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The purpose of this article is to integrate previous theory and research addressing interpersonal complementarity, a construct that is central to refined and extended research and clinical applications of interpersonal theory. The article first describes the 1982 Interpersonal Circle, which the author constructed as a comprehensive taxonomy of the domain of two-dimensional interpersonal behavior. The 1982 Circle integrates and expands the content of four major adult interpersonal measures (LaForge & Suczek's Interpersonal Check List, Wiggins's Interpersonal Adjective Scales, Lorr & McNair's Interpersonal Behavior Inventory, and Kiesler et al.'s Impact Message Inventory) to provide a circle taxonomy consisting of 16 segments, 128 subclasses, 2 levels, and 350 bipolar items. Second, the article reviews previous conceptions of interpersonal complementarity and, using the 1982 Circle as a theoretical and operational guide, derives 11 propositions of complementarity as they apply in personality, psychopathology, and psychotherapy.

Various writers argue that interpersonal theory has significant implications for the study of personality, abnormality, and psychotherapy (Adams, 1964; Anchin & Kiesler, 1982; Bierman, 1969; Carson, 1969; Chance, 1966; DeVogue & Beck, 1978; Foa, 1961; Kiesler, 1979, 1982b; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976; Leary, 1957; McLemore & Benjamin, 1979; Wiggins, 1982). Unfortunately, the full power of interpersonal theory has yet to be convincingly demonstrated, and, as Wiggins (1982) observes, the interpersonal “approach has not been accorded as prominent a place in the mainstream of clinical thought as its proponents would desire” (p. 183).

One reason for this attenuated impact is that interpersonal researchers have directed the bulk of their energies to the area of personality, with considerably less theoretical or empirical attention being devoted to issues of psychopathology and psychotherapy. Another reason is that available two-dimensional interpersonal measures, although generating large bodies of empirical findings, are neither theoretically nor empirically comprehensive or precise enough to validly test central propositions of interpersonal theory or to guide concrete applications to assessment and therapy for abnormal behavior.

The purpose of this article is to integrate previous theory and research addressing interpersonal complementarity, a construct that is central to refined and extended concrete applications of interpersonal theory. I will first present the 1982 Interpersonal Circle, a taxonomy that represents my schematization and integration of adult two-dimensional circle measures developed by previous investigators. As I will document, none of these previous versions possesses the full range of logical and empirical properties necessary for precise and comprehensive derivation of theoretical propositions and empirical applications. Second, using the 1982 Circle as a
theoretical and operational guide, I will turn
to a systematic review and derivation of prop-
ositions of complementarity that are basic to
heuristic applications of interpersonal theory.

The 1982 Interpersonal Circle

Wiggins (1982) provides an excellent sum-
mary and critique of two-dimensional and
other interpersonal measures. His analysis,
critiques, conclusions, and especially his own
circle measure served as fundamental guide-
lines for development of the 1982 Circle. The
latter integrates the content domains of the
following four major adult, two-dimensional
measures: (a) the Interpersonal Check List
(ICL; LaForge & Suczek, 1955; Leary, 1957;
LaForge, Note 1), (b) the Interpersonal Be-
havior Inventory (IBI; Lorr & McNair, 1965,
1967), (c) the Interpersonal Adjective Scales
(IAS; Wiggins, 1979, Note 2), and (d) the Im-
 pact Message Inventory (IMI; Kiesler et al.,
1976; Perkins et al., 1979).

Essentially, the 1982 Circle expands the
work of Wiggins (1979, 1982) by providing
a taxonomy consisting of a large item sample
of the universe of possible two-dimensional
behaviors. From this item sample, alternative
forms of self-report and rating measures can
be constructed and, from a match of category
content, new measures using different item
formats can be derived. The 1982 Circle thus
serves as a comprehensive taxonomy of the
domain of two-dimensional interpersonal be-
behavior to which extant and future measures
or constructs may be compared, contrasted,
and/or anchored.

The basic problem with the four major
adult, two-dimensional circle measures is
that none incorporates the full range of the
following theoretical, methodological, and
empirical features necessary for a compre-
hen sive and heuristic interpersonal circle.
Most of these individual features have been
articulated clearly by the authors of the pre-
vious measures, yet the fact remains that
none of these empirical translations incor-
porates all of them.

1. An interpersonal circle defines a cir-
cular array of categories (segments)—factor
analytic findings usually yielding 16 (A-P)—
that operationalizes the domain of interper-
sonal behavior. The ordering of categories is
circular in that it is without beginning or end.

2. On the circular continuum, categories
or segments located at polar ends of circle
diameters are defined as classes of interper-
sonal behavior representing behavioral con-
trasts and/or semantic opposites. Hence,
each of the 16 segments should be highly
negatively correlated with its opposite and
show zero correlations with theoretically or-
thogonal segments. Wiggins (1982) docu-
ments that categories present in circle mea-
sures other than his IAS, and especially in the
ICL, are not consistently arranged so that
logical opposites appear directly across the
eight diameters of the circle. This represents
a deadly criticism of any interpersonal mea-
sure, because the principle of opposites (Ben-
jamin, 1974; Wiggins, 1982) defines a basic
circle characteristic without which it is im-
possible to derive precise and consistent pre-
dictions of interpersonal complementarity.

3. The circular array represents a two-di-
 mensional Euclidian space reflecting the joint
action of two basic interpersonal dimensions
or motivations, almost universally designated
Control and Affiliation. These dimensions
define, respectively, the vertical and horizon-
tal axes of the circle. A large body of research
reviewed by Berzins (1977), Bierman (1969),
Carson (1969), DeVogue and Beck (1978),
Foa (1961), and Wiggins (1982) convincingly
demonstrates that interpersonal behavior
represents the joint expression of these two
underlying dimensions. Hence, this criterion
reflects the assumption that pairs of inter-
actants, in their daily transactions, are ne-
gotiating mutually satisfactory definitions re-
garding who is going to be more or less in
control or dominant and what is to be the
characteristic level of friendliness or hostility.

4. Each of the 16 segments is a blend of
the two axis dimensions reflecting mathe-
 matically weighted combinations of Control
(−4 through 0 to +4) and Affiliation (−4
through 0 to +4). That is, force fields emitted
by human interactants are defined in terms
of the mathematical weightings or loadings
of each one's respective behavioral segments
on the two axes of Control and Affiliation.
For example, a person's behaviors defined at
Segment H exhibit −1 friendly and −3 dom-
inant components, whereas a person's be-
haviors at Segment B show —1 friendly, +3 dominant elements. This criterion is essential because validation of propositions of complementarity requires segment definitions that match the precise circle mathematics specified originally by LaForge and Suczek (1955) and Leary (1957).

5. Empirical intercorrelations among the 16 segments should reveal a circumplex ordering (Guttman, 1954) wherein segments of interpersonal behavior adjacent on the circumference are positively correlated, and segments opposite on the circle are negatively correlated (LaForge & Suczek, 1955). This ordering is confirmed by the presence of a particular pattern of coefficients found in the matrix of intercorrelations among the 16 segments. A circumplex pattern exists in a matrix when "the highest correlations are next to the principal diagonal which runs from the upper left to the lower right corner. Along any row (or column) the correlations decrease in size as one moves farther away from the main diagonal and then increase again" (Lorr & McNair, 1965, p. 824).

6. For each of the 16 segments, the radius of the circle represents the intensity or extremeness of corresponding interpersonal behaviors. The degree of extremeness or abnormality of a particular behavior is represented precisely by its distance from the midpoint of the circle (LaForge & Suczek, 1955; Leary, 1957).

7. To permit precise assessment of the entire continuum of mild to extreme interpersonal behaviors, a circle should provide at least two (ideally more) levels of definitions and operationalizations for each of the 16 segments. This criterion asserts that level differentiation is crucial for validation of interpersonal theory. For example, interpersonal theorists (e.g., Leary, 1957) define abnormal behavior in two ways: (a) as rigid adherence to 1 or a few of the 16 segments of the interpersonal circle; and (b) as behaviors at extreme levels of 1 or a few circle segments. Differentiation of abnormal from normal interpersonal behavior, therefore, requires a measure sensitive to the entire radius continuum (mild to severe) of each circle segment. If interpersonal researchers are to make significant contributions to the diagnosis of maladjusted behavior by using the interpersonal circle as an alternative to Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III; American Psychiatric Association, 1980) nosology (Adams, 1964; McLemore & Benjamin, 1979), then the extreme levels of each of the 16 segments need to be clearly separable from milder and more normal levels.

8. To facilitate precise discriminations among interpersonal behaviors, definitions and operationalizations of each level of a particular segment should show minimal semantic/behavioral overlap with adjacent or other segments.

9. For comprehensive assessment and precise discrimination of interpersonal behavior, if possible, each segment should be elaborated further by defined subclasses of behavior at each level.

10. Circle items describing interpersonal behaviors should be in the form of either unambiguous adjectives or verb phrases describing overt behaviors, or both. One of the frustrations of interpersonal checklists is the semantic ambiguity inherent in many, if not most, adjective items. For example, describing a person's behavior as "severe" can denote either a person who is strict or rigorous in judging and disciplining others (which defines his or her behavior at Segment D of the circle) or a person who behaves harmfully, abusively, ruthlessly, sadistically, and so forth (which defines his or her behavior at Segment E). In response to this problem Lorr and McNair (1965) developed their IBI by translating ICL adjective items into items that described corresponding overt interpersonal behaviors. Buss and Craik (1981) emphasize delineation of interpersonal acts in contrast to dispositions reflected by adjectival behavioral descriptions. Their act-in-context units anchor interpersonal assessment in both overt behaviors and situations simultaneously. Hence, if a circle taxonomy is to guide reliable and valid characterizations of interpersonal behavior, it must be composed of unambiguous adjective items and/or items that directly reference overt interpersonal behaviors.

11. Circle definitions should be sufficiently operational in form to permit independent investigators reliably to cross-classify
12. A circle should permit precise derivation of propositions of complementarity for each of the two levels of each of the 16 segments, as well as for circle octants and quadrants. Although each of the four major adult two-dimensional measures defines 15 or 16 segments, none has been able to classify subjects’ behaviors reliably into individual segments (Wiggins, 1982). Instead, the best that seems presently possible is classification of subjects’ behaviors into octants. Also, investigators disagree as to the most heuristic tactic for data analysis, with some arguing for analysis of segments (LaForge, Note 1), some for octants (Leary, 1957), and others for quadrants (Carson, 1969). What this last criterion asserts is that for derivation of precise laws of complementarity, measures are required that can classify interpersonal behaviors at one of the two levels of 1 of the 16 segments. Precise placement into segment levels seems necessary if we are to develop the full power of the circle to assess the entire range of individual differences in interpersonal behavior.

Of the four major adult two-dimensional measures (ICL, IBI, IAS, IMI) none incorporates all 12 of these essential criteria—all fall short on at least 5. In contrast, the 1982 Circle taxonomy was designed to meet exactly all 12 criteria. Figure 1 depicts the 16 segments of the 1982 Circle. Table 1 lists the bipolar subclasses that define mild-moderate versus extreme levels of each of the 16 segments, as well as the number of circle items that operationalizes each.

The 1982 Circle items were constructed by the laborious and obsessive pursuit of an exhaustive list of synonyms and antonyms for each item present or implied in the ICL, IBI, IAS, and IMI. When possible, adjectives were also translated into verb-phrase descriptions of overt interpersonal behaviors. Because of the superior circumplex structure Wiggins (1982) has demonstrated for his measure, IAS items were used as initial markers for segment location and definition. This was followed by multiple classifications and reclassifications of items as they were arranged under each level of each of the 16 segments. Additional reclassifications occurred as it became clear that each segment could be further differentiated into several subclasses. The final step in this iterative process was classification of synonym–antonym, bipolar adjective, and verb-phrase items under each subclass of each level of each segment pair until the final list seemed relatively exhaustive or representative. The major aids I used in this task, in addition to the items from the previous measures, were the Random House Dictionary: Unabridged Edition and Doubleday’s Roget’s Thesaurus in Dictionary Form, with backup from Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary and Webster’s Collegiate Thesaurus.

The final list of 350 bipolar items has an item format distinct from all previous interpersonal measures. Instead of listing unipolar adjective or verb-phrase descriptions, each of the 350 bipolar 1982 items defines an interpersonal behavior for both a particular segment and for its behavioral/semantic opposite (located at the segment directly across the diameter of the circle), as illustrated by the following Segment A and Segment I items:

1. able to give orders easily led
2. talks others into doing what he wants
3. often assumes responsibility avoids
4. influential ineffective with others

Each of these four items simultaneously defines a person’s behavior on Segment A and on its opposite, Segment I. Item 1 assesses both A:Dominant (“able to give orders”) and its opposite, I:Submissive (“easily led”).

As a result of this bipolar format, one pole of the 350 items defines 8 of the 16 segments and the other pole defines the other 8 opposite segments. If this bipolar format were

---

1 The complete 1982 Circle taxonomy including segment, level, and subclass definitions as well as their respective bipolar items (a total of 350) can be found in Kiesler (Note 3). The manuscript, which is available from the author, also classifies each of the items from the ICL, IBI, IAS, and IMI under its corresponding 1982 Circle segment and level.
eliminated, each bipolar item could yield two unipolar items: For example, Item 1 could yield 1a ("able to give orders," Segment A) and 1b ("easily led," Segment I). However, for the 1982 Circle taxonomy the bipolar format was considered essential for two reasons: (a) to ensure that the principle of opposites (Benjamin, 1974; Wiggins, 1982) was built into every aspect of the 1982 Circle, and (b) to eliminate the behavioral/semantic ambiguity so often inherent in adjective items.

Figure 1 and Table 1 show that each of the 16 segments is assigned three separate labels. One label designates the entire continuum (the circle radius) of interpersonal behaviors constituting a particular segment (e.g., A: Dominant, E: Hostile, I: Submissive, M: Friendly). A second label designates the mild–moderate level of a particular segment continuum (e.g., A1: Controlling, E1: Antagonistic/Harmful, I1: Docile, M1: Cooperative/Helpful). A third names the extreme level of a particular segment (e.g., A2: Dictatorial, E2: Rancorous/Sadistic, I2: Subservient, M2: Devoted/Indulgent).

(text continues on page 192)
Table 1
Levels and Subclasses for the Eight Pairs of Opposing Segments for the 1982 Interpersonal Circle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment, level, and subclass</th>
<th>Opposing segment, level, and subclass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Dominant (38)</td>
<td>I: Submissive (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1: Controlling (21)</td>
<td>I1: Docile (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Leading/influencing (7)</td>
<td>a. Following/complying (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Active/self-assertive (4)</td>
<td>b. Passive/acquiescent (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Strong/managing (5)</td>
<td>c. Weak/yielding (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Taking-charge (5)</td>
<td>d. Obedient (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2: Dictatorial (17)</td>
<td>I2: Subservient (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Commanding (5)</td>
<td>a. Servile (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Overbearing (5)</td>
<td>b. Spineless (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bossy (3)</td>
<td>c. Submissive (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Tyrannical (4)</td>
<td>d. Slavish/fawning (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Competitive (45)</td>
<td>J: Deferent (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1: Critical/Ambitious (25)</td>
<td>J1: Respectful/Content (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Energetic (7)</td>
<td>a. Insolent (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Enterprising (6)</td>
<td>b. Unimaginative (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Competitive (7)</td>
<td>c. Content (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Critical (5)</td>
<td>d. Approving (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: Rivalrous/Disdainful (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Driven (4)</td>
<td>a. Listless (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Daringly shrewd (4)</td>
<td>b. Densely naive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Rivalrous (6)</td>
<td>c. Ambitionless (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disdainful (6)</td>
<td>d. Flattering (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Mistrusting (51)</td>
<td>K: Trusting (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1: Suspicious/Resentful (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Vigilant (4)</td>
<td>a. Unguarded (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Suspicious/jealous (9)</td>
<td>b. Trusting (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cunning (5)</td>
<td>c. Innocent (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Resentful (4)</td>
<td>d. Forgiving (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Covetous/stingy (6)</td>
<td>c. Generous (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: Paranoid/Vindictive (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Hypervigilant (4)</td>
<td>a. Totally unwary (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Paranoid/blindingly jealous (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Crafty/exploitative (6)</td>
<td>b. Gullible (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Vindictive (4)</td>
<td>c. Guileless (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Avaricious/envious (4)</td>
<td>d. Merciful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Cold (37)</td>
<td>K2: Gullible/Merciful (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: Cold/Punitive (19)</td>
<td>a. Totally unwary (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cold (5)</td>
<td>b. Gullible (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Stern (8)</td>
<td>c. Guileless (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Strict/punitive (6)</td>
<td>d. Merciful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: Icy/Cruel (18)</td>
<td>e. Prodigal (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Icy (5)</td>
<td>(table continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Harsh (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Inflexible/cruel (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment, level, and subclass</th>
<th>Opposing segment, level, and subclass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong>: Hostile (44)</td>
<td><strong>M</strong>: Friendly (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₁: Antagonistic/Harmful (22)</td>
<td>M₁: Cooperative/Helpful (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Antagonistic (7)</td>
<td>a. Cooperative (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Quarrelsome (5)</td>
<td>b. Agreeable (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Impolite (5)</td>
<td>c. Courteous (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Harmful (5)</td>
<td>d. Helpful (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂: Rancorous/Sadistic (22)</td>
<td>M₂: Devoted/Indulgent (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rancorous (5)</td>
<td>a. Devoted (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Belligerent (6)</td>
<td>b. Concurring (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Rude (3)</td>
<td>c. Hypercivil (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sadistic (8)</td>
<td>d. Indulgent/consoling (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong>: Detached (39)</td>
<td><strong>N</strong>: Sociable (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁: Aloof (20)</td>
<td>N₁: Outgoing (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Distinterested (6)</td>
<td>a. Involved (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Distant (7)</td>
<td>b. Sociable (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preoccupied (7)</td>
<td>c. Extraverted (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₂: Escapist (19)</td>
<td>N₂: Frenetically Gregarious (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Disengaged (4)</td>
<td>a. Intrusive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hermetic (7)</td>
<td>b. Monophobic (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Autistic/ eccentric (8)</td>
<td>c. Hyperactive/hyperconventional (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong>: Inhibited (41)</td>
<td><strong>O</strong>: Exhibitionistic (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G₁: Taciturn (24)</td>
<td>O₁: Spontaneous/Demonstrative (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Silent/private (7)</td>
<td>a. Talkative/disclosing (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Undemonstrative (4)</td>
<td>b. Demonstrative (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Stiff/ controlled (9)</td>
<td>c. Casual/spontaneous (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Opinionated (4)</td>
<td>d. Suggestible (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G₂: Unresponsive (17)</td>
<td>O₂: Histrionic (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Mute (5)</td>
<td>a. Loquacious/divulging (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Apathetic (4)</td>
<td>b. Histrionic (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Catatonic (4)</td>
<td>c. Impulsive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Obstinate (4)</td>
<td>d. Hypersuggestible (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong>: Unassured (53)</td>
<td><strong>P</strong>: Assured (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁: Self-doubting/ Dependent (28)</td>
<td>P₁: Confident/ Self-Reliant (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Self-doubting (9)</td>
<td>a. Confident (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dependent (5)</td>
<td>b. Self-reliant (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unassured (5)</td>
<td>c. Assured (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Awkward (5)</td>
<td>d. Self-composed (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Glum (4)</td>
<td>e. Cheerful (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Abusive (9)</td>
<td>a. Egotistical (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Helpless (5)</td>
<td>b. Rigidly autonomous (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Immobilized (4)</td>
<td>c. Cocky (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Bumbling (3)</td>
<td>d. Imperturable (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Depressed (4)</td>
<td>e. Euphoric (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers of items for each segment are in parentheses.
Hence, the entire continuum of Segment A is designated Dominant, the mild-moderate level is called Controlling, and the extreme level is named Dictatorial.

Table 1 shows that the number of 1982 items defining each of the 16 segments ranges from 37 to 53, with a median of 42.5, whereas the number of items defining each of the 32 segment levels ranges from 17 to 24, with a median of 21.5. Notice further that each segment level also is defined as the bipolar opposite of its corresponding level on the opposite segment (e.g., A₁:Controlling vs. I₁:Docile; A₂:Dictatorial vs. I₂:Subservient).

From Table 1 it can also be seen that each of the two levels for a particular segment is additionally defined by three to five subclasses. For example, Segment A:Dominant is defined by four subclasses at each of the two levels: A₁:Controlling by a:leading/influencing, b:active/self-assertive, c:strong/managing, and d:taking charge; and A₂:Dictatorial by a:commanding, b:overbearing, c:bossy, and d:tyrannical. For any one segment the number of subclasses at the two levels is identical, with the equivalent letters defining mild-moderate versus extreme levels of each subclass (e.g., A₁:a:leading/influencing and A₂:a:commanding; A₁:b:active/self-assertive and A₂:b:overbearing). Table 1 reveals that the number of circle items for each of the 64 segment-pair subclasses ranges from 3 to 9, with a median of 5. By far the majority of subclasses are operationalized by from four to seven circle items.

Not only is each level of each segment subclass operationalized by bipolar items, but each of the 128 subclasses is provided a category definition. For example, the four subclasses of level A₁:Controlling are defined as follows:

a. Leading/influencing: to tell or show the way by instruction, helpful information, or advice; to guide another in direction, course, action, opinion, and so forth; to exercise power over the minds or behavior of others; to affect, sway, move, or impel another to some action by direct or indirect means such as tact, address, artifice, and so forth.

b. Active/self-assertive: to be busy or frequently engaged in action; to be quick and diligent in doing, acting, performing, or working; to put oneself forward boldly and insistently and to resist influence.

c. Strong/managing: to engage others as mentally and morally powerful, firm, and courageous; to direct others toward a goal; to make decisions for others, for groups, or for organizations; to manipulate resources and expenditures to accomplish a purpose.

d. Taking charge: to charge, command, order, instruct, and direct others to do or not do something; to exercise direction or restraint over others.

The corresponding four subclasses of A₂:Dictatorial are similarly defined, as are the subclasses for all other circle segments.

It can also be seen from Table 1 that for the eight pairs of opposing segments the number of subclasses is identical, each pair being defined by the same bipolar items. To illustrate, Segment I:Submissive is operationalized by four subclasses at each level, just as is its opposite, Segment A:Dominant. Furthermore, the four subclasses of I₁:Docile are opposites, respectively, of the four subclasses of A₁:Controlling (e.g., I₁:a:following/complying vs. A₁:a:leading/influencing; I₁:b:passive/acquiescent vs. A₁:b:active/self-assertive). Similarly, the four subclasses of I₂:Subservient are opposites, respectively, of the four subclasses of A₂:Dictatorial (e.g., I₂:a:servile vs. A₂:a:commanding; I₂:b:spineless vs. A₂:b:overbearing).

In sum, the 1982 Circle contains 350 bipolar (700 unipolar equivalents) interpersonal items, 3 to 9 of which operationalize 1 of 64 segment-pair subclasses at either the mild–moderate or extreme levels of each of 16 segments. Each of the two levels of each of the 16 segments is operationalized by 3 to 5 subclasses, with the number of items defining each of the 32 levels ranging from 17 to 28, with a median of 21.5. Finally, each of the 16 segments (including both levels) is defined by 37 to 53 items, with a median of 42.6.

Table 2 compares the 1982 Circle item structure to that of the four two-dimensional circle measures. As can be seen, only the 1982 Circle provides a further breakdown of each segment into subclasses. Second, only the 1982 Circle and the ICL provide items for assessing two levels of each segment, with
the 1982 Circle averaging four times as many items for each of the 32 levels. Also, the 1982 Circle provides about five times as many items per segment as does any of the other measures.

Figure 2 depicts locations on the 1982 Circle of corresponding ICL, IAS, IBI, and IMI segments based on my content analysis of the latter segment items. Because the IMI was derived directly from the IBI, IMI segments exactly overlap IBI placements.

From Figure 2 it is apparent first that all four inventories differ from the 1982 Circle in either segment representation, placement, or both. Second, all four inventories are quite consistent with the 1982 Circle in representation and placement of the segments that anchor bipolar opposites on the Control and Affiliation axes, namely segments A, E, I, and M. Indeed, based on my content analysis, the ICL, IBI, and IMI all “overkill” in assessment of these circle positions by using two or more segment scales. Also, Figure 2 provides ample evidence that among two-dimensional circle measures, Dominant and Submissive segments anchor the poles of the Control axis, whereas Friendly and Hostile segments define the poles of the Affiliation dimension. The following sections summarize how each of the four measures contrasts with the 1982 Circle.

The Interpersonal Check List (ICL)

Figure 2 confirms some of the deficiencies of the ICL noted by other writers. A major shortcoming of the ICL is that it offers very few, if any, items to measure the 1982 segments O and N and their opposites, F and G. In other words the ICL contains serious measurement gaps in the top-right and bottom-left quadrants. Lorr and McNair (1965) noted these same gaps and constructed their Detachment, Deference, Affiliation, Sociability, and Exhibition scales to remedy the situation. Similarly, Wiggins (1979) developed his F:Aloof, G:Introverted, O:Extraverted, and N:Gregarious segments to remedy the problem. It follows from these segment omissions that the ICL cannot measure a good one fourth of the range of two-dimensional interpersonal actions. These gaps also indicate that many of the rules of complementarity that Leary (1957) specified for the ICL octants are incomplete, inconsistent, and/or invalid. Furthermore, some equivalently labeled ICL segments represent redundant measurement of other 1982 segments. That is, ICL N and O actually measure the 1982 L and M segments, ICL F is a redundant measure of 1982 E, and ICL G shares in anchoring 1982 C.

A second major shortcoming of the ICL described by Wiggins (1982) is its “lack of polarity between variables opposite to each other on the circle” (p. 197). Wiggins was careful to construct his IAS to avoid some of the spurious semantic contrasts present in several ICL opposites. For example, ICL Success versus Masochism was revised to produce the more genuine IAS semantic contrast of Ambitious versus Lazy; and ICL Narcissism versus Conformity was redefined for the IAS as Arrogant versus Unassuming. The 1982 Circle, in addition to using the IAS as its major marker measure, was also carefully

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1982 Circle</th>
<th>ICL</th>
<th>IBI</th>
<th>IMI</th>
<th>IAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of categories measured</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclasses</td>
<td>64 (128)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ICL = Interpersonal Check List; IBI = Interpersonal Behavior Inventory; IMI = Impact Message Inventory; IAS = Interpersonal Adjective Scales.

*Because the 1982 items are bipolar, one pole of the 348 items defines 64 subclasses for 8 segments; the other pole defines 64 corresponding subclasses for the 8 opposite segments—a total of 128 subclasses for the 16 circle segments. Similarly, each of the 350 bipolar items simultaneously assesses two segments—hence the monopolar item equivalent is 700 (2 x 350).
constructed in all aspects to avoid ungenuine segment opposites. Indeed, as described earlier, the principle of opposites permeates every aspect (segment, level, subclass, and item) of the 1982 Circle.

Another problem is that when compared to the 1982 Circle, ICL Segments P and B are misplaced and their locations need to be exchanged. Curiously, however, the corresponding opposite ICL segments, H and J, are correctly placed. This is further validation of Wiggins's (1982) criticism that many of the ICL segment opposites are semantically invalid.
On the other hand, a major strength of the ICL is that it provides for systematic assessment of the two levels of intensity on each of the 16 segment continua. The 1982 Circle retains this crucial circle feature and markedly increases the number of items used to measure the two levels.

The Interpersonal Adjective Scales (IAS)

From Figure 2 it is apparent that the 1982 Circle and Wiggins's IAS show perfect overlap with the exception of placement of four segments. This is as expected because the IAS was used as the major marker measure for construction of the 1982 Circle. However, the IAS B and P segments—and as a result their corresponding opposites, J and H—are apparently misplaced. The IAS places Ambitious at P and Arrogant at B, whereas the 1982 Circle reverses this placement. This reversal, in turn, necessitates reversal of their opposites, so that IAS J: Unassuming is moved to 1982 H and IAS H: Lazy is relocated at 1982 J.

The 1982 placements seem more logically valid because they fit more precisely the mathematical weightings of Control and Affiliation for the respective segments. That is, Confident more precisely meets the P segment weightings of +1 Friendly, +3 Dominant than does Ambitious—the latter more precisely meeting the B segment weightings of −1 Friendly, +3 Dominant. Also, factor analyses of both the IBI and IMI place the Competitive segment (the equivalent of Wiggins's P: Ambitious) in the upper-left quadrant consistent with P's 1982 Circle position. Furthermore, the fact that Wiggins's IAS sometimes mixes assessment of the two levels of each segment could also explain its misplacements. That is, the eight adjectives that operationalize Wiggins's P: Ambitious segment are all classified at the mild–moderate level, whereas all eight adjectives that anchor his B: Arrogant segment describe extreme-level behaviors. Intercorrelations could reflect this item level imbalance by pulling the position of Wiggins's extreme-level Arrogant scale from the friendly to the hostile side of A: Dominant.

These exchanges were made with some trepidation because Wiggins's (1982) evidence for IAS circular ordering is impressive. Future research with the 1982 Circle may indicate that my relocations are invalid and that the four segments should be shifted back to Wiggins's positions.

The major shortcoming of the IAS is that it does not provide systematic assessment of both levels (mild–moderate and extreme) of interpersonal acts on each of the 16 segments. My content analysis of IAS items revealed that only 22 of the 128 IAS adjectives could be classified at the extreme level (cf. Kiesler, Note 3). Furthermore, these 22 items are unsystematically placed in only 7 of the 16 segments. Hence, the IAS is primarily a measure of the mild–moderate level with the notable exception of the B: Arrogant segment. In contrast, the 1982 Circle provides systematic assessment of both levels for each of the 16 segments and also expands the content of each segment at both levels to subsume highly correlated but distinct subclasses.

The Interpersonal Behavior Inventory (IBI) and the Impact Message Inventory (IMI)

Because the IMI was derived from the IBI, the following observations regarding the IBI equally characterize the IMI. From Figure 2 it is apparent first that the IBI contains two major assessment gaps: at D in the top-left quadrant and at K in the bottom-right quadrant. The IBI and IMI thus do not measure the 1982 D: Cold and K: Trusting segments of interpersonal actions.

Also, content analysis (Kiesler, Note 3) reveals that four other 1982 segments are only
minimally or poorly measured by the IBI—
1982 E: Hostile subsumes only five IBI Hostility items; G: Inhibited contains only five IBI Inhibition and Detachment items; and the IBI Exhibition items are divided between 1982 Segments O: Exhibitionistic (five items) and P: Assured (three items). Hence, in addition to being completely unable to measure 1982 Segments D and K, the IBI and IMI provide only minimal or partial assessment of Segments E, G, O, and P.

Figure 2 also shows that the IBI and IMI “overkill” in assessment of four other 1982 segments. This is especially the case for 1982 G (which includes two IBI segments: Detachment and Inhibition), for 1982 H (which subsumes two IBI segments: Abasiveness and Succorance), and for 1982 M (which contains two IBI segments: Agreeableness and Nurturance). It is also the case to a lesser degree for 1982 B, which, besides IBI Competitiveness, includes four IBI Hostility items.

Another important shortcoming of the IBI and IMI is that their segments unsystematically mix items that measure mild-moderate and extreme levels of interpersonal acts. Almost one half (61) of the 140 IBI items are classified at the extreme level. Furthermore, mixtures for the various segments are inconsistent, and neither the IBI nor the IMI provides separate scores for the two levels.

An important future task is to revise and expand the IMI to a form where it can systematically assess both levels of the 1982 Circle segments. As Wiggins (1982) observes, a comprehensive interpersonal assessment battery needs to include a measure that targets the covert or inner engagements experienced by interpersonal interactants. The IMI uniquely performs this assessment task, albeit inadequately.

**Summary**

In sum, the ICL, IAS, IBI, and IMI all exhibit both major and minor circle deficiencies. These inadequacies, in turn, (a) preclude valid assessment of the full range of interpersonal actions in their normal and abnormal spheres, (b) prohibit derivation and test of the laws of interpersonal complementarity, (c) delay answers to exact placement on the circle of DSM-III (American Psychiatric Association, 1980) personality and other disorders, and (d) delay construction of differential interpersonal interventions for homogeneous groups of psychotherapy clients whose rigid interpersonal styles are defined at various segments or octants of the interpersonal circle.

It is my contention that the 1982 Circle, in contrast, provides the comprehensive and precise definition and operationalization of the 16 circle segments, which will permit heuristic pursuit of the important problems of personality and psychotherapy. The second section of this article attempts to demonstrate this utility by deriving systematically the laws of complementarity inherent in the 1982 Circle.

Before leaving this section, however, a brief discussion of Benjamin’s (1974, Note 4) Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB) measures is necessary. I did not include the SASB before because it is not in the form of a two-dimensional circle organized around the axes of Control and Affiliation.

Instead, Benjamin’s SASB model is built upon two circumplexes designed to integrate the circles of Leary (1957) and Schaefer (1959). One circumplex, the parentlike or active plane, is constructed around the vertical axis of Power versus Autonomy. The second, the childlike or reaction plane, is constructed around the vertical axis of Individualism versus Submission. This separation of the two planes reflects Benjamin’s assumption that Autonomy is the opposite of Power, whereas Submission is the complement of Power. Accordingly, her second plane depicts the complements (reactions and their opposites) to the interpersonal behaviors (actions and their opposites) arranged on the circumplex of her first plane.

Comparison of Benjamin’s two diagonal planes (reflecting three underlying dimensions) to the two-dimensional framework of the 1982 Circle provides a few conclusions. First, the lower halves of her two planes contain the four quadrants of the 1982 Circle. The lower half of Plane 1 assesses “hostile-power” and “friendly-influence,” and the lower half of Plane 2 measures “hostile-comply” and “friendly-accept.” Second, the remaining upper halves of her two planes describe interpersonal behaviors that seem quite
troublesome to place anywhere within the 1982 Circle. These latter quadrants may measure behaviors restricted more to real parent-child interactions and, hence, occurring less frequently among adult interactants. Third, until very recently Benjamin's two planes were defined solely by the 36 individual items around each diagonal. As Wiggins (1982) observes, Benjamin "tends to analyze all 36 variables on each plane rather than reducing items to a smaller set of octant or sixteenth scales" (p. 195). The unfortunate result is that SASB items are not grouped into the familiar 16 segments with corresponding category definitions, although in her 1980 version Benjamin (Note 4) provides octant clusters for both planes. Fourth, the SASB does not provide systematic categorization of the mild–moderate versus extreme levels of interpersonal acts on the two planes. Fifth, as Wiggins (1982) argues, it is difficult at present to determine with any clarity whether Benjamin's two planes do in fact form separate circumplexes.

Nevertheless, Benjamin's model has demonstrated its fine-tuned power in multiple applications to the psychotherapy situation (Benjamin, 1977, 1979a, 1979b, 1982). Her SASB system has been "by far, to date, the most scientifically rigorous and clinically astute model published" (McLemore & Hart, 1982, p. 233) and "the most detailed, clinically rich, ambitious, and conceptually demanding of all contemporary models" (Wiggins, 1982, p. 193).

A central issue underlying this SASB discussion is whether two or three dimensions more validly represent the basic structure of interpersonal behavior. Two-factor structure is supported by findings for the ICL and especially for the IAS. Inconsistent support comes from findings for the IBI and IMI. And, as Wiggins (1982) concludes, despite the large amounts of evidence presented by Benjamin, it is difficult to answer with any degree of certainty the questions of whether her two SASB planes "do in fact form separate circumplexes, and whether the complementary relations between these two planes are as specified" (p. 195). Before this crucial theoretical question can be answered more definitively, the most essential requirement seems to be availability of two-dimensional circle measures that meet all the logical and empirical criteria outlined earlier and incorporated into the 1982 Circle taxonomy.

Interpersonal Complementarity Revisited

Since Sullivan (1953), a central construct of interpersonal theory has been the reciprocity or complementarity governing the exchanges of human interactants. Surprisingly, little systematic development of this construct has occurred in subsequent interpersonal theory, however. If complementarity is a valid construct, important and multiple understandings and predictions follow for the wide range of human social behavior including interactions between client and therapist. The purpose of this second section is to provide a systematic statement of propositions of complementarity inherent in the interpersonal circle in general and in the 1982 Circle in particular.

Before proceeding with this task, however, two other traditions that have addressed the notion of interpersonal reciprocity need to be mentioned. The first has been provided by interactional communication theorists (Bateson, 1958; Berne, 1964; Goffman, 1967; Haley, 1963; Jackson, 1959; Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Ruesch & Bateson, 1951; Sluzki & Beavin, 1977; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967; Watzlawick & Weakland, 1977; Winch, 1958). These formulations, in contrast to those deriving from the interpersonal circle, have concentrated on reciprocity as it operates on the Control dimension only. That is, reciprocity in an interpersonal exchange represents the constant struggle by each person to control what sort of power relationship is to exist between them (Haley, 1963).

Bateson (1958) was the first to use the terms complementary and symmetrical to describe dissimilar and similar control behaviors among dyadic interactants. Jackson and Haley (Jackson, 1959) elaborated Bateson's notions in the context of their control theory as follows: "In a complementary relationship the two people are of equal status in the sense that one appears to be in the superior position, meaning that he initiates action and the other appears to follow that action." In contrast, a "symmetrical relationship is one between two people who behave
as if they have equal status. Each person exhibits the right to initiate action, criticize the other, offer advice, and so on” (pp. 126–127).

Furthermore, in the complementary relationship the person culturally or contextually recognized as being superior is in the “one-up” or primary position, whereas the person recognized as being inferior is in the “one-down” or secondary position (Haley, 1963). Lederer and Jackson (1968) added a third type of reciprocity, a parallel relationship, wherein control not only tends to have an equal distribution among interactants but also flows easily and alternatingly from A to B to A as the situation changes and dictates.

A second alternative tradition regarding complementarity comes from Schutz’s (1958) three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior, and from research with his Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Scale (FIRO-B). For Schutz, three types of interpersonal reciprocity or compatibility are possible as the result of the operation of three classes of needs: inclusion, control, and affection.

(a) Reciprocal compatibility exists when each participant’s level of “expressed” behavior matches the other’s level of “wanted” behavior for each of the three need areas. (b) Originator compatibility describes reciprocity in regard to who originates and who receives behaviors for each of the three need areas. If both participants prefer to originate behaviors, “competitive” incompatibility exists; if both prefer to receive, “apathetic” incompatibility occurs. (c) Interchange compatibility designates the degree to which both participants rank similarly the respective importance of the three need areas. The FIRO-B measures each of these three types of compatibility.

Now we can bring our focus to bear on the third tradition, interpersonal theory, which offers notions of reciprocity directly derivable from the interpersonal circle itself.

Sullivan (1953) first offered the notion of interpersonal reciprocity with his “theorem of reciprocal emotion,” which states that “integration in an interpersonal situation is a process in which (1) complementary needs are resolved (or aggravated); (2) reciprocal patterns of activity are developed (or disintegrated); and (3) foresight of satisfaction (or rebuff) of similar needs is facilitated” (p. 129). Furthermore, the outcome of a particular integrative attempt may be either conjunctive (leading to inclusion or further interaction) or disjunctive (leading to exclusion or avoidance of further interaction). These integrative attempts occur in the context of a dyadic or larger social system and, in the case of the dyad, neither Person A’s needs nor Person B’s needs alone determine the outcome. Interactants’ interpersonal needs always seek conjoint expression and resolution; hence, interpersonal behavior can be understood only from a systems perspective. This focus on two-person mutual influence or bidirectional causality represents a fundamental novelty of Sullivan’s formulations.

The broadest notion of reciprocity or complementarity, thus, is that our interpersonal actions are designed to invite, pull, elicit, draw, entice, or evoke “restricted classes” of reactions from persons with whom we interact, especially from significant others. Reactions by others to our acts are not random, nor are they likely to include the entire range of possible reactions. Instead, reactions to us tend to be restricted to a relatively narrow range of interpersonal responses. At mostly unaware and automatic levels, our actions are designed to push or force others to respond in ways that are complementary to our acts and that confirm our self-definitions.

For Danziger (1976), “redundancy” is the key aspect of circular causality inherent in this notion of reciprocity or complementarity. That is, human transactions over time show consistencies and regularities; dyads spin out an “orderliness in the sequence of interaction” (p. 184). The sequence contains a series of reciprocal exchanges that shows a significant deviation from chance ordering, which manifests a patterned order.

Unfortunately, Sullivan (1953) offered very little systematic amplification of this theorem. The surviving general notion of complementarity was that actions of human participants are redundantly interrelated (i.e., have patterned regularity) in some manner over the sequence of transactions.

Leary (1957) provided a more systematic restatement of Sullivan’s theory. Equally important, he offered an operational definition of complementarity within his interpersonal circle and by the ICL developed by LaForge
and Suczek (1955). Leary defined his “principle of reciprocal interpersonal relations” as follows: “Interpersonal reflexes tend (with a probability significantly greater than chance) to initiate or invite reciprocal interpersonal responses from the ‘other’ person in the interaction that lead to a repetition of the original reflex” (p. 123). Furthermore, a person provokes responses from others that reinforce the person’s original actions, a feature Leary called “the reinforcing quality of social interaction” (p. 123).

Throughout his book Leary highlighted this “reciprocal nature of social interaction, the reflex way in which humans tailor their responses to others, and the automatic way in which they force others to react to them” (p. 83); this “reciprocal process by which human beings tend to pull from others responses that tend to maintain their limited security operations” (p. 112); and this “automatic process by which we pull certain reactions from others and, in turn, respond with a limited set of behaviors” (p. 156).

Surprisingly, Leary did not explicitly define the rules of complementarity, although they were clearly implicit in his interpersonal circle and were explicitly applied to personality and clinical groups in the second half of his volume. Leary did clearly identify two major dimensions or motivations that formed the structure of interpersonal behavior (and the interpersonal circle)—namely, dominance–submission and love–hate. Implied throughout his volume was the fact that the vertical axis of his circle reflected the rule that dominant reflexes elicit submissive reactions, and vice versa, whereas on the horizontal axis love pulls love, and hate elicits hate. These basic rules were illustrated in Leary’s detailed descriptions of eight interpersonal styles, or personalities, and their psychiatric equivalents, which could be classified at the various octants of his circle. In these descriptions, interpersonal styles on the left side of the circle pulled complementary octants residing in the other quadrant of the left side (e.g., FG pulled CD), whereas right-side octants pulled octants falling in the other quadrant on the right side (e.g., NO pulled KL).

It was left to Carson (1969) to articulate the principle of complementarity implicitly present and explicitly applied throughout Leary’s volume. Carson first restated Leary’s principle of reciprocal interpersonal relations as follows: “The purpose of interpersonal behavior, in terms of its security-maintenance functions, is to induce from the other person behavior that is complementary to the behavior proffered” (p. 112). Adopting Leary’s two basic circle dimensions, Carson observed that interpersonal behaviors convey implicit messages that give or deny love or status to the self or to the other person. Hence, “an interpersonal act represents, in part, a prompt or ‘bid’ to elicit response behavior falling within a certain range of the interpersonal circle” (p. 115), and “the adoption of a particular interpersonal stance in large part serves the function of producing a particular stance in the other person” (p. 143).

Carson also offered an important explicit definition of the complementarity that governs interpersonal relations. “Generally speaking, complementarity occurs on the basis of reciprocity in respect to the dominance–submission axis (dominance tends to induce submission, and vice versa), and on the basis of correspondence in respect to the hate-love axis (hate induces hate, and love induces love)” (p. 112). Thus, Carson designated complementarity as the more general term and defined the two subsidiary concepts of reciprocity and correspondence. Also, echoing Leary, he reiterated the assumption that a “complementary interaction is in itself mutually rewarding to at least some degree, probably by way of enhancing the security of both participants” (p. 145).

In addition, Carson was the first to specify the contrasting but crucial anticomplementary and noncomplementary relationships as they operate on the quadrants of Leary’s interpersonal circle. Carson renamed Leary’s horizontal axis “hostile–friendly”; the resulting quadrants became “hostile–dominant” (HD), “friendly–dominant” (FD), “hostile–submissive” (HS), and “friendly–submissive” (FS). “When a person ‘offers’ behavior falling within any of the quadrants of the interpersonal circle, he is, in effect, ‘inviting’ the other person to adopt a complementary stance in respect to both of the principal dimensions of the circle” (p. 147). However, the participant’s reactions can take one of three distinct
forms. (a) “If the other person ‘accepts’ both aspects of the invitation or proposal” (p. 147), he adopts the complementary position (i.e., HD pulls HS, HS pulls HD, FD pulls FS, FS pulls FD). (b) If the other person accepts only one of the component messages, he adopts a noncomplementary position (i.e., HD pulls FS, FS pulls HD, FD pulls HS, HS pulls FD). (c) Finally, if the other person rejects both aspects of the invitation or proposal, he adopts an anticomplementary position (i.e., HD pulls FD, FD pulls HD, HS pulls FS, FS pulls HS). In the remainder of this article I will refer to Carson’s noncomplementary response as the acomplementary response, and use “noncomplementary” to subsume both acomplementary and anticomplementary responses.

According to Carson, a complementary interaction is in itself mutually rewarding to at least some degree. Similarly, the acomplementary interaction, “although lacking perfect complementarity, nevertheless leaves open a channel of potential transaction and negotiation” (p. 147) and, hence, is potentially still mutually rewarding. In contrast, the anticomplementary interaction, because it involves rejection of the person’s bid for both love and status, embodies “a relatively complete repudiation” (p. 148) of the person’s proffered self-definition. As a result, “it leaves very little ground upon which to effect a sustained engagement” (pp. 147–148) and, potentially, is minimally rewarding or aversive.

It is necessary to point out that neither Leary nor Carson specified another type of acomplementarity inherent in the interpersonal circle, namely, what occurs when Person A and Person B fall at identical circle quadrants or segments. That is, a hostile-dominant person can interact with another hostile-dominant person, a friendly-submissive person with another friendly-submissive person, and so on. These interactions involving identical styles are acomplementary because complementarity exists on one axis but not on the other (e.g., in the case of FD–FD, correspondence exists on “hostile–friendly,” but nonreciprocity exists on “dominance–submission”). Hence, from this point on I will distinguish two types of acomplementarity: isomorphic, or those transactions in which interactants show identical styles at the segment, octant, or quadrant levels, and semimorphic, or those other acomplementary transactions that show complementarity on one but not both circle axes. As we will see, the semimorphic acomplementary response always falls at segments directly opposite on the circle.

It is interesting to note that these complementary and noncomplementary characterizations represent an important departure of interpersonal theory from the commonsense notions that either “opposites” or “likes” attract. In interpersonal theory, likes (isomorphics) and opposites (semimorphics) only partially attract, whereas they also partially repel. Rather, complementaries attract totally and anticomplementaries repel totally.

Benjamin (1974), applying Carson’s complementarity and noncomplementarity concepts to development of her three-dimensional SASB model, offered the first circle definition of the concept of opposites. For her, opposites are defined as segments that reflect the same proportions of the underlying dimensions (Control and Affiliation for two-dimensional measures), except that the signs are changed. For example, Segment B is the opposite of Segment J because B is defined mathematically as −1 Affiliation, +3 Control, whereas J is defined as +1 Affiliation, −3 Control. The principle of opposites (cf. also Wiggins, 1982) represents a circle property essential to precise definition of complementarity, acomplementarity, or anticomplementarity. In order for the mathematics of Euclidian space to apply, each of the 16 segments needs to define acts behaviorally and semantically opposite to the segment at the other end of a particular circle diameter. Valid laws of complementarity cannot be derived from the interpersonal circle unless it contains, as does the 1982 Circle, eight pairs of exact segment opposites that define clearly contrasting classes of interpersonal acts.

Having completed this review of interpersonal circle notions of complementarity, I will now summarize these formulations with three theoretical propositions.

**PROPOSITION 1.** A person’s interpersonal actions tend (with a probability significantly
greater than chance) to initiate, invite, or evoke from an interactant complementary responses that lead to a repetition of the person's original actions.

Interpersonal behaviors, in a relatively unaware, automatic, and unintended fashion tend to invite, elicit, pull, draw, or entice from interactants restricted classes of reactions that are reinforcing of, and consistent with, a person's proffered self-definition. If complementary reactions are not forthcoming from interactants, the relationship will either not endure or it will be altered in such a manner that complementarity is established.

This proposition is a restatement of Leary's (1957) principle of reciprocal interpersonal relations. It also describes the "command" level (in contrast to the "report" level) of human communication described by Bateson (1958) and Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967).

From his "communications analytic" position, Beier (1966) labeled a particular interpersonal action the "evoking message." According to Beier, the evoking message imposes a condition of emotional engagement on a decoder, and, as a result, the decoder countercommunicates as the encoder wishes, without being aware of complying. The encoder also is unaware that he or she has imposed a condition or sent a command message and, consequently, obtains responses from decoders for which he or she cannot account, even though the responses were self-elicited. Beier contrasts the evoking message to the "persuasive message" in which the encoder is aware of what he or she wants from or is imposing on the decoder. Beier (1966) notes:

The evoking message is probably one of the basic tools used by individuals to maintain their consistency of personality. With this message an individual can elicit responses without being aware that he is responsible for doing so. To a certain extent he can create his environment without feeling that he is accountable for the responses which come his way. (p. 13)

Kiesler (1979, 1982a; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976; Kiesler, Note 5) places Beier's evoking message and its decoder equivalent, the impact message," in central positions in his interpersonal communication theory for psychopathology and psychotherapy. For Kiesler, the impact message refers to the distinctive pattern, the particular complex of covert, internal engagements (feelings, cognitions, fantasies) an interactant recurrently experiences as the direct effects of a person's interpersonal behavior. Kiesler and his colleagues developed the IMI to operationalize the domain of impact messages in personality and psychotherapy.

PROPOSITION 2. For interpersonal behavior as operationalized by the two-dimensional interpersonal circle, complementarity occurs on the basis of (a) reciprocity in respect to the Control dimension or axis (dominance pulls submission, submission pulls dominance), and (b) correspondence in respect to the Affiliation dimension (hostility pulls hostility, friendliness pulls friendliness).


This proposition has significant implications for redefinition of "social reinforcement" in behavior theory and therapy, as DeVogue and Beck (1978) and Kiesler, Bernstein and Anchin (1976) have argued. For example, DeVogue and Beck observe:

Only in friendly dominant/friendly submissive dyads . . . would social "reinforcement" in the form of praise and approval have its maximum effect. In any nonreciprocal dyad (i.e., in which the subject attempted to utilize hostile dominance, hostile submission, or friendly dominance) we could predict less frequent use of the target response by the subject than in this reciprocal dyad (where the subject displayed a friendly submissive tactic) . . . It could also be predicted that within any of these nonreciprocal dyads, but especially when the subject attempts to use hostile dominance vis-a-vis the reinforcer, the subject may show a decrease in the target response in order to avoid the aversive stimulation of praise and approval. (p. 221)
Further, for those people employing tactics for which the reciprocal is unfriendliness, coldness, rejection, dependency, or deference from others, praise and approval are aversive stimuli. In fact, for the latter group a replicated finding is that the removal of praise and approval has functioned as a negative reinforcer. In short . . . those most likely to experience praise and approval as reinforcing are those biased toward friendly submission, while those least likely are those limited to hostile dominance . . . This transactional pattern suggests the importance of utilizing an interactional theory to enhance formulations derived from conditioning-based models.

**PROPOSITION 3.** For interpersonal behavior as operationalized by the two-dimensional interpersonal circle: (a) Complementarity exists among interactants when Respondent B reacts to Person A with interpersonal acts reciprocal in terms of Control and corresponding in terms of Affiliation; (b) anticomplementarity exists when Respondent B reacts to Person A with behavior both nonreciprocal in terms of Control and noncorresponding in terms of Affiliation; (c) acomplementarity exists among interactants when Respondent B reacts to Person A with actions either reciprocal on Control or corresponding on Affiliation, but not both; (d) isomorphic acomplementarity exists when Respondent B reacts from circle segments identical to those used by Person A; and (e) semimorphic acomplementarity exists when Respondent B reacts from circle segments directly opposite to those used by Person A.

We can now illustrate, using the 1982 Circle, the three propositions we have developed so far. Figure 3 depicts interpersonal complementarity as it operates among the quadrants and among the segments of the 1982 Circle. It is apparent from Figure 3 that the complementary response always occurs vertically within the circle, and always within the right or within the left halves of the circle. This is necessarily the case as the result of the rule of correspondence (hostility pulls hostility on the left side, friendliness pulls friendliness on the right).

Figure 4 shows anticomplementarity as it works among the quadrants and among the segments of the 1982 Circle. It can be seen that the anticomplementary response always occurs horizontally within the circle and always within the top or within the bottom halves of the circle. This is necessarily the case because the anticomplementary response always entails noncorrespondence (hostility is responded to with friendliness, friendliness with hostility) and nonreciprocity (dominance is responded to with dominance, submission with submission). As Benjamin (Note 8) observes, “the concepts of opposition and complementarity can be combined to yield a prediction for antithesis (anticomplementarity): it is found by moving to the opposite and then to the ‘complement’ of the opposite” (p. 8).

Figure 5 shows possibilities of semimorphic and isomorphic acomplementarity as they operate among the quadrants and among the segments of the 1982 Circle. As can be seen, all instances of semimorphic
Figure 4. Anticomplementary quadrants and segments of the 1982 Interpersonal Circle.

acomplementarity occur directly across the diameters at the opposite segments, whereas all instances of isomorphic acomplementarity fall at identical circle segments.

It is important to note that two other depictions of each of Figures 3, 4, and 5 are necessary for precise specification of complementarity and noncomplementarity on the 1982 Circle. These illustrations would be identical to the respective figures except that one would show the 16 segments using their corresponding mild-moderate labels and the other would show the 16 segments using their corresponding extreme labels (cf. Figure 1). These additional figures reflect another proposition of complementarity that needs to be added at this point.

**Proposition 4.** Interpersonal complementarity and noncomplementarity operate precisely only within the same level or intensity of behavior. That is, interpersonal actions at a particular level of intensity tend (with a probability significantly greater than chance) to initiate, invite, or evoke from interactants complementary responses at the equivalent level of intensity (mild–moderate actions pull mild–moderate complementary responses, extreme acts pull extreme complementary responses).

It follows from Proposition 4 that it is a conceptual error to mix segment levels in studying interpersonal complementarity. For example, $A_1$:Controlling pulls $I_1$:Docile, not $I_2$:Subservient. Likewise, $A_2$:Dictatorial pulls $I_2$:Subservient, not $I_1$:Docile, and so on. This proposition also underscores again the vital necessity of operationalizing at least two levels of acts for each of the 16 circle segments.

Before leaving these initial propositions of complementarity, we need to illustrate them also at the octant level, which will be done...
after a few necessary introductory observations. First, the last half of Leary's (1957) volume details the workings of complementarity (but not of anticomplementarity or acomplementarity) at the octant level for his eight personality and abnormal groups. As Table 3 shows, however, Leary did not apply circle complementarity either consistently or precisely. The precise complementary response (the column labeled “1982 Circle”) for each of the octants involves two segments only (e.g., AP pulls IJ, BC pulls GH), whereas Leary defines the complementary response with as many as four different segments, and defines complementarity validity for only 3 of the 8 octants (11, 77, 88).

Second, it needs to be emphasized that actually 16 different octants are definable for the interpersonal circle (the total list results from combining the last and the third-from-last columns in Table 3)—not merely the eight elaborated by Leary and others. This is the case because interpersonal acts at any one segment (e.g., C) can blend with acts of the highly correlated adjacent segment on either side (i.e., B as well as D). Each of the 16 segments represents a conceptually “pure” class of interpersonal acts that never occurs alone in a given person. An individual’s behavior, at a minimum, is a blend of acts from at least two adjacent segments and may combine a triad of segments (a peak segment plus one segment from each side of the peak). A pressing issue for interpersonal theory and research concerns exactly how large a slice of circle segments is encompassed by an individual’s behavior. Furthermore, according to the interpersonal “rigidity” definition of maladjustment (Leary, 1957), the slice is of necessity smaller for the maladjusted person than it is for the more normal individual.

Table 4 lists each of the 16 possible octants of the 1982 Circle and its complementary, anticomplementary, semimorphic-acomplementary, and isomorphic-acomplementary responses. This table can be used to find quickly the complementary and noncomplementary predictions for any one of the 16 octants. For example, assume that a particular person is defined at Octant DE:Cold–Hostile. We can then predict that this person is likely to evoke from others the complementary response at Octant EF:Hostile–Detached (cold pulls detached, hostile pulls hostile). Anticomplementary interactants, whom the person tends to avoid, are characterized at Octant MN:Friendly–Sociable. Acomplementary interactants who are semimorphic (opposites) will fall at Octant LM:Warm–Friendly, and those who are isomorphic (likes) will be characterized at the identical octant, DE:Cold–Hostile. The person will tend to experience approach–avoidance tendencies with both acomplementary types. Similar exact predictions can be made for each of the other 15 octants.

Wiggins (1982) offers an alternative octant formulation of complementarity based on the work of Foa (1961, 1965, 1966; Foa & Foa, 1974) and Carson (1969, 1979) and reflecting the hypothesis that interpersonal behavior is structured around three facets: di-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octant</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Psychiatric equivalent</th>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>Leary</th>
<th>1982 Circle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>IJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Narcissistic</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>GH, IJ</td>
<td>GH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sadistic</td>
<td>Psychopath</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>F, GH</td>
<td>EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Distrustful</td>
<td>Schizoid</td>
<td>FG</td>
<td>B, CD</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Masochistic</td>
<td>Depressive</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>B, CD, E</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>JK</td>
<td>N, OP, A</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Overconventional</td>
<td>Hysteric</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Hypernormal</td>
<td>Psychosomatic</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>KL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Comparison of Theoretically Precise 1982 Interpersonal Circle With Leary's (1957) List of Complementary Octants for the Eight Personality Types and Their Psychiatric Equivalents
### Table 4
Predicted Complementary, Anticomplementary, and Acomplementary Octants for Each of the 16 Interpersonal Style Octants of the 1982 Interpersonal Circle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1982 Circle</th>
<th>Complementary</th>
<th>Anticomplementary</th>
<th>Semimorphic acomplementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA:Assured-Dominant</td>
<td>IJ:Submissive-Deferent</td>
<td>AB:Dominant-Competitive</td>
<td>HI:Unassured-Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG:Detached-Inhibited</td>
<td>CD:Mistrusting-Cold</td>
<td>KL:Trust-Warm</td>
<td>NO:Sociable-Exhibitionistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI:Unassured-Submissive</td>
<td>AB:Dominant-Competitive</td>
<td>IJ:Submissive-Deferent</td>
<td>PA:Assured-Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO:Sociable-Exhibitionistic</td>
<td>KL:Trust-Warm</td>
<td>CD:Mistrusting-Cold</td>
<td>FG:Detached-Inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB:Dominant-Competitive</td>
<td>HI:Unassured-Submissive</td>
<td>PA:Assured-Dominant</td>
<td>IJ:Submissive-Deferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD:Mistrusting-Cold</td>
<td>FG:Detached-Inhibited</td>
<td>NO:Sociable-Exhibitionistic</td>
<td>KL:Trust-Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ:Submissive-Deferent</td>
<td>KL:Trust-Warm</td>
<td>AB:Dominant-Competitive</td>
<td>FG:Detached-Inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL:Trust-Warm</td>
<td>NO:Sociable-Exhibitionistic</td>
<td>HI:Unassured-Submissive</td>
<td>CD:Mistrusting-Cold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Corresponding isomorphic-acomplementary octants are identical to the original 1982 Interpersonal Circle octants (e.g., PA for PA, BC for BC).

Directionality (giving vs. taking, accepting vs. rejecting), object (self, other), and resource (status, love). Wiggins (1982) aligns the eight combinations of these three facets with the respective octants of his IAS circle, stating that “any given interpersonal variable may be reduced to its underlying facet elements with reference to its profile coding on these elements” (p. 215). He derives from the facet structure of each octant the specific “kinds of dyads formed when an initial definition of an interpersonal situation is accepted by the other participant” (p. 216)—that is, the specific complementary pairs of octants derived from his facet analysis. For example, Wiggins’s complementary response to PA:Ambitious—Dominant behavior is LM: Warm—Agreeable, a response in which LM grants love but not status to himself while granting both love and status to PA, as requested.

Wiggins’s predictions for complementarity offer a clear theoretical alternative to the octant predictions of the 1982 Circle listed in Table 4. In no case do the corresponding octant predictions agree (for the example cited before, the 1982 Circle PA pulls IJ, not LM; etc.). Also Wiggins’s formulations need to be expanded to include all 16 octants. Nevertheless, these contrasting definitions of octant complementarity provide competing guides to future interpersonal theory and research.

Now we need to add seven other propositions of complementarity that have not been articulated at all by previous writers.

**PROPOSITION 5.** A given instance of the complementary response consists of a two-stage sequence occurring rapidly in an interactant: (a) a covert response, labeled the “impact message,” and (b) the subsequent overt action, labeled the “complementary response.”
Kiesler (1979, 1982a; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976; Kiesler et al., 1976; Perkins et al., 1979; Kiesler, Note 5) describes the impact message as including those emotions, action tendencies, cognitive attributions, and fantasies that represent Interactant B's covert engagements, or pulls, in his or her transactions with Person A. These classes of impacts all occur internally in B's experience and mediate in large part his or her subsequent overtly expressed complementary response. The impact message, thus, is the distinctive complementary pattern of covert engagement experienced by one interactant in response to another. In contrast, the actions (words and nonverbal behavior) Interactant B actually emits in response to Person A comprise the traditionally labeled complementary response.

To illustrate, Interactant B starts a transaction with Person A, whose behaviors are defined at Octant HI: Unassured–Submissive. As their transaction proceeds, B increasingly experiences the covert first stage of complementarity by registering complementary impacts to HI, such as feeling “superior to him” and “frustrated that he won’t defend his position”; action tendencies, such as “I should be very gentle with him” and “I could tell him anything and he would agree”; and cognition attributions such as “he thinks he is inadequate” and “he would accept whatever I said.” As B continues to experience these complementary internal engagements, his overt actions, the second-stage complementary response, increasingly manifest behaviors from the complementary octant, AB: Dominant–Competitive.

Future theory and research face the considerable task of determining to what precise extent within live transactions the propositions of complementarity apply isomorphically to both of these stages (i.e., to the first-stage covert complementary response or impact message and to the second-stage overt complementary response).

**Proposition 6.** The more extreme and rigid (maladjusted) the interpersonal style of Interactant B, the less likely he or she is to show the predicted complementary response to the interpersonal actions of Person A. An important exception occurs when the predicted complementary response to A falls at the exact segments that define B’s extreme and rigid style.

This proposition expresses the fact that a maladjusted interactant tends to respond with his extreme and rigid style regardless of the segments and levels of actions presented by Person A. Unless the person interacting with maladjusted Interactant B presents a style exactly complementary to B’s, B will resist strongly any other prompt or bid that would require him or her to move to other segments of the circle. To illustrate, Interactant B is defined at the extreme level of Octant KL, that is, at $K_2L_2$: Gullible/Merciful–Condoning (cf. Figure 1). If B is interacting with a person whose style is exactly complementary (i.e., at Octant NO: Sociable–Exhibitionistic), B will respond to that person with $K_2L_2$ behaviors, and if B is interacting with any other person, B will also respond with $K_2L_2$ behaviors, instead of with the predicted complementary response.

**Proposition 7.** Optimal change in a person’s interpersonal style can be effected by facilitating an increased frequency and intensity of interpersonal acts from segments opposite on the circle—by helping a person become more like an interactant who is semimorphically acomplementary (behaviorally opposite) to him or her.

This proposition, in addition to referring to general behavior change, takes interpersonal complementarity directly into the psychotherapy session.

A person or client who presents a rigid and extreme maladjusted style rather ruthlessly forces others to adopt a complementary position. Over time this rigid presentation of a very restricted class of interpersonal acts represents aversive stimuli for interactants, leading them to avoid or escape continued transactions with the client. These consequences for the client result in a very constricted experience of the world (cf. Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1979, 1982b; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976; Leary, 1957). In order to experience a greater range of experience with others that reflects more positive consequences, the client needs to learn (a) to emit acts from a wider range of segments on the
circle and (b) to emit acts generally of less intensity, that is, from the mild–moderate level of circle segments.

What Proposition 7 asserts is that optimum client change results from helping a client to act more like a person representing his direct opposite on the circle. To illustrate, the goal of therapeutic intervention for a client defined at the DE:Cold–Hostile octant is an increased frequency of instances in which he conducts his transactions in a LM:Warm–Friendly manner. More frequent occurrence of these acts, because they demand behaviors weighted exactly oppositely on the Control and Affiliation dimensions, has the greatest likelihood of producing a spread of the client’s actions away from the extreme of the DE octant.

The major reason the client has not been able to accomplish this goal spontaneously is that semimorphic-acomplementary (opposite) responses (in this case, warm–friendly ones) trigger in him approach–avoidance tendencies. In other words, the client is “resistant” or “countercontrolling” to the changes demanded of him to act more like his interpersonal opposite and, thus, is resistant to “getting better.” Nevertheless, the major goal of interpersonal therapy is to facilitate a client’s movements toward behaviors directly opposite to the client’s defined maladjusted style.

**Proposition 8.** An interactant or therapist can exert the greatest pressure for change in a person’s or client’s interpersonal actions by providing responses anticomplementary on the circle to the person’s or client’s interpersonal style.

The therapist’s stance that exerts maximum pressure for client change (for moving the client toward segments opposite on the circle) is the complement of the octant opposite to that defining the client’s style (Benjamin, 1974)—namely, the anticomplementary octant. Another way to say this is that the therapist “pulls” for greatest client change when he or she provides, instead of the complementary response, the opposite of the complementary response—namely, the anticomplementary response. Continuing our example, for the extreme DE:Cold–Hostile client, therapist acts exerting the greatest pressure for improvement in the client’s style would fall at the anticomplementary octant, MN:Friendly–Sociable. As Benjamin (Note 8) states, “use of the antithesis (anticomplementary) feature enhances the probability of drawing out the opposite behavior” (p. 9).

On the other hand, early use by the therapist of the anticomplementary response might result in the client’s premature termination, as a direct result of the strong anxiety produced by this avoidance situation. It seems probable, then, that effective use of the anticomplementary response can occur only in later stages of the therapy transaction.

Kiesler (1982b) argues that the covert complementary response, the impact message, is necessarily experienced by the therapist in two stages: a “hooked” stage in which the therapist cannot provide the complementary response because of the superior pulling power of the maladjusted client; and a “disengagement” phase in which the therapist, through various labeling and interventive maneuvers, regains the freedom to stop the complementary response and move his or her actions to other quadrants of the circle. From the client’s perspective, it may be necessary for the therapist first to “hook” the client by providing the complementary response (or, as we will see shortly, by providing asocial responses), so that later introduction of the anticomplementary response does not elicit the strong client anxiety probable in earlier sessions.

Benjamin (Note 8) also offers some interesting notions regarding sequential timing of the anticomplementary response in therapy. “With more disturbed individuals, one usually cannot move directly to the antithetical (anticomplementary) point and have much impact” (p. 25). Instead, she offers the Shauette principle to guide prior interventions leading to eventual use of the anticomplementary response: “The milieu must ‘connect’ first with the patient by taking the complementary posture (with a constructive thrust) and then moving in a counter-clockwise direction toward the final goal specified by the antithesis principle” (p. 25).

Berzins (1977) suggests similar therapeutic possibilities in his excellent review of research on therapist–patient matching.
It would seem that a complementary therapist could be readily provided. Anticomplementary pairing could be avoided since, under anticomplementary pairing conditions, therapeutic communication would be difficult to establish and dropouts may occur. On the other hand, given initially satisfactory (complementary) pairing conditions, the therapist’s subsequent main task is to avoid prolonged complementary reciprocation of the patient’s interpersonal overtures since doing so would ‘confirm’ the patient’s rigid or constricted self-concept and little therapeutic change could be expected. (p. 225)

As Carson (1969) earlier suggested, the generally effective therapist is one who is able to move to any quadrant of the interpersonal circle in response to the presenting maladaptive styles of particular patients.

DeVogue and Beck (1978) point out that “persons preferring to engage the therapist from a position of friendly submission should make the ideal client for therapy” because they respond best to praise and approval. Furthermore, “these people should be most able to assume nonaversively a compliant role with a dominant other” (p. 234). DeVogue and Beck go on to offer a four-stage process model in which interpersonal and behavior therapy strategies are integrated. In Stage 1 “the therapist tries to avoid any style that would clearly fall into an intense range of status or affect” (p. 236). As a result of this tactic, the client begins to use his or her preferred interpersonal tactic to initiate a comfortable form of intimacy with the therapist. In Stage 2 the therapist “invites the client directly into a conversation about the here-and-now relationship” (p. 236). In Stage 3 the therapist “refuses to engage in the reciprocal behavior to the client’s position. Instead, he launches an unemotional and logical attack against the client’s position, while providing the client with a clear message of his desire to continue the relationship” (p. 236). Finally, Stage 4 is “the point at which behavioral techniques could be optimally instituted” (p. 237).

**PROPOSITION 9.** Relative to the anticomplementary response, an interactant or therapist can exert the next greatest pressure for change in a person’s or client’s interpersonal style by emitting interpersonal acts from the class of asocial responses, including metacommunicative feedback to the person or client that describes his or her style and its self-defeating consequences.

According to Beier (1966; Young & Beier, 1982), whenever the therapist withholds the customary, preferred, or expected (i.e., complementary) response, the therapist responds to the client in an asocial or disengaged way. In turn, as a direct result the client experiences a sense of “beneficial uncertainty,” because the client’s preferred style did not produce the expected and familiar interpersonal consequences. Thus, the client is provided a new experience in response to his old patterns. If the therapist continues to provide this climate of new experience, over time the client is obliged to discover and produce new interpersonal acts. As examples of therapeutic asocial responses, Young and Beier (1982) list delay responses, reflection of content and feeling, labeling the interaction style, and use of therapeutic paradox. Kiesler (1979, 1982a; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976; Kiesler, Note 5) emphasizes throughout his interpersonal communication psychotherapy that the asocial response of metacommunicative feedback has interventive priority throughout the course of therapy.

Because the asocial response has yet to be defined precisely relative to the interpersonal circle, it is vital that the issue be addressed by interpersonal investigators. In my judgment, the asocial response relates to the interpersonal circle in one of three ways: (a) by falling at the midpoint or origin of the circle and, hence, being totally neutral in regard to both Control and Affiliation, (b) by constituting a milder or more ambiguous form of the anticomplementary response, or (c) by falling altogether outside the domain of the circle on some plane defining a metalevel of interpersonal activity. Clarification of this important issue can come only from future research.

Until that time, it seems to me that any asocial response to Person A by Interactant B requires two components: that B in no way provides the complementary response “bid for” by A and that B’s response has ambiguous meaning in the sense that A cannot pinpoint at all the position on the circle from which B is responding.

**PROPOSITION 10.** Interpersonal complementarity applies primarily to naturally occurring, relatively unstructured interpersonal
situations. The extent to which it applies in various structured situations or in other environmental contexts remains to be determined.

Several authors have argued that interpersonal theory adopts an interactionist position (Endler & Magnusson, 1976) whereby a person’s interpersonal acts reflect the conjoint effects of person and situation factors (Carson, 1969; Duke & Nowicki, 1982; Kiesler, 1979, 1982b; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976). Kiesler and his colleagues have argued further that by far the most important class of situations consists of “other persons,” or, more precisely, of the presenting interpersonal styles of various interactants.

An important task for interpersonal investigators is to specify classes of situational factors relevant (and irrelevant) to elicitation of interpersonal acts from the respective octants of the interpersonal circle. For example, what kinds of situations does a DE:Cold–Hostile person tend to seek out as well as to avoid? In which contexts is his or her style likely to be elicited most strongly or likely to be elicited not at all?

Duke and Nowicki (1982), addressing the point that most interpersonal theorists have not specified situations beyond the general category of significant others, describe an initial taxonomy of situations that has guided their social-learning/interpersonal research program. Other situational taxonomies are appearing (e.g., Argyle, Furnham, & Graham, 1981), and these or others need to be interfaced directly with the respective octants of the 1982 Interpersonal Circle.

Of course, the interpersonal theory articulated in this article already provides a central component of any valid situational taxonomy by specifying exactly on the 1982 Interpersonal Circle the predicted complementary, anticomplementary, and acomplementary octant responses for a particular pair of interactants (Table 4). Complementary interactions evoke approach behaviors from both participants, anticomplementary ones lead to avoidance or escape actions, and acomplementary interactions evoke a mixture of approach and avoidant responses from both participants. Nevertheless, it is crucial that investigators address the interactions of these transactional patterns with other environmental or contextual factors. Much is left to be done.

Until these clarifications appear, propositions of complementarity seem to apply precisely only to naturally occurring, relatively unstructured transactions such as informal conversations at parties or other loosely structured social events, free-time activities and encounters, intimacy transactions, and open-ended therapy interviews. The feature common in these situations is that minimal expectations exist regarding socially correct or desirable responses or social role definitions (e.g., boss–employee, teacher–student). Essentially, an unstructured situation is one that can appropriately elicit from interactants the entire range of interpersonal acts. Also, typically it is in unstructured situations that most interactions with significant others occur.

When considering situational factors, one must keep another point in mind. That is, the “radical trait” assumptions of transsituationality and transtemporality (Mischel, 1968) more validly apply to maladjusted persons than they do to more normal (mild–moderate level) individuals. The interpersonal definition of maladjusted behavior (extreme and rigid acts on the interpersonal circle) indicates clearly that the actions of abnormal individuals tend to override differences in situational parameters, including different styles of interactants.

PROPOSITION 11. It is unclear how interpersonal complementarity applies over the temporal range of continuing transactions between interactants. The stages of sequential outcome for complementary and noncomplementary transactions need to be specified for all octants of the 1982 Interpersonal Circle.

Interactions represent stochastic transactions of varying frequency and duration, over varying periods of lifetime. This proposition underlines the necessity of empirically charting the distinctive course that different transactions take. Stochastic methodologies can accomplish this by assessing sequential dependencies among interactants, by revealing patterned redundancies occurring over time.

Stochastic (sequential analysis) statistics are summarized in Cairns (1979), Cox and
Lewis (1966), Gottman (1979), Lamb, Suomi, and Stephenson (1978), Parzen (1962), and van Hooff (1982). They include the following specific methodologies: (a) Markov chain analysis (Benjamin, 1979; Hertel, 1972; Kemey & Snell, 1960; Raush, 1972); (b) lag sequential analysis (Bakeman & Dabbs, 1976; Gottman & Notarius, 1978; Sackett, Note 9); (c) information theory approaches (Attneave, 1959; Garner, 1962; Gottman & Notarius, 1978; Losey, 1978; Raush, 1965; Steinberg, 1977); (d) time-lag correlation (van Hooff, 1982); and (e) the phrase structure grammar model (Dawkins, 1976; Hutt & Hutt, 1970; Westman, 1977).

In contrast to traditional correlational and experimental designs, stochastic methods focus on microanalysis of each unfolding exchange between interactants over some period of time. These methods also exclusively measure properties of the transacting dyad, in contrast to assessing individual behavior within a dyad. Hence, they permit direct assessment of the propositions of complementarity. Finally, stochastic methods capture all three aspects of circular causality (Danziger, 1976): feedback, redundancy, and nonsummative.

Duke and Nowicki (1982) offer an initial formulation of four distinct stages of interaction sequence: choice, beginning, deepening, and termination. They speculate that each of the four relationship phases demands “different requirements from interpersonal styles” (p. 86). Berzins (1977) emphasizes the “need for longitudinal research that would clarify the manner in which participants move across quadrants of the Interpersonal Circle as a function of initial pairing conditions” (p. 237).

In sum, we have little systematic knowledge regarding the lawful redundancies that characterize the natural sequence of distinct interpersonal transactions. It is only by stochastic investigations that we can discover the important governing parameters as well as the additional propositions of complementarity for personality, psychopathology, and psychotherapy.

Additional Directions for Future Research

Several expansions of interpersonal theory are necessary for full understanding not only of interpersonal complementarity but of human behavior more generally. A brief discussion of three of these issues follows.

1. Perhaps the most important future task is to continue the creative work of Carson (1969, 1971, 1979, 1982) and Golding (1977, 1978, 1980), which attempts to specify the cognitive events that mediate interpersonal acts for persons defined at distinct octants of the interpersonal circle. Targeting the distortions in interpersonal construal style of maladjusted persons, Carson (1969) argues that a mutually reinforcing relationship exists between the manner in which the person construes the social environment and his characteristic style of interpersonal actions.

Historically, interpersonal theory has concentrated more on explanation of overt behavior, with much less attention devoted to the cognitive and other events that occur simultaneously under the skins of individual participants. Many questions need answers. For example, what are the specific self-definitions, cognitive assumptions, expectancies, and the like that characterize a person exhibiting a DE: Cold–Hostile style? What are the specific attributes that such a person values in himself or herself and in others? Or that he or she despises? Or by which he or she is frightened? What are the specific rational and irrational self-statements that propel his or her preferred self-presentations to others? What are the cognitive styles that shape and color his or her perceptual and other experience?

Specification of the distinctive content and style of a person’s cognitive events is necessary if we are to fully understand that person’s overt interpersonal behavior and if we are to intelligently design differential therapeutic interventions.

2. Another important issue was referred to parenthetically in discussion of Proposition 10. To clarify the effects of situational factors, we need to understand much more about significant others. Who are these persons? What are the defining properties of an interactant significant to a particular person? Is a “significant other” a family member? A spouse? A close friend? A work acquaintance? A therapist? Some research has begun to address this central interpersonal issue (Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979), but much remains to be done.
3. Finally, basic aspects of nonverbal communication need to be integrated both with the interpersonal circle and with interpersonal theory more generally. For example, considerable research shows that the Control and Affiliation dimensions that underlie the circle are also basic to nonverbal behavior (LaFrance & Mayo, 1978; Mehrabian, 1971, 1972). Accordingly, the interpersonal acts defining the 1982 Interpersonal Circle segments need to include the corresponding control (e.g., greater asymmetrical posture, visual dominance pattern, more frequent initiation of touch) and affiliation (e.g., more direct body orientation, reciprocal gaze and touch, closer interpersonal distance) nonverbal behaviors.

Kiesler (1979, 1982b; Kiesler, Bernstein, & Anchin, 1976; Kiesler, Note 5) provides a theoretical integration of nonverbal behavior with interpersonal theory. His interpersonal communication theory pulls together three distinct traditions: (a) empirical research in nonverbal communication (Argyle, 1975; Harper, Wiens, & Matarazzo, 1978; Harrison, 1974; Knapp, 1978; LaFrance & Mayo, 1978; Mehrabian, 1971, 1972; Siegman & Feldstein, 1978); (b) communications psychiatry (Bateson, 1958; Beier, 1966; Berne, 1964; Goffman, 1967; Laing, 1962; Ruesch & Bateson, 1951; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967; Watzlawick & Weakland, 1977); and (c) interpersonal theory of personality and psychopathology.

In conclusion, interpersonal theory offers exciting promise for understanding human social behavior and as a paradigm comprehensive enough to encompass other theoretical and empirical approaches. I hope that this article stimulates further efforts toward fulfillment of that promise.

Reference Notes
4. Benjamin, L. S. Three levels of the SASB model (quadrant, cluster and full). (Unpublished figure.) Madison, Wis.: Intrex Interpersonal Institute, 1980.
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