of one's life, including interpersonal behavior. Mental capacity and energy potential are two broad categories of innate potential (Thomas, 1978). The third life force, environment--a dyn-

TABLE 1  
EIGHT PATTERNS OF POLAR STRENGTHS

---

<u>THREE MAJOR STRENGTHS</u>	<u>PATTERN NUMBER</u>
Thinking-Practical-Dependent	I
Thinking-Practical-Independent	II
Thinking-Theoretical-Dependent	III
Thinking-Theoretical-Independent	IV
Risking-Dependent-Practical	V
Risking-Dependent-Theoretical	VI
Risking-Independent-Practical	VII
Risking-Independent-Theoretical	VIII

---

amic and moving group of forces from the outside--includes people and how they relate to one another. Environment's power is limited in that it cannot change our basic pattern of strengths or our innate potential (Thomas, 1978). Fourth, personal choice is the force that creates personal freedom and responsibility. Personal choice is another dynamic changing force like environment (Thomas, 1978).

Personal choice and environment change; innate potential and basic patterns of strength do not. Personal choice enables one to be more effective in interpersonal relationships.

Each pattern has unique expressions of strength and tendencies in interpersonal relationships. The succession of behaviors when using only one of these strengths, polarization (using one strength at the expense of the others), impedes interpersonal behavior.

#### Types of Interpersonal Behavior

People who are Patterns I or III express these strengths in relationships: acceptance, cooperativeness, listening, thoughtfulness, warmth, approachability, loyalty, peacemaking, building trust, supportiveness, and dependability. People with these patterns experience the following temptations: think negatively of self, avoid confrontation or conflict, underestimate own strength, let others rule life, understate

self in group, "gunnysack" feelings, hide feelings and procrastinate in making decisions. These people want to receive from a relationship: stimulation, leadership, inclusion, acceptance, warmth, understanding, approval, support and advice. People with these patterns want others to encourage, not rush them, take the initiative, ask for their help, and show their appreciation in a quiet manner. They prefer a comfortable relationship that shows a good deal of personal concern (Thomas, Note 3).

People who are Patterns II & IV have these strengths to offer in a relationship: self-discipline, rationality, leadership in thinking, task orientation, and tenacity. People with these patterns experience the following temptations: to view dependence as a weakness, to use self-confidence to depend less on others, to withdraw from involvement with others, to think negatively of others, to hold people at arm's length, to hold feelings within, to treat emotions as something that need to be kept under control and not expressed, to deprecate emotional people, and to stay aloof and uninvolved. People with these patterns want intellectual stimulation, respect, accomplishment of a task, loyalty, and productive effort. People with Patterns II & IV want others to keep their distance, listen to their thoughts, stay task-oriented, have calm discussions, be left alone often and give very subtle appreciations (Thomas, Note 3).

Patterns V & VI are people who have these strengths to offer in relationships: intimacy, warmth, trust, ability to listen, social skills, emotional sympathy, concern for feelings of others, initiative in establishing relationships, aggressive helpfulness, and emotional communication. People with these patterns experience these temptations: to let the needs and demands of others rule their lives, to avoid confrontation and conflict, to go overboard to please everybody, to act on impulse, to let "heart" rule "reason," to polarize on "feelings" and lose the values of rationality, and to try to get too "close" to others. Patterns V & VI are people who want to receive from a relationship: "warm fuzzies" that never end, recognition, frequent compliments and "strokes," popularity, emotional support and approval, inclusion, a great deal of interaction, human companionship, understanding, warm community, and relationships of depth. People with Patterns V & VI want others to give them a warm response, share their feelings, to be open with them "show us that you need us," interact and be talkative and respond (Thomas, Note 3).

People who are Patterns VII & VIII have these strengths to offer in relationships: initiating action, self-assertiveness, enthusiasm, self-confidence, forcefulness, willingness to take a risk, energy and dynamism, out-front leader, excitement, and movement. People with these patterns exper-

ience the following temptations: to talk too much, be impatient, withhold trust, not trust or depend on others, to be competitive and "territorial," try to do too much, make decisions too quickly, be overly aggressive in expressing thoughts and feelings, and press others to decide quickly. Patterns VII and VIII are people who want to receive from a relationship: the spotlight, lots of recognition for contributions, interesting and exciting relationships, active support, loyalty both ways, accomplishment of a personal objective, and to win. People with these patterns want interaction and response (the stronger the better) from others. These people would tend to say "follow me but don't let me run over you," "contribute, but don't take over," "don't crowd me or try to possess me," or "don't beat around the bush." These people prefer others to take over doing the details (Thomas, Note 3).

The Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths has been utilized in correlation studies with the Vocational Preference Inventory, DF Opinion Survey and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Mayo & Thomas, 1978). The two theories, Bi/Polar and FIRO, have never been used in the same study (Thomas, Note 2).

Bi/Polar is basically a self-development system. Mayo and Thomas (1978) suggest comparison to Transactional Analysis (Berne, 1964), Parent Effectiveness Training (Gordon,

1975), and Assertiveness Training (Fensterheim, 1975). Thomas (Note 4) and Clemons (Note 5) have compared Bi/Polar psychology to Jung's intraversion-extraversion, rational-irrational polarities.

### Summary

This review of literature reveals a theory of interpersonal relationships (FIRO) and a system of strength identification (Bi/Polar). Each has identified areas of interpersonal behavior that are common to every person.

FIRO is a three dimensional theory in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Bi/Polar identifies strengths in the areas of Thinking/Risking, Practical Thinking/Theoretical Thinking, and Dependent Risking/Independent Risking.

Behavior for the FIRO theory ranges from loner to people gatherer (inclusion), rebel to independent/dependent (control), pessimist to optimist (affection). Behavior for the Bi/Polar system ranges from being stable to dynamic, seeing how things are to how they might be, and expressing courage to be dependent to courage to be independent.

Both theories are used in marriage counseling, business management and personal counseling. FIRO has been compared to the theories of Freud, Adler, and Jung. Bi/Polar has been compared to the theory of Jung. Studies show FIRO-B has

been used as one of several tests to understand individual personality dynamics. Studies in group cohesion, sensitivity groups, and marital counseling have supported the use of the FIRO-B instrument.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN

#### Sample

All participants in this study were volunteers. Each person had an equal chance to participate. To obtain the subjects, a randomized selection was made from the Bi/Polar files of 300 people who had attended Bi/Polar Seminars in June, July, and August, 1977.

The sample included 150 subjects from 11 states and 7 cities and towns in Texas who had participated in Bi/Polar Seminars. Two types of seminars were represented, a management level business seminar, paid for by employers, and a local church seminar of voluntary attendants.

The pattern for each person was identified by an inventory completed by the individual, Form A, and five other people, Form B, who relate to the individual in different environments. They then attended a seminar.

The 150 subjects includes females and males between 20 and 70 years of age. They received letters of explanation and an authorization to sign for use of data for research only. Samples of both the letter and the authorization are included in the Appendix. The letter requested the subjects

to retake the Bi/Polar Form A and the FIRO-B for research purposes only.

Of the 150 contacted, 64 responded. These included 30 males ranging in age from 21 to 63 with a mean age of 41.9, and 34 females ranging in age from 21 to 63 with a mean age of 41.9. No racial or economic information was available.

### Instrumentation

#### FIRO-B

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) is a 54 item Likert-type questionnaire used for clinical and research purposes. The questionnaire measures interpersonal behavior in three fundamental dimensions; inclusion, control, and affection. The test is a measure of how people behave toward others and how they want people to behave toward them (Ryan, 1977).

Reliability. The reliability of the FIRO-B was measured by reproducibility and a coefficient of internal consistency was found for each scale. Five of the six scales had a coefficient of .94 and one, .93. The coefficients of stability ranged from .71 to .82 on the six scales (Schutz, 1966).

Validity. A sampling of the universe of items yields

a satisfactory content validity (Schutz, 1966). Bloxum (1972) suggests that FIRO sub-scales are related to non-test interpersonal behavior as well as to other personality measures. He indicates clearly that FIRO is valid for research.

Concurrent validity studies have been in the area of demonstrating differences between already existent groups, or individuals with already known attitudes (Schutz, 1966). Dialog, a computer search of the literature at Texas Woman's University, reveals validity studies including construct validity (Froehle, 1970; Ryan, 1970; Ryan, Maquire, & Ryan, 1970) and convergent and discriminant validity (Coultras, 1971). One correlation study was found; an examination of the relationship between FIRO-B, Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC) (Kuehl, DiMarco, & Wims, 1975). The study revealed that the LPC score and the Consideration dimension of the LOQ were found to be positively related to all the FIRO-B scales except expressed Control. Initiating Structure positively relates to expressed Control. No correlation studies with Bi/Polar were found.

#### Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths, Form A

The Form A is a seven point Likert type questionnaire used for evaluation purposes. The 90 item questionnaire

identifies an individual's major strengths in the polar areas of Thinking/Risking, Practical/Theoretical Thinking, and Depending/Independent Risking.

Reliability. According to Mayo and Thomas (1978), the individual items correlate highly with their own scales and negligibly with the other two scales. The mean correlation coefficients that correlate highly are T-R with T-R, .68, P-T with P-T, .63, and D-I with D-I, .60.

As part of the present study, Mayo and Thomas (1978) administered a test/retest for Form A. The Pearson correlation coefficients for test/retest reliability for the three scales were as follows: T-R .907, P-T .828, and D-I .828.

Validity. An interesting validation study was conducted by Mayo and Thomas (1978). Through personal interviews with 41 subjects three psychologists who understand the Bi/Polar system made either/or judgments concerning which pole of the Bi/Polar scale seemed characteristic of each subject. This procedure was repeated for each of the three polar pairs. The judges agreed perfectly with the test on 16 of 41 attempts. Also there was a high number of instances of agreement on two scales out of the three. This indicates the results are highly significant in their convergence.

Relationships with other inventories. Bi/Polar scale scores were related to scores on the Vocational Preference

Inventory (Holland 1966), DF Opinion Survey (Guilford, Christensen, & Bond, 1956), and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Guilford & Zimmerman, 1949) given to a sample of 59 executive applicants. T-R scores have a high positive correlation with the Enterprising scale from the VPI, the Guilford-Zimmerman and the Self-Reliance scale from the DF Opinion Survey. Negative correlations were displayed with the Self-Control (Sc) scale from the VPI and the Restraint (R) and Thoughtfulness (T) scales from the Guilford-Zimmerman (Mayo and Thomas, 1978).

### Procedure

Letters of explanation were mailed to 150 subjects (See Appendix). The letter requested the Bi/Polar Seminar graduates to help improve the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths by retaking the same inventory they completed for a seminar, Form A. They were also requested to take the FIRO-B. It was described to the subjects as a widely used test designed to help people understand how they interact with each other.

The letter states that responses to the FIRO-B will be used as basic data to see how it relates to the Bi/Polar Inventory. The subjects were advised that responses will be kept strictly confidential. The subjects were advised to spend about ten minutes completing each test and return them

in a pre-addressed, stamped envelope to the Bi/Polar office. They had approximately two weeks to complete the tests.

Since the study was not concerned with evaluation by others, only the Bi/Polar self-inventory, Form A, was used. The Bi/Polar Inventories were tallied at the Bi/Polar office and the scores made available to the investigator. The investigator scored the FIRO-B tests.

### Hypothesis

In order to investigate the relationship between Bi/Polar and FIRO the following hypothesis was stated:

There is no statistically significant correlation between the measurements of interpersonal behavior in the FIRO-B questionnaire and the relationship tendencies of Bi/Polar patterns in a sample of adult volunteer subjects.

1. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Thinking-Risking, and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

2. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Practical-Theoretical, and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

3. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Dependent-Independent

Risking, and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

### Statistical Treatment

A simple Pearson product-moment technique, program RØ1Ø from the Texas Woman's University Statistical Library, calculated the correlations between the variables. The correlations were performed at the Texas Woman's University data processing center.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In order to test the following hypothesis, program RØ1Ø, a simple Pearson product-moment correlation, was performed at Texas Woman's University. The results are presented in Table 2.

#### Correlation

Hypothesis. There are no statistically significant correlations between the measurements of interpersonal behavior in the FIRO-B questionnaire and the relationship tendencies of Bi/Polar patterns.

1. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Thinking-Risking, and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.
2. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Practical-Theoretical Thinking and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.
3. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Dependent-Independent Risking and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection.

TABLE 2

A SIMPLE PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION  
 FIRO-B QUESTIONNAIRE AND BI/POLAR INVENTORY FORM A

	THINK	RISK	PRAC THINK	THEO THINK	DEP RISK	INDEP RISK
Ie	-.390**	.390**	.097	-.100	.144	-.144
Iw	-.389**	.389**	.203	-.212	-.068	.068
Ce	-.388**	.388**	.022	-.023	-.356**	.356**
Cw	-.080	.080	.185	-.200	.444**	-.444**
Ae	.143	-.143	-.047	.044	.324**	-.324**
Aw	-.181	.181	.107	-.119	.368**	-.368**
$\Sigma I$	-.389**	.389**	.176	-.185	.151	-.151
$\Sigma C$	-.329**	.329**	.186	-.197	-.139	.139
$\Sigma A$	-.148	.148	.031	-.039	.361**	-.361**
$\Sigma e$	-.504**	.504**	.137	-.146	-.094	.094
$\Sigma w$	-.206	.206	.168	-.180	.407**	-.407**
$\Sigma$	-.366**	.366**	.160	-.171	.203	-.203
dI	-.043	.043	-.073	.083	-.029	.029
dC	-.511**	.511**	.158	-.161	-.547**	.547**
dA	.115	-.115	-.180	.190	-.100	.100
d	-.244*	.244*	.031	-.028	-.394**	.394**

\*p < .05; \*\*p < .01

The Pearson product-moment correlation was selected to compare the FIRO-B questionnaire and the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths, Form A. Tuckman (1972) suggests use of the Pearson product-moment correlation to compare sets of interval data. Tuckman (1972) further states that most behavioral measurement is considered to be interval in nature and since the analysis of data from Likert scales is usually based on summated scores over a number of items, the equal-interval assumption is workable. According to Popham (1967) the level of significance for the correlations tested are  $.05 < .319$  and  $.01 < .245$ .

Analysis of the data shows correlations between interpersonal behavior measured by the FIRO-B and relationship tendencies identified by Bi/Polar, Form A, at  $.245$  or better ( $p < .01$ ). Every area of the FIRO-B with the exception of dI and dA have at least one correlation at the  $.01$  level. Three areas (Ce, dC,  $\xi$ d) correlate with two polar pair, Risking/Thinking and Dependent/Independent Risking. Inclusion scores fall consistently in the positive column of Risking. The affection scores follow a similar pattern of positive scores in the Dependent Risking column. The control scores are scattered through the data.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Problem

The FIRO theory and the Bi/Polar system are concerned with interpersonal behavior. FIRO measures behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Bi/Polar identifies eight patterns of strengths a person draws on in his relationships. Similarities and differences are one purpose of this study. Another purpose is to validate the Bi/Polar, Form A, using the FIRO-B as a criterion variable.

Hypothesis. The following hypothesis was tested: There are no statistically significant correlations between the measurements of interpersonal behavior in the FIRO-B questionnaire and the relationship tendencies of Bi/Polar patterns. Data analysis indicates the null hypothesis can be rejected.

1. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Thinking-Risking, and FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Data analysis indicates the null hypothesis can be rejected.

2. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Practical-Theore-

tical Thinking and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Data analysis indicates the null hypothesis can be retained.

3. There are no statistically significant correlations between the Bi/Polar pair of strengths, Dependent-Independent Risking and the FIRO-B areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Data analysis indicate the null hypothesis can be rejected.

#### Procedure

A randomized sample of 150 volunteer subjects was selected from the approximately 300 attendants of Bi/Polar seminars, June-August, 1978. One Bi/Polar Form A and one FIRO-B test were sent to each participant. They were accompanied by a letter explaining the research (See Appendix). Of the 150 contacted, 64 responded, 30 males and 34 females with a mean age of 41.9. The Form A and the FIRO-B were correlated with a simple Pearson product-moment technique, program RØ1Ø in the Texas Woman's University Statistical Library.

#### Findings

Since both a review of the literature and personal com-

munication with Dr. Thomas (Note 2) confirm that the FIRO-B questionnaire and the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths have not been previously correlated, findings concerning the degree and direction of the relationship between the two instruments are of interest. Analysis of the data shows statistical correlations at the .01 level of .245 or better between areas of interpersonal behavior in FIRO-B and polar pairs that identify relationship tendencies in Bi/Polar.

Statistical correlations at the .01 level of .245 or better were found in 14 of the 16 FIRO-B categories when correlated with Thinking/Risking and Dependent/Independent Risking. Difference of Inclusion and difference of Affection were the exceptions. No correlations at the .01 level or better were found between the FIRO-B areas and Practical/Theoretical Thinking.

The strongest correlations are between difference of Control, dC, and the polar pairs of Thinking/Risking and Dependent/Independent Risking. With a correlation of .511, dC counts for 26% of variance in the T-R pair. With a correlation of .547, dC counts for 30% of variance in the D-I pair.

### Conclusions

The data infer that inclusion, control, and affection

behaviors correlate with the relationship tendencies of the Bi/Polar patterns at the .01 level of significance or better.

### Thinking-Risking

For the Thinking-Risking pair, correlations were positive for Risking patterns and negative for Thinking patterns in the categories of Ie, Iw,  $\xi I$ , Ce,  $\xi C$ ,  $\xi e$ ,  $\xi$ , and dC. This suggests that initiation of relationships is a function of Risking strength. The use of Risking strength when reaching out to others and wanting to be included (Ie, Iw) is inferred. Risking strength seems to express more control (Ce) and desire for structure (Cw) than Thinking strength.  $\xi$  seems to indicate that Risking strength enables interaction, confrontation, and embracing others. Since dC is one measure of assertiveness (Shilling, Note 6), the possibility exists that assertiveness accounts for 26% of the strengths of the T-R pair and 30% of the strengths of the D-I pair.

The negative results of the Thinking scores appear to validate the intention of the Bi/Polar Inventory, to identify tendencies toward poles. The data tends to confirm the "either/or" factor in Bi/Polar since the scores were totally consistent in their positive or negative direction.

### Practical-Theoretical

For the Practical-Theoretical Thinking pair there were

no correlations at or above the .01 level. The data appear inconsistent when compared to the other two poles. This suggests the possibility that the process of thinking has no relationship with interpersonal behavior as defined in the FIRO theory. FIRO-B was designed to measure inclusion, control, and affection behaviors. No evidence was found to suggest that FIRO-B measures thinking. Practical-Theoretical Thinking appears to be the variable that adjusts to the consistency of the other two pairs.

#### Dependent-Independent

For the Dependent-Independent Risking pair,  $C_w$ ,  $A_e$ ,  $A_w$ ,  $\xi_A$ , and  $\xi_w$  correlate positively with Dependent Risking and negatively with Independent Risking. Affection, expressed and wanted, seems to be more of an expression of Dependent than Independent Risking strength. The  $\xi_A$  infers need for warmth and exchange of affection is a function of Dependent Risking strength.  $\xi_w$  infers the need to have others initiate interaction is more a use of Dependent than Independent Risking strength.

$C_e$ ,  $d_C$ , and  $\xi_d$  correlate negatively with Dependent Risking strength and positively with Independent Risking strength. Independent Risking strength seems to enable one to assume more responsibilities, assert one's self, and take charge in a relationship. This does not appear to be a func-

tion of Dependent Risking strength.

The low correlations for dA and dI may be accounted for by the facts that dI score is not concerned with the amount of contact desired and dA is not concerned with the total amount of affection desired (Schutz, Note 1).

### Summary

Risking strengths enable interaction, confrontation, and embracing. These seem to be the strengths that express control and desire structure. The significance of Thinking strength is uncertain in the study since personal interaction was investigated, not thinking ability.

The correlations of the Affection scores and Dependent Risking scores at the .05 level suggests the possibility that affection is an expression of Dependent strength and reflects the need to have others initiate interaction. Willingness to assume responsibility, assert one's self, and take charge in a relationship appears to be a function of Independent Risking as shown by the correlations at the .05 level with Ce and dC.

The polar relationship of the Thinking-Risking and the Dependent-Independent Risking scores seems to support the Bi/Polar theory that the polar pairs identify relationship tendencies. Each time FIRO-B and Bi/Polar are compared the possibility exists that these two pairs will consistently

mirror each other. Practical-Theoretical Thinking probably will not since this study did not identify or measure the thinking function, only the relationship tendencies of Thinking patterns. FIRO-B appears to measure interpersonal behavior exclusively. The lack of correlation at the .01 level with Practical-Theoretical Thinking suggests thinking and interpersonal behavior are two separate functions that can be identified independently.

Patterns I & III have Thinking and Dependent Risking as major strengths (Table 1). The negative correlations of Ie, Iw, and  $\xi$  I with Thinking suggest these patterns will tend to wait for an expression of inclusion. The positive correlations between affection and Cw indicate desire for affection and control. People with these patterns will tend to want others to take the initiative in inclusion (Iw) and leadership (Cw). They will then tend to respond with warmth and support.

Patterns II & IV have Thinking and Independent Risking as major strengths. The negative correlations of Thinking and the areas of Ie, Iw, and  $\xi$  suggest the possibility that people with these patterns behave in such a way as to discourage inclusion. The negative correlations of Independent Risking with Ae and Aw appear to point to a preference for task completion in a relationship rather than intimacy. The positive correlations between Independent Risking and

$\xi d$ ,  $Ce$ ,  $dC$  and the negative correlation with  $Cw$  tend to indicate that the control issue in relationships will be important. Although people with these patterns prefer others to initiate a relationship ( $\xi d$ ), the preference probably will tend to be to make the decisions in the relationship ( $Ce$ ) rather than to be controlled ( $Cw$ ).

People with Patterns V & VI have Risking and Dependent Risking as major strengths. The positive correlations between Risking and  $Ie$ ,  $Ew$ , and  $\xi I$  infer that people with these patterns are willing to make the first move toward others. The positive correlations between  $Ae$ ,  $Aw$ ,  $\xi A$ , and Dependent Risking suggest that people with these patterns will tend to want close, intimate relationships. The negative correlations with  $Ce$ ,  $dC$ ,  $\xi d$  and positive correlation with  $Cw$  infer that people with these patterns want others to take the initiative in leadership ( $Cw$ ,  $Ce$ ), will tend to be less assertive ( $dC$ ), but will be willing to initiate relationships.

People with Patterns VII and VIII have Risking and Independent Risking as major strengths. The positive correlations between Risking and  $Ie$ ,  $Iw$ ,  $\xi I$ ,  $\xi e$ , and  $\xi$  suggest that people with these patterns are willing to move toward others and initiate relationships. Positive correlations between  $dC$  and  $Ce$  with Independent Risking and negative correlation between  $Cw$  and Independent Risking suggest asser-

tiveness, power, and dominance will tend to be major issues in relationships. The negative correlations with Ae, Aw,  $\xi_A$  and  $\xi_w$  with Independent Risking suggest the possibility that affection is less of an issue in relationships than control.

### Implications

The Thinking-Risking pair appears to revolve, in part, around the issue of inclusion from the pole of being a loner to the pole of people gathering. The Dependent-Independent Risking pair appears to revolve, in part, around the issue of affection from the pole of pessimism to the pole of optimism. The control scores are scattered with Ce being an expression of Independent strength and Cw an expression of Dependent Risking strength. In other words, interpersonal behavior seems to be a function of Risking strengths.

### Further Study

Several studies reviewed relate to Bi/Polar and warrant further study. In his category of affiliation Leary (1957) uses descriptions of Dependent-Risking strength such as affectionate, friendly, warm, and approving. The study also describes Independent-Risking strengths, leading, force-

ful, and able to give orders, in a dominance category. This suggests similarities could be found between the Leary study and Bi/Polar.

The Carter (1955) group interaction studies use many words descriptive of Bi/Polar strengths. Factor I (aggressive and confident) seems to fit with Independent Risking strength. Factor II (adaptable and cooperative) suggests Dependent Risking strength as does Factor III (social and adaptable).

Bi/Polar is used extensively in business management. A comparison of the studies of professional executives by Mayo and Thomas (1978) with Bellaver's (1974) study might prove of interest.

One study utilizing FIRO-B might prove of interest to counselors. There may be a comparison of the low scoring inclusion score which connotes "abandonment" with Master-son's (1976) theory of "fear of abandonment" in the borderline adult.

Since the possibility exists that FIRO-B and Bi/Polar validate one another in the relationship area, a study is in order to validate the thinking pole of the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths. The data tends to support the hypothesis that inclusion, control, and affection behaviors correlate with the relationship tendencies of the Bi/Polar patterns. This information can be put to practical use.

The data also seem to support the feasibility of using FIRO-B in conjunction with the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths to point toward possible areas of growth in relationships using FIRO-B to identify defensive behavior and behavior deficits.

## REFERENCES

- Baldwin, A., Kallhorn, J., & Vreese, F. Patterns of parent behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1945, 58, 1-75.
- Bellaver, P. The effectiveness of FIRO-B to predict executive professional leadership. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 36(01-A), 55.
- Benne, K., & Sheats, P. Functional roles of group members. Journal of Social Issues, 1948, 4, 41-49.
- Berne, E. Games people play. New York: Ballantine Books Inc., 1964.
- Bloxum, B. Tests & reviews: Character--nonprojective. In O. K. Buros (Ed.). The seventh mental measurements yearbook, I. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972, (p. 169).
- Burke, R., Firth, J., & McGrattin, C. Husband-wife compatibility and the management of stress. Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 94(2), 243-252.
- Carter, L. Recording and evaluating the performance of individuals as members of small groups. Small Groups: Studies in Interaction, Knopf, N. Y., 1955.
- Champney, H. The variables of parent behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1941, 36, 525-542.
- Coultas, M. The convergent and discriminant validation of the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior, FIRO-B. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 03-A.
- Datta, L. On the unidimensionality of the Alpert-Haber Achievement Anxiety Test. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20(2), 606.
- Fensterheim, H., & Baer, J. Don't say yes when you want to say no. New York: MCKay, 1975.

- Fleisher, D., & Levin, J. A second study in composition of small learning groups in medical education. Journal of Medical Education, 1970, 45(11), 929-938.
- Froehle, T. Construct validity of the FIRO-B questionnaire: A failure to replicate? Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1970, 34(2), 146-148.
- Fromm, E. Man for himself. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1947.
- Fromme, D., & Close, S. Group compatibility and the modification of affective verbalizations. Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 1976, 15(2) 189-197.
- Gordon, T. Parent effectiveness training. New York: New American Library, 1975.
- Guilford, J., Christensen, P., & Bond, N. The DF opinion survey, Beverly Hills: Sheridan Supply Co., 1949.
- Guilford, J., & Zimmerman, C. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Beverly Hills: Sheridan Supply Co., 1949.
- Harvey, V., DiLuzio, G., & Hunter, W. A comparison of verbal and nonverbal groups. Small Group Behavior, 1975, 6(2), 210-210.
- Holland, J. The psychology of vocational choice. London: Blaisdell Publ. Co., 1966.
- Horney, K. Our inner conflicts. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Insel, S., Reese, C., & Alexander, B. Self-Presentations in relation to internal and external referents. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32(4), 289-395.
- Kaye, J. Group interaction and interpersonal learning. Small Group Behavior, 1973, 4(4), 424-448.
- Kuehl, C., DiMarco, N., & Wims, E. Leadership orientation as a function of interpersonal need structure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60(1), 143-145.

- Lawlis, G., & Klein, R. Interpersonal cohesion and feeling orientation: An application of matrix algebra. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32(3, Pt 1).
- Leary, T. The interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald, 1957.
- Lundgren, D. Interpersonal needs and member attitudes toward trainer and group. Small Group Behavior, 1975, 6(4), 371-388.
- Masterson, J. Psychotherapy of the borderline adult. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1976.
- Mayo, C., & Thomas, J. A manual for the Bi/Polar Inventory of Strengths. Richardson, Texas: Bi/Polar Inc., 1978.
- Mumford, M. A comparison of interpersonal skills in verbal activity groups. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 1974, 28(5), 281-283.
- Pollack, H. Change in homogeneous and heterogeneous sensitivity training groups. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37(11), 60-66.
- Popham, W. Educational statistics. New York: Harper/Row, 1967.
- Ryan, B., Maguire, T., & Ryan, T. An examination of the construct validity of the FIRO-B. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1970, 34(5), 419-425.
- Ryan, L. Clinical interpretation of the FIRO-B. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc., 1977.
- Robbins, G., & Toomer, J. Innovative uses of the FIRO-B in couple counseling. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 1976, 2(3), 277-282.
- Schlafer, R. A comparison of selected test variables between structured vs unstructured marathon encounter group counseling. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(10-A), 6391.

- Schutz, W. The interpersonal underworld. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books Inc., 1966.
- Smith, P. Controlled studies of the outcome of sensitivity training. Psychological Bulletin, 1975, 82(4) 597-622.
- Thomas, J. Bi/Polar: A way of understanding people and their relationships. Richardson, Texas: Bi/Polar Inc., 1978.
- Tuckman, B. Conducting educational research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

#### REFERENCE NOTES

1. Schutz, W. D., FIRO-B Sum and Difference. Unpublished Manuscript. (Available from Consulting Psychologists Press Inc. 577 College Ave., Palo Alto, California, 94306).
2. Thomas, J. W. Personal Communication, Richardson, Texas, October 1, 1977.
3. Thomas, J. W., General Relationship Tendencies for the Eight Bi/Polar Patterns. Unpublished Manuscript. (Available from Bi/Polar Inc., Box 1237, Richardson, Texas).
4. Thomas, T. J. Comparison of Two Theories of Personality, Unpublished Manuscript, Spring, 1976.
5. Clemons, H. Personality Types in C. G. Jung and J. W. Thomas, Partial fulfillment of requirements, Psychology 5324, Dept. of Psychology, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, Fall, 1975.
6. Shilling, L. E., Personal communication, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas, May 9, 1978.

APPENDIX



January 10, 1978

DR. JAY W. THOMAS  
President

Dear Bi/Polar Seminar Graduate:

We are continually trying to improve the BI/POLAR INVENTORY OF STRENGTHS. We are asking you to help us do this by completing the two inventories enclosed. One is a copy of the BI/POLAR INVENTORY OF STRENGTHS. It is the same as the one you completed on yourself before you attended the Bi/Polar Seminar. The other is the FIRO-B, a widely used test designed to help people understand how they interact with each other.

We intend to compare your responses on this Bi/Polar Inventory with your responses on the Bi/Polar Inventory you filled out before attending the seminar. This will give us a good test of the reliability of the Bi/Polar Inventory.

We intend to use your responses on the FIRO-B as basic data to see how the FIRO-B relates to the Bi/Polar Inventory.

Your personal responses will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be used only as a study of the reliability of the Bi/Polar Inventory and a study of the relationship between the FIRO-B and the Bi/Polar Inventory.

Please complete both the BI/POLAR INVENTORY OF STRENGTHS and the FIRO-B with its authorization to use it in research. It takes only about ten minutes to complete each one. After completing them, return them to us in the stamped pre-addressed envelope that we have enclosed. In order to get our research done on a timely basis, we need to receive your completed inventories by January 30, 1978.

We would be glad to send you your scores on the Bi/Polar Inventory. If you want us to send them to you, please put a note, together with your address, on the completed Bi/Polar Inventory you return to us.

Thanks for your time, effort and interest.

Sincerely,

*J. W. Thomas*  
J. W. Thomas

Enc.  
JWT:pf