

**Theoretical and Review Articles // Artículos teóricos y de revisión**

- |   |         |  |
|---|---------|--|
| Mitch J Fryling<br>Linda J Hayes  | 131-140 | Interpersonal Closeness and Conflict<br>in Interbehavioral Perspective   |
| J Carmelo Visdómine Lozano<br>Bárbara Gil Luciano<br>Jesús Gil Roales-Nieto | 141-161 | Aproximación contextual-funcional a la psicopatía:<br>análisis de casos [A <i>Functional-contextual Approach</i><br>to <i>Psychopathy: Cases Analysis.</i> ]                                     |
| Shifali Singh<br>Jaswinder Singh  | 163-172 | Effective Psychotherapeutic Approaches to<br>Treatment for Ethnic Minorities.  |
| Pablo Molina Moreno<br>Raúl Quevedo Blasco                                  | 173-188 | Una revisión de la aplicación de la Terapia<br>de Aceptación y Compromiso con niños y adolescentes.<br>[ <i>Acceptance and Commitment Therapy with children and<br/>adolescents: A review.</i> ] |

**Research Articles // Artículos de investigación**

- |   |         |   |
|---|---------|---|
| Eduardo Miguel Blasco Delgado<br>Aurembiaix Llobera Cascalló<br>L Jorge Ruiz Sánchez<br>Jorge Villarroel Carrasco | 191-202 | Measuring the attitudes from Spanish and Catalan<br>people toward Spanish and Catalan Identity with the<br>Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure.              |
| Alda Patrícia Portugal<br>Maria João Beja<br>Diana Cunha<br>Fábia Camacho<br>Joana Spínola<br>Ana Sofia Santos    | 203-215 | Emerging Adulthood and Parent-Child Communication:<br>A validation study with Perception Scale of<br>Parenting Communication.                                     |
| Oksana Zazymko<br>Olena Skulovatova<br>Viktoriia Staryk<br>Iryna Tonkonoh   | 217-227 | Peculiarities of the motivating needs sphere of TV<br>viewers with different television preferences.  |
| Ferran Burgal Juanmartí<br>Jordi Segura Bernal<br>Victòria Fernández Puig<br>Miriam Sánchez Matas                 | 229-238 | Trastorno límite de la personalidad e inteligencia<br>[ <i>Borderline Personality Disorder and Emotional<br/>Intelligence in Institutionalized Adolescents.</i> ] |
| Justin Thomas<br>Marie-Clare Bakker<br>Ayesha Al Jaber<br>Monique Raynor  | 239-249 | The <i>Affective Gallery</i> : A Naturalistic Exploration<br>of the Relationship Between Attentional Bias and<br>Depressive Symptoms.                             |

**Notes and Editorial Information // Avisos e información editorial**

- |                  |         |   |
|------------------|---------|---|
| Editorial Office | 253-254 | Normas de publicación- <i>Instructions to Authors.</i>                                |
| Editorial Office | 255     | Cobertura e indexación de IJP&PT. [ <i>IJP&amp;PT<br/>Abstracting and Indexing.</i> ] |

# IJP&PT

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY & PSYCHOLOGICAL THERAPY

**EDITOR**Francisco Javier Molina Cobos  
Universidad de Almería, España**REVIEWING EDITORS**Mónica Hernández López  
Universidad de Jaén  
EspañaFrancisco Ruiz Jiménez  
Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz  
Colombia**ASSOCIATE EDITORS**Dermot Barnes-Holmes  
Universiteit Gent  
BelgiumJ. Francisco Morales  
UNED-Madrid  
EspañaMauricio Papini  
Christian Texas University  
USAMiguel Ángel Vallejo Pareja  
UNED-Madrid  
EspañaKelly Wilson  
University of Mississippi  
USA**ASSISTANT EDITORS**Adolfo J. Cangas Díaz  
Emilio Moreno San PedroUniversidad de Almería, España  
Universidad de Huelva, España**MANAGING EDITOR**Adrián Barbero Rubio  
Universidad Pontificia Comillas & MICPSY, EspañaEDITORIAL OFFICE/SECRETARÍA DE EDICIÓN  
MICPSY, Madrid, España

# IJP&PT

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY & PSYCHOLOGICAL THERAPY

### Comité Editorial / Editorial Committee

**Editor:** Francisco Javier Molina Cobos, *Universidad de Almería, España*

#### Associate Editors

Dermot Barnes-Holmes, *Universiteit Gent, Belgique-België*  
Francisco Morales, *UNED, Madrid, España*  
Mauricio Papini, *Christian Texas University, USA*  
Miguel Ángel Vallejo Pareja, *UNED, Madrid, España*  
Kelly Wilson, *University of Mississippi, USA*

#### Reviewing Editors

Mónica Hernández López, *Universidad de Jaén, España*  
Francisco Ruiz Jiménez, *Fund. Univ. Konrad Lorenz, Colombia*  
Adolfo J. Cangas Díaz, *Universidad de Almería, España*  
Emilio Moreno San Pedro, *Universidad de Huelva, España*

**Former Editors** Jesús Gil Roales-Nieto, *Universidad de Almería, España, (2001-2011)*  
Santiago Benjumea, *Universidad de Sevilla, España, (2012-2016)*  
Miguel Rodríguez Valverde, *Universidad de Jaén, España, (2017)*

#### Managing Editor

Adrián Barbero Rubio *Universidad Pontificia Comillas & MICPSY, España*

### Consejo Editorial / Editorial Advisory Board

Yolanda Alonso *Universidad de Almería, España*  
Erik Arntzen *University of Oslo, Norway*  
M<sup>o</sup> José Bágüena Puigcerver *Universidad de Valencia, España*  
Yvonne Barnes-Holmes *National University-Maynooth, Ireland*  
William M. Baum *University of New Hampshire, USA*  
Gualberto Buela Casal *Universidad de Granada, España*  
Francisco Cabello Luque *Universidad de Murcia, España*  
José Carlos Caracuel Tubío *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
Gonzalo de la Casa *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
Charles Catania *University of Maryland Baltimore County, USA*  
Juan Antonio Cruzado *Universidad Complutense, España*  
Victoria Díez Chamizo *Universidad de Barcelona, España*  
Michael Dougher *University of New Mexico, USA*  
M<sup>o</sup> Paula Fernández García *Universidad de Oviedo, España*  
Perry N Fuchs *University of Texas at Arlington, USA*  
Andrés García García *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
José Jesús Gázquez Linares *Universidad de Almería, España*  
Inmaculada Gómez Becerra *Universidad de Almería, España*  
Luis Gómez Jacinto *Universidad de Malaga, España*  
M Victoria Gordillo Álvarez-Valdés *Universidad Complutense, España*  
Celso Goyos *Universidade de Sao Paulo, Brasil*  
David E. Greenway *University of Southwestern Louisiana, USA*  
Patricia Sue Grigson *Pennsylvania State College of Medicine, USA*  
Steven C. Hayes *University of Nevada-Reno, USA*  
Linda Hayes *University of Nevada-Reno, USA*  
Phillip Heline *Temple University, USA*  
Per Holth *University of Oslo, Norway*  
Robert J. Kohlenberg *University of Washington, Seattle, USA*  
María Helena Leite Hunzinger *Universidade de Sao Paulo, Brasil*  
Julian C. Leslie *University of Ulster at Jordanstown, UK*  
Juan Carlos López García *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
Fergus Lowe *University of Wales, Bangor, UK*  
Armando Machado *Universidade do Miño, Portugal*  
G. Alan Marlatt *University of Washington, Seattle, USA*  
Jose Marques *Universidade do Porto, Portugal*  
Helena Matute *Universidad de Deusto, España*  
Ralph R. Miller *State University of New York-Binghamton, USA*  
Fernando Molero *UNED, Madrid, España*  
Rafael Moreno *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
Ignacio Morgado Bernal *Universidad Autónoma Barcelona, España*  
Edward K. Morris *University of Kansas-Lawrence, USA*  
Lourdes Munduate *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
Alba Elisabeth Mustaca *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*  
José I. Navarro Guzmán *Universidad de Cádiz, España*  
Jordi Obiols *Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España*  
Sergio M. Pellis *University of Lethbridge, Canada*  
Ricardo Pellón *UNED, Madrid, España*  
Wenceslao Peñate Castro *Universidad de La Laguna, España*  
Victor Peralta Martín *Hospital V. del Camino, Pamplona, España*  
M. Carmen Pérez Fuentes *Universidad de Almería, España*  
Marino Pérez Álvarez *Universidad de Oviedo, España*  
Juan Preciado *City University of New York, USA*  
Emilio Ribes Iniesta *Universidad Veracruzana, México*  
Josep Roca i Balasch *INEF de Barcelona, España*  
Armando Rodríguez *Universidad de La Laguna, España*  
Jesús Rosales Ruiz *University of North Texas, USA*  
Juan Manuel Rosas Santos *Universidad de Jaén, España*  
Kurt Saltzinger *Hofstra University, USA*  
Mark R. Serper *Hofstra University, USA*  
Carmen Torres *Universidad de Jaén, España*  
Peter J. Urciuoli *Purdue University, USA*  
Guillermo Vallejo Seco *Universidad de Oviedo, España*  
Julio Varela Barraza *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*  
Juan Pedro Vargas Romero *Universidad de Sevilla, España*  
Graham F. Wagstaff *University of Liverpool*  
Stephen Worchel *University of Hawaii, USA*  
Edelgard Wulfert *New York State University, Albany, USA*  
Thomas R. Zentall *University of Kentucky, USA*

*International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy* is a four-monthly interdisciplinary publication open to publish original articles, reviews of one or more area(s), theoretical reviews, or methodological issues, and series of interest to some of the Psychology areas. The journal is published for the *Asociación de Análisis del Comportamiento* (AAC) and MICPSY, and indexed and/or abstracted in **Cabell's Directory**, **Clarivate Analytics** (*Emerging Sources Citation Index*), **Catálogo Latindex**, **ClinPSYC** (American Psychological Association), **DIALNET**, **Academic Search Premier** (EBSCO Publishing Inc.), **Google Scholar Metrics**, **IN-RECS** (Index of Impact of the Social Sciences Spanish Journals), **ISOC** (CINDOC, CSIC), **Journal Scholar Metrics**, **MIAR**, **ProQuest PRISMA**, **PSICODOC**, **Psychological Abstracts**, **PsycINFO**, and **RedALyC**, **SCOPUS**.

*International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy* es una publicación interdisciplinaria cuatrimestral, publicada por la Asociación de Análisis del Comportamiento (AAC), abierta a colaboraciones de carácter empírico y teórico, revisiones, artículos metodológicos y series temáticas de interés en cualquiera de los campos de la Psicología. Es publicada por la *Asociación de Análisis del Comportamiento* (AAC) y MICPSY y está incluida en las bases y plataformas bibliográficas: **Cabell's Directory**, **Clarivate Analytics** (*Emerging Sources Citation Index*), **Catálogo Latindex**, **ClinPSYC** (American Psychological Association), **DIALNET**, **Academic Search Premier** (EBSCO Publishing Inc.), **Google Scholar Metrics**, **IN-RECS** (*Índice de Impacto de Revistas Españolas de Ciencias Sociales*), **ISOC** (CINDOC, CSIC), **Journal Scholar Metrics**, **MIAR**, **ProQuest PRISMA**, **PSICODOC** (*Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos*) y **RedALyC** (*Red de Revistas Científicas de América Latina y El Caribe, España y Portugal*), **SCOPUS**.

## **Interpersonal Closeness and Conflict in Interbehavioral Perspective**

**Mitch J Fryling\***

*California State University Los Angeles, USA*

**Linda J Hayes**

*University of Nevada, Reno, USA*

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper presents an interbehavioral conceptualization of interpersonal relationships, emphasizing both interpersonal closeness and conflict. In doing so, processes of association and subsequent substitution of stimulus function are described, setting the foundation for an analysis of how relationships are formed from an interbehavioral perspective. Specific attention is given to factors that impact intimacy and closeness in relationships, especially ways in which closeness may be fostered and conflict made more likely. The topic of communication is addressed, and possible therapeutic targets are highlighted from a novel conceptual context. The analysis is contrasted with more traditional ways of thinking, including more common behavior analytic perspectives. The implications of adopting the proposed interbehavioral conceptualization are provided.

*Key words:* conflict, interbehaviorism, interpersonal closeness, intimacy, relationships.

How to cite this paper: Fryling MJ & Hayes LJ (2019). Interpersonal Closeness and Conflict in Interbehavioral Perspective. *International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy*, 19, 2, 131-140.

### ***Novelty and Significance***

*What is already known about the topic?*

- Many researchers have studied relationships and demonstrated the importance of relationships in human life.
- Some behavior analysts have developed theories and conducted experiments focused on particular skills associated with relationships.

*What this paper adds?*

- This paper provides a conceptual analysis of how relationships develop in natural science perspective.
- Specific attention is given to processes that facilitate and hinder relationship quality.

Interpersonal relationships are fundamental to most areas of human life. For example, humans often have relationships of some sort with their family members, co-workers, friends, and significant others (i.e., spouses and partners). While these broad categories probably capture the most significant relationships in the lives of humans, relationships seem to be present in even more areas of everyday life. Indeed, people interact with other people all day long, and may develop relationships of some sort with anyone with whom they interact on a regular basis. Some relationships are obvious, as when two individuals are in a romantic relationship, whereas others are less clear, as when someone has a friendly relationship with a barista at a coffee shop that they frequent. In this sense relationships of various sorts are both multitudinous and pervasive.

Relationships are not only pervasive in the lives of humans, but they also have a significant impact on those lives. A great deal of research has examined the extent to which relationships impact health and quality of life. For example, relationship quality

---

\* Correspondence to: Mitch Fryling, Division of Special Education & Counseling, California State University, Los Angeles CA 90032, USA. Email: Mitchell.Fryling2@calstatela.edu; Linda Hayes, Department of Psychology/296, University of Nevada, Reno NV 89557, USA. Email: lhayes@unr.edu

has been found to be associated with patterns of sleep, with positive relationships being associated with better sleep and negative relationships associated with worse sleep (e.g., Chen, Waite, & Lauderdale, 2015; Kent, Uchino, Cribbet, Bowen, & Smith, 2014). In addition to sleep, relationship quality has also been found to be associated with improved cardiovascular health (Donoho, Seeman, Sloan, & Crimmins, 2015) and reduced disability (Choi, Yorgason, & Johnson, 2016). Marital quality has been the subject of much research, and while there is still much to learn, this literature generally points to an association between better relationship quality and better health (Robles, 2014; Robles, Slatcher, Trombello, & McGinn, 2014). Importantly, the negative impact of a strained relationship can extend beyond the individuals in the relationship, such that the most recent *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-V) includes a condition reflecting this circumstance called “Child Affected by Parental Relationship Distress” (Bernet, Wamboldt, & Narrow, 2016). Relationships of all sorts seem to impact quality of life. For instance, Vaughn, Drake, and Haydock (2016) found negative workplace relationships to be associated with poor mental health of college students. While a thorough overview of all of the research in this area is far beyond the scope of the present paper, these examples highlight the fact that relationship quality impacts the lives of humans in important ways.

Given all of this, the topic of relationships warrants attention from behavior scientists. Of particular importance is the consideration of factors that might impact the quality of relationships, as relationship quality has been shown to be associated with many socially significant outcomes (see above). This aim seems to be particularly well aligned with the goals of behavior analytic approaches, as behavioral approaches specifically aim to understand how the environment may be altered to influence behavior in socially significant ways (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968; Wolf, 1978). Despite this, little conceptual work has focused on relationships within behavior analysis (Some attention has been given to the topic of the therapist-client relationship within behavior analysis, especially within Functional Analytic Psychotherapy. For example, Follette, Naugle, and Callaghan (1996) provided an analysis of the therapeutic relationship in radical behavioral perspective). The present paper describes a behavioral conceptualization of interpersonal relationships and emphasizes factors that contribute to relationship closeness and conflict. Important assumptions about the subject-matter of behavior analysis are considered and implications are highlighted. The analysis is pursued from an interbehavioral perspective (Kantor, 1953, 1958), and in the following section a brief overview of interbehavioral foundations that are fundamental to the understanding of relationships is provided.

### INTERBEHAVIORAL PSYCHOLOGY

Developed by JR Kantor (1958), interbehavioral psychology is an organized, systemic approach to the science of psychology. Derived from a unique philosophy of science, interbehaviorism (Kantor, 1953), Kantor’s approach to the discipline of psychology is entirely naturalistic. One implication of this is that all philosophical and discipline specific constructs are derived from contacts with events in the natural world (Kantor, 1957; Smith, 2007). More plainly, this means that assumptions about the world (including behavior), and constructs employed for analytical purposes are all based upon things confronted in the world.

This stands in contrast to more typical methods of developing constructs throughout psychology and the social sciences more broadly; the majority of the social sciences *impose* constructs on events rather than derive constructs *from* events (Smith, 2007). This is seen in the great many dualistic constructs that dominate the helping professions and social sciences. For example, personalities, minds, psyches and the like are often assumed to reside within individuals, and to determine individuals' behavior, despite those very things never having been observed in the world. While the requirement that all constructs be derived from events factors largely into most varieties of behaviorism, its thorough appreciation seems to be unique to interbehaviorism. Interbehaviorists also conceptualize behavior itself in a unique way, as *interbehavior*.

### *The Psychological Event*

As denoted by the word *interbehavioral*, interbehavioral psychology places special emphasis on the interaction between stimulation and responding as a *single event* (stimulation  $\longleftrightarrow$  responding). This is contrasted with other ways of conceptualizing behavior, where stimulation is thought to *elicit* responding (Stimulus $\rightarrow$ Response; as in respondent conditioning) or where behavior is thought to be occasioned by stimuli and then change the environment in some way that reinforces or punishes the response (Stimulus $\rightarrow$ Behavior $\rightarrow$ Consequence; as in operant conditioning). While the detailed implications of these various ways of thinking about behavior may be debated, the explicit focus on stimulation and responding as an interaction is a fundamental feature of interbehavioral psychology.

Not only are stimulation and responding conceptualized as an event, but that event also includes a complex field of other factors (Kantor, 1958). That is to say, interactions of stimulation and responding occur in particular settings, and the interactional setting, including all of an individual's history with respect to it, also participates in each psychological event. Importantly, interbehaviorists avoid assigning causal roles to any of the factors that participate in this multi-factored field of interaction (Fryling & Hayes, 2011; Hayes, Adams, & Dixon, 1997). The event orientation of interbehavioral psychology underscores the thoroughly contextual and multi-factored nature of the subject-matter of behavior science. Particularly relevant to the analysis of relationships is the interbehavioral conceptualization of stimulus substitution (Kantor, 1924).

### *Stimulus Substitution*

Individual behavior is functionally related to a great many things in the environment, and many of these things are considered stimuli in behavioral perspective. Keys on the keyboard stimulate typing, cups stimulate grasping, spoken words stimulate hearing, and so on. These examples depict how the physical properties of the objects with which we interact can determine the sort of responses we may have with respect to them. We can only grasp a cup or type on a keyboard in so many ways, and these ways depend on the physical properties of the stimuli themselves. This sort of stimulus function might be considered direct (Hayes, 1992a).

While a great deal of human behavior consists of interactions with the direct stimulus properties of objects, even more behavior seems to occur with respect to the indirect, or substitute stimulus functions that objects develop by virtue of their historical relationships with other stimuli. That is, a great deal of our behavior occurs with respect to aspects of our environment that are not physically present, through the outcome of

present stimulus objects having developed the psychological functions of absent stimulus objects. When present stimuli develop the psychological functions of absent stimuli, we may say that present stimuli are *substituting* for absent stimuli (Kantor, 1924, pp. 50-51). This sort of stimulus substitution develops through the process of an individual responding with respect to spatiotemporal associations conditions (Kantor, 1924, p. 316) in a multi-factored context. Associations conditions may occur among stimuli and stimuli, stimuli and settings, stimuli and responses, responses and responses, responses and settings, and settings and settings (Kantor, 1924, p. 321). Importantly, conditions of association *alone* do not result in the development of substitute stimulus functions; an individual *must also respond with respect to those association conditions* for substitute stimulus functions to develop (e.g., observe them, describe them; e.g., Fryling, Johnston, & Hayes, 2011). This issue is particularly key to understanding relationships.

As an example of this process, an individual may observe stimulus A to occur in a context with stimulus B, and, as a consequence of observing this association stimulus A may develop the functions of B; A(B), and B may develop the functions of A; B(A) (see L Hayes, 1992a -Here the direct stimulus functions are outside of the parentheses and the indirect or substitute stimulus functions are inside of the parentheses). Importantly, and consistent with the natural science aims of behavioral approaches, stimulus substitution also seems to explain some of the most complex human activity without resorting to hypothetical constructs, and underlies processes involved in stimulus equivalence and derived relational responding research more broadly (Hayes, 1992a). That is, stimulus substitution provides a way to explain complex human behavior without violating fundamental behavioral assumptions about the subject-matter.

Some examples from everyday life may make the relevance of this process more obvious; the topic of memory especially highlights substitution processes (Fryling & Hayes, 2010). Revisiting a place where one previously lived often involves many instances of substitution. For example, many adults move away from the specific neighborhood where they spent their childhood, and a great many association conditions occurred in the childhood context. Association conditions in the childhood context likely involved various people being associated with places, activities, buildings, and more. As a consequence of this, while visiting one's childhood neighborhood or home as an adult one may think about their neighbors, friends, teachers, and experiences there in general. What is most interesting from a conceptual standpoint, and a point about which theories in psychology differ, is how it is that someone responds with respect to something that is not currently present. Surely one's childhood teachers are not physically present when they are being remembered while driving by a school one attended years ago. The question becomes: What is the individual responding to and how is this to be conceptualized? In this particular case, the school itself (now present) may have developed the psychological stimulus functions of the things it has been associated with in the past (the teacher). That is, the past is made present through substitution processes; the school has become the teacher, psychologically speaking (Hayes, 1992b). Similar analyses could be made of thinking about a previous dinner date while at a familiar restaurant, and even observing what another person is thinking, as with perspective-taking (DeBernardis, Hayes, & Fryling, 2014; Fryling & Hayes, 2014).

It is these latter topics, the observation of thoughts and perspective-taking that are especially pertinent to the conceptualization of interpersonal relationships. Similar to the examples presented so far, over the course of developing a relational history with another person (responding with respect to association conditions involving another

person), including observing someone engaging in certain behavior, talking about various events, in particular situations, and more, it becomes possible to observe what someone may be thinking and feeling (Hayes & Fryling, 2009). In this sense, responding with respect to association conditions involving another person is what makes perspective-taking possible. For example, a particular relational history may involve you observing your significant other get very upset whenever a particular topic is discussed. Through such a history you may notice that they are upset when someone who regularly discusses the topic is present in another setting. Likewise, if your relational history with another person involves them discussing how they regularly watched a particular movie with their ex-husband, you may notice that they are thinking about their ex-husband when the movie is mentioned at a later time.

These examples may seem overly simplified, but this is only because traditional, dualistic ways of thinking have overly obfuscated analyses of these topics (i.e., by turning the analysis towards hypothetical constructs). Moreover, association conditions and subsequent stimulus substitution can become incredibly complex. This is especially so when one considers the generalization of substitute stimulus functions (e.g., that a restaurant that is only somewhat physically similar to a restaurant at which you had a date with a particular person may remind you of that person). A consideration of stimulus substitution processes has unique implications for understanding relationships, highlighting factors that may influence relationship quality in both positive and negative ways. The following section considers the specific implications of this analysis for understanding relationships with others.

### CONCEPTUALIZING RELATIONSHIPS

As described thus far, association conditions are pervasive throughout the lives of people. That is, things occur in relation to other things, in contexts, and therefore develop the stimulus functions of other things in those contexts and vice-versa. As a result, many things develop the psychological functions of other things. In fact, any object could stimulate a response to any other object (or circumstance stimulate a response to any other circumstance), given an individual has responded with respect to an association condition involving the two things in the past (This is not to suggest that everything becomes everything, or that over time stimuli develop the substitute stimulus functions of everything they have ever been associated with. Rather, particular substitute stimulus functions participate in unique event fields, and specific substitute stimulus functions are actualized in these unique settings). Of course, these association conditions also include people; part of what participates in association conditions is the behavior of people with whom we interact. As previously described, a particular setting may stimulate seeing someone who one visited that setting with in the past, despite the fact that the person is no longer present in the setting. Similarly, the behavior of someone we have a relationship with may stimulate responding to other things (e.g., remembering a previous argument), depending on our history with that particular behavior. As substitution processes involve a history of responding with respect to relations among stimuli, a shared history with another person is a fundamental requirement of developing a relationship with them. The following section elaborates on the role of shared histories in the development of relationships.

### *Shared History*

Most would probably agree that a significant part of developing a relationship with someone involves understanding their behavior, including their thoughts and feelings. This repertoire is significant because it involves predicting how another person may behave as well as helps people understand how they should best behave towards them. For example, knowing that a friend is under a significant amount of stress helps one be a better friend, and knowing that a significant other is feeling sad or upset may change how one behaves with respect to that person in meaningful ways. Clearly, the understanding of the thoughts and feelings of people we have relationships with is fundamental to the strength of those relationships. This seems likely to be precisely what is referred to when one says that they feel “close” to someone. Further, the absence of such an understanding seems likely to be involved when someone reports to feel “distant” from another person, and is especially prone to participate in situations in which there is relationship conflict.

What is required for an understanding of another’s thoughts and feelings is a *shared* history with another person. Looking closer at what this shared history is comprised of specifically allows us to understand important features of it, including aspects that are essential to promote intimacy and closeness as well as factors that seem related to relationship conflict.

### *Closeness and Conflict*

As described earlier, association conditions lead to the development of substitute stimulus functions when individuals *respond with respect to those association conditions*. Most often, this involves observing association conditions, though associations may also be responded to with hearing, touching, and other responses; the important point is that the relationship among factors is *interacted* with in some way. As the examples thus far have depicted, in the context of relationships responding with respect to association conditions among someone’s behavior and features of the environment results in better responding with respect to that person’s behavior in general. When this happens, one may feel like they are understood, like someone “gets them”. In this sense we may describe relationship closeness as being at least partially a product of observing the behavior of one another person including the detailed circumstances in which it occurs, and therefore increasingly responding to substitute stimulus functions, such as another person’s thoughts and feelings. This way the people involved in the relationship experience an increasingly similar world together, there is a level of understanding, of perspective-taking, established.

By contrast, relationship conflict may be conceptualized as being at least partially attributable to a lack of responding, a lack of observing association conditions that occur with respect to a person in a relationship. Generally speaking, this may occur when one individual behaves with respect to various situations, including discussions about thoughts and feelings in various contexts, about different topics, and more, while the other person in the relationship *fails to respond with respect to those association conditions* (e.g., fails to observe or listen). For example, one person may tell another that they are particularly worried about something that is happening at work, and then later the other person may fail to respond appropriately when the topic is discussed (e.g., provide additional support when someone asks about how work is going). In this

example, there isn't a *shared history*; the worried individual is responding with respect to their environment (i.e., association conditions are occurring and substitute stimulus functions are evolving), but substitute stimulus functions fail to develop for the other person because they are not responding with respect to those association conditions (e.g., as when someone is preoccupied or distracted). As this example highlights, individuals might behave in *proximity* to one another, but not develop a shared history (Note that some individuals *prefer* to avoid having too much of a shared history with others to prevent others from observing their thoughts and feelings. Such is the case of lying, where successful lies depend on the lack of a shared history, and the detection of lies resulting from histories overlapping -see Fryling, 2016). The analysis provided thus far has implications for a number of topics, including the broad topic of communication and the specific topic of private events as embraced by many behavior analysts (e.g., Skinner, 1953, 1974).

### COMMUNICATION

Thoughts and feelings are considered to be the causes of other behavior to both lay people and more traditional social scientists. For example, someone may assume that another person yelled at their significant other *because* they felt angry, or that they gave a good speech *because* they felt confident. Moreover, thoughts and feelings are often believed to occur in a non-natural world, a non-physical world, separate from those things that are confrontable to others in the natural world and that are found to exist in the world of nature. This idea, that things in some other world impact things in the natural world, is the philosophy of dualism. Consistent with this line of thinking, if one's thoughts and feelings are to be understood by others, the individual who has those thoughts and feelings must *express* them (i.e., because those thoughts and feelings exist in some other world that only the individual experiencing the thought or feeling can contact). In other words, if closeness depends upon another person understanding how you feel and what you think, then closeness depends upon people sharing their thoughts and feelings with others; communication becomes fundamental.

As described above, behavior analysts eschew dualistic lines of thinking, arguing that it involves circular logic, hypothetical constructs, and is ultimately unhelpful towards a functional analysis of behavior (e.g., Skinner, 1953). Still, many behavior analysts argue that things like thoughts and feelings are private to the individual, though, hence their being called "private" events. Importantly, private events are not considered to be mental happenings or causes of behavior but rather by-products of contingencies of reinforcement and punishment (e.g., Skinner, 1974). Nevertheless, in Skinner's analysis thoughts and feelings remain things that are within the individual and therefore only available to be contacted by the individual experiencing them. Given this, it is not surprising that Skinner also places emphasis on teaching people to talk about their private events (Skinner, 1957, pp. 131-134; 1974, pp. 26-28). To Skinner, learning to talk about private events has important social implications; it helps the verbal community predict and prepare for future behavior (e.g., 1974, p. 25). The important point here is that Skinner's analysis of these issues also places emphasis on the need for the speaker to describe their private experiences. That is, the emphasis is on expressing thoughts and feelings as a means of helping the verbal community predict and prepare for future

behavior, just as with the more traditional dualistic model. The language is different, but the logic is the same.

While communication (e.g., telling other people how you feel) has long been considered to be central to good relationships (e.g., Gottman, Notarius, Gonso, & Markman, 1979), the present analysis extends and elaborates upon some of these long-held assumptions. As described thus far, association conditions and the subsequent development of substitute stimulus functions permit the observation of another person's thoughts and feelings. Observing one's thoughts and feelings facilitates relationship closeness, and the absence of such an observation is likely to participate in relationship conflict. Implied in this is that one's thoughts and feelings are not private in principle, in the sense that they are not able to be contacted by another person. Rather, thoughts and feelings are subtle, public events, available for others to interact with just like other events. The difference being that the observation of such events depends upon a shared relational history (DeBernardis *et alii*, 2014; Hayes & Fryling, 2009). Following from this, a failure to observe another person's thoughts and feelings has nothing to do with their being private, but rather with the absence of a *shared* relational history. Given this, it is not the case that one must always have to discuss their thoughts and feelings over the course of a relationship in order for those thoughts and feelings to be understood. Indeed, over the course of a shared history developing in the context of a relationship more and more of one's thoughts and feelings may be observed, and, presumably, less and less needs to be said about thoughts and feelings that are otherwise assumed to be private (this may happen when couples have been together for extended periods of time).

To be clear, this is not to suggest that discussions of one's thoughts and feelings are not important in the development of relationships. On the contrary, getting to know another person certainly involves many discussions of these sorts. Talking about thoughts and feelings is part of the association conditions that participate in a shared history between an individual and another person. Such discussions involve relations among thoughts and feelings in the context of various topics, in different situations, and more. Of course, as suggested throughout this paper, a shared history requires one to respond with *respect to those association conditions*, that is, to interact with relationships between thoughts and feelings and other things. This is essential to the definition of a *shared* history and to the development of substitute stimulus functions. Surely, the occurrence of such association conditions, and the listener's corresponding responding with respect to those association conditions, greatly enhances relationship closeness as conceptualized in this paper.

The analysis described herein highlights that while talking about one's thoughts and feelings surely has its place in the development of relationships with other people, a *shared history* and the development of substitute stimulus functions is perhaps even more fundamental. This analysis may facilitate the conceptualization of the many mindfulness-based interventions in a conceptually coherent, behavior analytic manner. For example, recent work has emphasized the importance of couples being psychologically present while spending time together (e.g., Walser & Westrup, 2009). In other words, to not just be physically present, but also *psychologically* present, to respond with respect to one another, to develop a *shared history*. This analysis also provides an alternative to traditional ideas in psychology and behavior analysis by specifically focusing on shared history rather than internal events. This focus on shared history has both practical and conceptual implications. As a therapeutic target, the focus may shift towards sharing experiences together and all that this may entail, and analyzing factors that influence this.

Conceptually, the analysis is philosophically coherent and expands the comprehensiveness of the work in behavior analysis. As the field of behavior analysis continues to develop and evolve it is important for an increasingly complex range of topics to be addressed while at the same time honoring our philosophical foundations.

## REFERENCES

- Baer DM, Wolf MM, & Riskey TR (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 91-97. Doi: 10.1901/jaba.1968.1-91
- Bernet W, Wamboldt MZ, & Narrow WE (2016). Child affected by parental relationship distress. *Journal of the Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 55*, 571-579. Doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2016.04.018
- Chen J, Waite LJ, & Lauderdale DS (2015). Marriage, relationship quality, and sleep among US older adults. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 56*, 356-377. Doi: 10.1177/0022146515594631
- Choi H, Yorgason JB, & Johnson DR (2016). Marital quality and health in middle and later adulthood: Dyadic associations. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 71B*, 154-164. Doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbu222
- DeBernardis G, Hayes LJ, & Fryling MJ (2014). Perspective-taking as a continuum. *The Psychological Record, 64*, 123-131. Doi: 10.1007/s40732-014-0008-0
- Donoho CJ, Seeman TE, Sloan RP, & Crimmins EM (2015). Marital status, marital quality, and heart rate variability in the MIDUS cohort. *Journal of Family Psychology, 29*, 290-295. Doi: 10.1037/fam0000068.
- Follette WC, Naugle AE, & Callaghan GM (1996). A radical behavioral understanding of the therapeutic relationship in effecting change. *Behavior Therapy, 27*, 623-641. Doi: 10.1016/S0005-7894(96)80047-5
- Fryling MJ (2016). A developmental-behavioral analysis of lying. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 16*, 13-22.
- Fryling MJ & Hayes LJ (2010). An interbehavioral analysis of memory. *European Journal of Behavior Analysis, 11*, 53-68.
- Fryling MJ & Hayes LJ (2011). The concept of function in the analysis of behavior. *Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis, 37*, 11-20. Doi: 10.5514/rmac.v37.i1.24686
- Fryling MJ & Hayes LJ (2014). Are thoughts private? *Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis, 40*, 1-10.
- Fryling MJ, Johnston C, & Hayes LJ (2011). Understanding observational learning: An interbehavioral approach. *The Analysis of Verbal Behavior, 27*, 191-203.
- Gottman J, Notarius C, Gonso J, & Markman H (1979). *A couple's guide to communication*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Hayes LJ (1992a). Equivalence as process. In SC Hayes & LJ Hayes (Eds.), *Understanding verbal relations* (pp. 97-108). Reno, NV: Context Press.
- Hayes LJ (1992b). The psychological present. *The Behavior Analyst, 15*, 139-146.
- Hayes LJ, Adams MA, & Dixon MR (1997). Causal constructs and conceptual confusions. *The Psychological Record, 46*, 97-111.
- Hayes LJ & Fryling MJ (2009). Overcoming the pseudoproblem of private events in the analysis of behavior. *Behavior & Philosophy, 37*, 39-57.
- Kantor JR (1924). *Principles of psychology*. Chicago, IL: Principia Press.
- Kantor J (1953). *Logic of modern science*. Chicago, IL: Principia Press.
- Kantor J (1957). Constructs and events in psychology: Philosophy: Banished and recalled. *The Psychological Record, 7*, 55-60.
- Kantor J (1958). *Interbehavioral psychology*. Chicago, IL: Principia Press.
- Kent RG, Uchino BN, Cribbet MR, Bowen K, & Smith, T W (2015). Social relationships and sleep quality. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 49*, 912-917. Doi: 10.1007/s12160-015-9711-6.
- Robles TF (2014). Marital quality and health: Implications for marriage in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*, 427-432. Doi: 10.1177/0963721414549043

- Robles TF, Slatcher RB, Trombello JM, & McGinn MM (2014). Marital quality and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*, 140-187. Doi: 10.1037/a0031859
- Skinner BF (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Skinner BF (1957). *Verbal behavior*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Skinner BF (1974). *About behaviorism*. New York: Knopf.
- Smith NW (2007). Events and constructs. *The Psychological Record, 57*, 169-186.
- Vaughn AA, Drake RR, & Haydock S (2016). College student mental health and quality of workplace relationships. *Journal of American College Health, 64*(1), 26-37. Doi: 10.1080/07448481.2015.1064126
- Walser RD & Westrup D (2009). *The mindful couple: How acceptance and Mindfulness can lead you to the love you want*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger.
- Wolf MM (1978). Social validity: the case for subjective measurement or how applied behavior analysis is finding its heart. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 11*, 203-214. Doi: 10.1901/jaba.1978.11-203

Received, March 11, 2019  
Final Acceptance, April 13, 2019

***International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy (IJP&PT)*****Abstracting & Indexing / Cobertura e indexación**

*International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy* is indexed and/or abstracted in **Cabell's Directory**, **Clarivate Analytics (Emerging Sources Citation Index)**, **Catálogo Latindex**, **ClinPSYC** (American Psychological Association), **DIALNET**, **Academic Search Premier (EBSCO Publishing Inc.)**, **Google Scholar Metrics**, **IN-RECS** (Index of Impact of the Social Sciences Spanish Journals), **ISOC** (CINDOC, CSIC), **Journal Scholar Metrics**, **MIAR**, **ProQuest PRISMA**, **PSICODOC**, **Psychological Abstracts**, **PsycINFO**, and **RedALyC**, **SCOPUS**.

*International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy* está incluida en las bases y plataformas bibliográficas: **Cabell's Directory**, **Clarivate Analytics (Emerging Sources Citation Index)**, **Catálogo Latindex**, **ClinPSYC** (American Psychological Association), **DIALNET**, **Academic Search Premier (EBSCO Publishing Inc.)**, **Google Scholar Metrics**, **IN-RECS** (*Índice de Impacto de Revistas Españolas de Ciencias Sociales*), **ISOC** (CINDOC, CSIC), **Journal Scholar Metrics**, **MIAR**, **ProQuest PRISMA**, **PSICODOC** (*Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos*) y **RedALyC** (*Red de Revistas Científicas de América Latina y El Caribe, España y Portugal*).

**Datos sobre impacto y citas de IJP&PT pueden consultarse, entre otras, en las siguientes bases de datos / Data on the impact and citations of IJP&PT can be found at the following databases:**

*IJP&PT* has been selected for coverage in **Clarivate Analytics (Web of Science)** and will be indexed and abstracted in **Emerging Sources Citation Index** beginning with volume 17#1.

**Scopus**

<https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/7000153258>

**Cite Score 2018 of IJP&PT: 0.91 Q2**

**Source Normalized Impact per Paper 2017 (SNIP) of IJP&PT: 0.482**

**SCImago Journal Rank 2017 (SJR) of IJP&PT: h Index 25**

**Total Cites: 2013= 72; 2014= 87; 2015= 73; 2016= 63; 2017= 60; 2018= 64**

**Google Scholar Metrics**

[https://scholar.google.com/citations?view\\_op=top\\_venues&vq=es](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=top_venues&vq=es)

**IJP&PT data on January 2019**

**h5-Index: 16**

**h5-Median: 29**

**Matriz de Información para el Análisis de Revistas**

**ICDS 2018: 9.7**

<http://miar.ub.edu/issn/1577-7057>

