

INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATIONS OF SPOUSES
IN FATHER DAUGHTER INCEST

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

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY
VEVA LANE LAKE, B.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST, 1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to Dr. James C. Laney, Dr. David D. Marshall, Dr. Robert P. Littlefield, and Dr. Iris E. Amos, for their aid and guidance in the preparation of this paper, and to the administrators, and caseworkers at the treatment centers, without whom this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Review of the Literature	4
	Statement of the Problem	13
II	METHOD	17
	Selection of Subjects	17
	Instruments	17
	Procedure	19
	Statistical Hypotheses	21
	Statistical Analyses	25
III	RESULTS	27
IV	DISCUSSION	38
	Implications for Diagnosis and Treatment	44
V	SUMMARY	47
.		
	REFERENCES	52
APPENDICES		
A	Demographic and Socioeconomic Questionnaire	57
B	Analyses of Variance Tables	58
	Table A: Difference-Inclusion	58
	Table B: Difference-Control	58
	Table C: Difference-Affection	59
	Table D: Originator Compatibility- Inclusion	59
	Table E: Originator Compatibility- Control	60

Table F: Originator Compatibility- Affection	60
Table G: Reciprocal Compatibility- Inclusion	61
Table H: Reciprocal Compatibility- Control	61
Table I: Reciprocal Compatibility- Affection	62
Table J: Interchange Compatibility- Inclusion	62
Table K: Interchange Compatibility- Affection	63
Table L: Overall Compatibility-Inclusion .	63
Table M: Overall Compatibility-Affection .	64

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1	Discriminant Function Analysis-Husbands .	29
2	Discriminant Function Analysis-Wives . . .	32
3	Analysis of Variance of Interchange Compatibility-Control	37
4	Analysis of Variance of Overall Compatibility-Control	37

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The discovery of father daughter incest, defined as overt sexual behavior involving genital contact, has shocked some while it has aroused others. Few, however, understand the complexities of this "family affair" (Boekelheide, 1978, p. 87). Understanding has been shrouded by the aftermath which has followed public disclosure (Browning & Boatman, 1977). The criminal status of incest (Reed, 1977) and the reactions of professional and lay communities alike, have frequently contributed to the destruction of an already troubled family. Fathers have been imprisoned, daughters removed from homes, and mothers left to provide for what family may remain (Giaretto, 1976a). Such family dismemberment has rarely been curative. It has robbed the participants of any opportunity for resolution (Rosenfeld, 1979). Successful rehabilitation of these families has been demonstrated through humanistic, reunion oriented, treatment programs (Giaretto, 1976b). Their continued

efforts both deserve and require the support of empirical research.

Father daughter incest has been the most frequently reported form of incestuous behavior. Incidence statistics have ranged from 19 cases to 431 cases per million population per year in the United States (Phillips & Halley, 1978).

The transgression of the incest barrier has been attributed to situational stress (Mieselman, 1978), alcoholism (Virkkunen, 1974), mental defectiveness (Bender & Blau, 1937), psychopathy (Lukianowicz, 1972), psychosis (Bagley, 1969), and pedophilia (Summit & Kryso, 1978). Sociocultural factors such as community mores, disorganization, overcrowding, and limited education have also been considered accountable (Lukianowicz, 1972; Riemer, 1940). These findings have represented a minority of cases and have not been considered to be characteristic of the typical incestuous family (Maisch, 1973). Incestuous families have more frequently been found representative of the population from which they were drawn with respect to both organismic and sociocultural factors (Giaretto, 1976b).

One demographic variable, the age of the participants, has consistently been cited as an important factor in incest. Sexual relations usually began prior

to the daughter's puberty, when the father was in his third or fourth decade of life. The incestuous relationship generally continued for several years.

Henderson (1972) and Weiner (1964) have reviewed this issue.

Researchers have agreed that all family members played a role in the genesis and maintenance of the incestuous relationship (Heims & Kaufman, 1963; Lustig, Dresser, Spellman, & Murray, 1966). Its occurrence has been seen as an attempt to reestablish equilibrium (Lustig et al., 1966), or as a family defense against loss (Gutheil & Avery, 1977), in a dysfunctional family characterized by disturbed role relationships.

The exact nature of role disturbances has been addressed by several authors (Cormier, Kennedy, & Sangowicz, 1962; Justice & Justice, 1979). They have included a disruption of sexual relations between the spouses with the husband turning to his physically maturing daughter for sexual gratification. The marital relationship has been particularly discordant and the father has been aided in his incestuous activity by a collusive wife (Henderson, 1972; Swanson, 1968).

These findings suggested that the occurrence of incest was a product of unsatisfactory interpersonal relationships, particularly the relationship between the

spouses. While other factors may have been involved, they did not appear to have led to incest in the absence of these characteristic interpersonal behaviors. The purpose of this investigation was to define these behaviors in an objective fashion by examining each spouse's interpersonal orientations and the complementarity of their orientations in families where father daughter incest has occurred.

Review of the Literature

Though incestuous families have been considered dysfunctional, reports on the level of dysfunction have been inconsistent. Hersko, Halleck, Rosenberg, and Pacht (1961) interviewed three adolescent girls who exhibited a history of father daughter incest. They concluded that incest was a symptom of "widespread chronic family disorganization" (p. 30). Conversely, Gligor (1966) surveyed 57 daughters who had engaged in father daughter incest and 53 daughters who had been adjudicated as sexual delinquents. She concluded that the families did not significantly differ, nor did they show serious disorganization.

Regardless of the level of disorganization, incestuous behavior has appeared as a family defense against

loss. Lustig et al. (1966) treated six father daughter incest families. They concluded that incest was a tension reducing mechanism which served to maintain the family unit, maintain a facade of role competency for the parents, defend the parents from feelings of sexual inadequacy, and reduce separation anxiety for all family members. Similarly, Sholevar (1975) treated three families and concluded that incestuous behavior was, though ineffective, a defense against loss. Gutheil and Avery (1977) also concluded that the occurrence of incest in the family they treated was a defense against a shared fear of separation and loss. Giaretto (1976a) treated over 300 families and concluded that incest was an attempt to re-establish homeostasis.

Raphling, Carpenter, and Davis (1967) interviewed one family and concluded that a model for incestuous behavior in previous generations was paramount in the choice of incest as a method for achieving equilibrium in the family. Similarly, a history of incest was also noted by Rosenfeld, Nadelson, Krieger, and Backman (1977). They treated four incestuous families.

The previous literature suggested that the family which engaged in incest was reacting to a threat against its integrity, perhaps in a manner determined by its forebearers. The following literature suggested that

this threat was the characteristic interpersonal relationships of family members. Researchers' efforts have resulted in a relatively consistent picture of the families' interpersonal relationships.

Lustig et al. (1966) presented the most explicit picture. They concluded that the occurrence of incest depended on five conditions: (a) the daughter assumed the mother's role, becoming the central figure of the home, (b) impaired sexual relations between the spouses left the father with unrelieved sexual tension, (c) the father was unable to secure sexual satisfaction outside of the home due to a need to maintain a facade of patriarchy, (d) all family members shared a fear of family disintegration, and (e) the nonparticipant mother condoned and sanctioned her daughter's role as her husband's sexual partner.

Similarly, Nakashima and Zakus (1977) found three predominant dynamics in the 23 cases of father daughter incest they reviewed: (a) the mother condoned the incest, (b) there was an impaired sexual relationship between the spouses, and (c) all family members denied the behavior due to a fear of family disintegration.

Poznanski and Blos (1975) also concluded that the mother cooperated with the father to allow the occurrence of incest, that the family showed a history of

marital conflict, and that stepfathers were more likely to commit incest than natural fathers. Their conclusions were drawn from two cases. The family dynamics have appeared similar, however, regardless of relationship by blood or marriage (Maisch, 1973).

Anderson and Shafer (1979) surveyed 62 cases of father daughter incest and portrayed these families in behavioral terms. They described them as "character disordered" (p. 436). They delineated 11 prominent characteristics of the family members: (a) poor impulse control, (b) inadequate judgment, (c) conflict with authority, (d) physical rather than verbal, expression of needs, (e) manipulateness as a means of need satisfaction, (f) little or no guilt feelings, (g) self-centeredness, (h) irresponsibility, (i) little anxiety, (j) major dependency conflicts, and (k) fear of intimacy.

While portraying similar pictures, several researchers have placed a major emphasis on the mother's behavior. Heims and Kaufman (1963) concluded that the mother pushed her daughter into the mothering role and that the father accepted the substitution of the daughter for a sexual partner. Their conclusions were drawn from a psychotherapy sample which compared daughters who had actually engaged in incest with

daughters who had incestuous wishes for a relative (n=20).

Tormes (1968) compared 20 incestuous families with 20 families whose daughter had been sexually victimized. She concluded that the mother was primarily responsible for the occurrence of incest as she would have been the only family member capable of preventing the relationship. Machotka, Pittman, and Flomenhaft (1967) treated two families referred for father daughter incest. They concluded that the mother precipitated the incest by abandoning her role as a sexual partner, and subsequently, by giving covert messages to both the daughter and husband that the daughter assume the wifely functions. They further suggested that the mother's denial of incest served to prevent changes in the family's distorted roles, thus maintaining the relationship.

Herman and Hirschman (1977) treated 15 women with a history of father daughter incest. They reported that the women perceived their mothers as having rejected and abandoned them. Cormier et al. (1962) also concluded that these women were perceived by their husbands as being unloving and hostile.

Research pertaining to the mother's intrapsychic functioning has enhanced understanding of her role abandonment. Browning and Boatman (1977) reviewed the

records of nine father daughter incest families. They found chronic depression to be predominant in these women and suggested that this finding explained their previously cited sexual withdrawal, passivity, and emotional distance. Justice and Justice (1979) reviewed the records of 101 cases of father daughter incest. They concluded that these mothers sought a role reversal with their daughter in an effort to secure the nurturance missed in their own childhood. They portrayed the mothers as frigid, weak, submissive, chronically fatigued, and indifferent or absent. They stated that these women treated their husbands as children. Similarly, Kaufman, Peck, and Tagiuri (1954) described them as immature, infantile and dependent upon their own mothers who had rejected them. Their conclusions were drawn from interviews with 11 women.

Though findings pertaining to the mother in father daughter incest families have been sparse, they suggested that she was a woman whose dependency needs were never met in her own family of origin. Her demonstrated lack of nurturing behavior and failure to function in the role of wife and mother may have resulted from an absence of historical models. Nonetheless, it appeared doubtful that the role she subsequently chose led to the satisfaction of her original unmet needs.

Other investigators of family dynamics have placed more weight on the father's role in the occurrence of incest. Maisch (1973) reported that the father's authoritarian and dominating influence on the family was predominant in contributing to the family dysfunction. Coupled with this finding was the mother's inability to provide emotional solidarity to the family. Maisch noted absent, restricted, or unsatisfactory sexual relationships in 74% ($n=78$) of these marriages. Weinberg (1955) interviewed 203 men charged with incest. Of father daughter incest families, Weinberg (1972) stated that the family was characterized by the presence of a patriarchal father figure who frequently intimidated all family members. Goodwin, Sahd, and Rada (1978) surveyed 40 cases of father daughter incest. They pointed to the father's "rigid, moralistic, and patriarchal" (p. 274) attitude, as well as the relinquishment of maternal responsibilities by the mother, as key factors in these families. Cavallin (1966) tested 12 incestuous fathers. He suggested that incest was an expression of family conflict but was primarily an expression of the father's unconscious hostility which fused with primitive genital impulses.

Research pertaining to the father's intrapsychic functioning has further illuminated his behavior.

Cormier et al. (1962) tested 27 incestuous fathers. They described them as non-criminal, of normal intelligence or above, and as having made acceptable occupational and social adjustment prior to the onset of incest. Cormier et al. noted that these men used excessive denial to prevent themselves from feeling guilt. They characterized them as adolescents. The father's psychological processes which led to incest were described as follows:

(1) the daughter becomes the substitute for the wife; (2) the daughter is the substitute, not for the present wife, but for the girl he courted many years ago; (3) parallel to this, he, too, has the illusion that he is again the young man he was when he wooed his wife; (4) the real wife now symbolizes the forbidding mother; (5) the daughter herself has become transformed to the early giving mother.

(p. 11)

Weiner (1962) tested five incestuous fathers and concluded that all showed a history of disturbed family backgrounds and exhibited unresolved conflicts with their fathers. He further stated that these men showed an absence of psychotic features but exhibited paranoid traits, problems with identity, and showed homosexual

longings. Weiner also commented on the excessive use of denial these men used to avoid guilt feelings.

Swanson (1968) examined 25 men who had committed a variety of sexual abuses toward children. Five of the men had engaged in father daughter incest. Swanson concluded that while symptoms of personality disorganization or inflexibility were present, the environmental circumstances were more important in precipitating the offenses, citing loss of the usual sexual partner and alcoholism as precipitating factors. Maisch (1973) found incestuous fathers to be predominantly normal intellectually, of normal personality and of normal sexuality. Maisch also found aggressiveness and alcoholism as secondary but important features of these men.

Justice and Justice (1979) described the father as a person longing "for a closeness, a sense of belonging and intimacy that he seldom can verbalize and never has experienced. . . . He does not know how to be close . . . in a nonsexual sense or how to meet his needs . . . in a non-physical way" (p. 63).

Research on the fathers in father daughter incest has portrayed a man whose dependency needs were never met in his own family of origin. Though he desired intimacy, he also appeared afraid of it and developed rigid defenses against it. He had also abandoned his

role as husband and parent and adopted a less threatening role, a suitor of his daughter. Unfortunately, this position may have held his family together, but he also remained in need.

The literature has indicated that incest occurred in a family characterized by specific relationship styles. Both parents have sought out roles other than the one they found themselves in, both appeared equally needy, and neither were able to satisfy their needs except through a homeostatic mechanism, incest, which only perpetuated and exacerbated their sense of inadequacy and aloneness. Their behaviors were strikingly similar though neither was able to bridge the distance between themselves, perhaps, due to a fear of the intimacy they longed for.

Statement of the Problem

While many investigators have attempted to define the interpersonal behaviors which led to incest, their conclusions have been drawn from studies plagued by small samples, a lack of comparison groups, questionable measurement methods, and unreproducible sampling procedures. This investigation was an attempt to describe the behaviors of incestuous spouses' interpersonal

orientations in families where father daughter incest had occurred, in a reproducible, empirical fashion.

Shutz (1966) postulated that all individuals had three basic needs: (a) the need for inclusion, which addressed issues of affiliation and association, (b) the need for control which addressed issues of authority and decision making, and (c) the need for affection, which addressed issues of love and intimacy. Shutz reported that this schemata was a sufficient representation of interpersonal behavior to explain and predict interpersonal phenomenon. Shutz (1967) subsequently introduced a scale designed to measure both the behavior an individual expressed towards others and the behavior an individual wanted expressed toward oneself, from others, for each of the three need areas. He also stated that the scale could be used to assess compatibility.

The interpersonal relationships of the spouses in father daughter incest families clearly reflected less than ideal satisfaction of Shutz's three interpersonal needs. With respect to control, the father's dominance suggested excessive expressed control behavior. The mother's passivity suggested an absence of expressed control behavior. With regard to inclusion, the indications were discrepant. Although both spouses may have wanted to include, or be included, their actions were

often exclusionary. The rejecting attitude of the mother suggested an absence of expressed affection behavior. The affection behavior of the father is questionable. His incestuous activity could be viewed as excessive affection behavior, or conversely, as an attempt to dehumanize one or all family members.

The literature suggested that the interpersonal needs of incestuous spouses generally went unmet. This may have resulted from not knowing what they wanted from others, or, not asking for what they wanted from others. Hence, it remained unclear whether or not they would want much inclusion, control, or affection behavior expressed towards them.

Another plausible interpretation stemmed from the assumption that there was a relationship between the behavior an individual expressed towards others and the behavior an individual wanted from others, i.e., if one wanted affection from others, one might have expressed affection towards others. Indications in the literature that incestuous spouses felt helpless, suggested that they may not perceive a relationship between giving and receiving, nor would they internalize responsibility for such a relationship. In fact, it appeared likely that there would be a great deal of discrepancy between the

inclusion, control, and affection behaviors they expressed and wanted expressed towards themselves.

The literature suggested that incestuous spouses experienced significant marital conflict and role frustration which indicated that they experienced a lack of compatibility between their interpersonal behaviors.

Finally, the literature suggested that incestuous spouses were not particularly different from the world around them either psychically or socioeconomically.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Selection of Subjects

Fifteen incestuous couples who were referred to the Sexual Abuse Units of Dallas County Mental Health-Mental Retardation Center (DCMHMRC) and the Dallas County Department of Human Resources (DCDHR) for father daughter incest comprised the experimental group. No distinction was made between stepfathers and natural fathers.

Fifteen couples who had responded to advertisements for volunteers placed in the Carrollton, Farmers Branch, Garland, and Irving area newspapers, and who had at least one school age daughter, comprised the control group.

Instruments

All subjects were given Shutz's Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) to assess their interpersonal orientations. The FIRO-B is a nonprojective, self-report measure, composed of six, nine-item Guttman scales. Each scale yielded one score: expressed

inclusion (\underline{e}^I), wanted inclusion (\underline{w}^I), expressed control (\underline{e}^C), wanted control (\underline{w}^C), expressed affection (\underline{e}^A), and wanted affection (\underline{w}^A). Shutz (1967) reported a coefficient of internal stability, derived from the split half method, of .94 for each of the six scales. The six scales were reported to have a mean coefficient of stability of .76. The scales show moderate to low intercorrelations, with the higher correlations found between \underline{e}^I and \underline{e}^A (.47), \underline{e}^I and \underline{w}^I (.49) and \underline{e}^A and \underline{w}^A (.42). The lower correlations were between \underline{e}^C and \underline{w}^C (.07), \underline{e}^I and \underline{w}^C (.08), \underline{w}^I and \underline{e}^C (.06), and \underline{w}^I and \underline{w}^C (.06). Shutz (1966) reported that content validity was a property of all Guttman scaling procedures. The fact that all responses for a given scale are accepted sequentially up to a point at which all remaining items are rejected, and that 90% of all possible responses in a given area can be correctly predicted from a knowledge of the number of accepted responses implies that the scale is both reproducible and samples a unidimensional trait (Shutz, 1967). Numerous studies have shown satisfactory concurrent validity for the FIRO-B scales. They have been correlated with political attitudes (McElheny in Shutz, 1966), conformity, and occupations (Shutz, 1966).

Shutz (1966) developed formulas to measure three types of compatibility; originator compatibility (\underline{oK}), reciprocal compatibility (\underline{rK}), and interchange compatibility (\underline{xK}). The scores are derived from the following formulas:

$$\underline{oK} = (\underline{e}_i - \underline{w}_i) + (\underline{e}_j - \underline{w}_j) \quad (1)$$

$$\underline{rK} = |\underline{e}_i - \underline{w}_j| + |\underline{e}_j - \underline{w}_i| \quad (2)$$

$$\underline{xK} = |(\underline{e}_i + \underline{w}_i) - (\underline{e}_j + \underline{w}_j)| \quad (3)$$

(Shutz, 1966; p. 113). Overall type compatibility (\underline{K}) was derived by summing the three compatibility scores for a given need area and were derived from the following formulas:

$$\underline{K}^I = \underline{rK}^I + \underline{oK}^I + \underline{xK}^I \quad (4)$$

$$\underline{K}^C = \underline{rK}^C + \underline{oK}^C + \underline{xK}^C \quad (5)$$

$$\underline{K}^A = \underline{rK}^A + \underline{oK}^A + \underline{xK}^A \quad (6)$$

(Shutz, 1966; p. 114). Each type of compatibility was computed for each need area as were the three measures of overall compatibility, to assess the incestuous and non-incestuous spouses' degree of interpersonal compatibility.

Procedure

The subject pool for the experimental group consisted of all intact married couples referred to DCDHR for father daughter incest. All incestuous families

were routinely staffed after referral to determine the most appropriate treatment modality. Couples were then engaged in group treatment through the Sex Abuse Unit of DCDHR or individual and family treatment through the Sex Abuse Unit of DCMHMRC. After assignment to a given treatment modality, and within the first two weeks of treatment, incestuous couples were approached by their respective case managers and asked if they would be willing to participate in a research project. Of 17 couples approached, only two were unwilling to participate. They were then given a written explanation of the purposes of the study, i.e., it was a study of the interpersonal relationships of couples in families where an accusation of father daughter incest had been made.

The subject pool for the control group consisted of married couples with school age children who had responded to advertisements in the suburban area newspapers of Carrollton, Farmers Branch, Garland, and Irving, requesting volunteers for research. Each couple was asked to participate in a study designed to examine the interpersonal relationships of married couples with school age children. They were subsequently asked the ages and sex of their children. All couples who had at least one school age daughter were selected.

All couples were given a written explanation of the study which informed them of their rights and assured them of anonymous participation. To assure anonymity, a blind testing procedure was used. Packets which contained a brief demographic and socioeconomic questionnaire (see Appendix A) and FIRO-B were given to all subjects. These testing materials were coded with the numbers 1-30, using the subscripts a and b to designate females and males, respectively. The numbers 1-15 were used for the experimental group while the numbers 16-30 were used for the control group. An uncoded consent form was attached to the outside of the packet and was removed and separated from the data.

Control subjects were mailed identical packets with return envelopes. They were instructed to call the examiner after they completed the packets for a debriefing. On calling they were informed of the purposes of the study and of their role as a control group and given the opportunity to withdraw their data before returning it.

Statistical Hypotheses

Four major sets of hypotheses were tested in this study. The first general hypotheses regarded the

expressed and wanted behaviors of incestuous husbands and their demographic and socioeconomic status. Due to procedural necessity, the overall hypothesis was stated in the null form. The hypothesis stated that there will be no significant difference between group centroids for incestuous and non-incestuous husbands. Specific alternative hypotheses were subsequently generated for the following variables. It was hypothesized that:

- (1) Incestuous husbands will express higher levels of control behavior than non-incestuous husbands.
- (2) Incestuous husbands will significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in wanted control behavior.
- (3) Incestuous husbands will significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in expressed affection behavior.
- (4) Incestuous husbands will significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in wanted affection behavior.
- (5) Incestuous husbands will significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in expressed inclusion behavior.

- (6) Incestuous husbands will significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in wanted inclusion behavior.
- (7) Incestuous husbands will not differ significantly from non-incestuous husbands on demographic and socioeconomic measures.

The second general hypotheses regarded the expressed and wanted behaviors of incestuous wives as well as their demographic and socioeconomic status. Due to procedural necessity, the overall hypothesis was stated in the null form. It stated that there will be no significant difference between group centroids for incestuous and non-incestuous wives. Specific alternative hypotheses were generated for the following variables. It was hypothesized that:

- (8) Incestuous wives will express significantly less control behavior than non-incestuous wives.
- (9) Incestuous wives will significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in wanted control behavior.
- (10) Incestuous wives will express significantly less affection behavior than non-incestuous wives.

- (11) Incestuous wives will significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in wanted affection behavior.
- (12) Incestuous wives will significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in expressed inclusion behavior.
- (13) Incestuous wives will significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in wanted inclusion behavior.
- (14) Incestuous wives will not differ significantly from non-incestuous wives on demographic and socioeconomic measures.

The third general hypotheses referred to the relationship between the incestuous spouses' expressed and wanted interpersonal behaviors. Specifically it was hypothesized that:

- (15) Incestuous spouses will show a greater discrepancy between the control behaviors they express and want expressed towards them than non-incestuous spouses.
- (16) Incestuous spouses will show a greater discrepancy between the affection behaviors they express and want expressed towards them than non-incestuous spouses.

- (17) Incestuous spouses will show a greater discrepancy between the inclusion behaviors they express and want expressed towards them than non-incestuous spouses.

The fourth set of hypotheses regarded the intramarital compatibility of incestuous spouses' interpersonal behaviors. Specifically it was hypothesized:

- (18) Incestuous spouses will show less originator compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas.
- (19) Incestuous spouses will show less reciprocal compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas.
- (20) Incestuous spouses will show less interchange compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas.
- (21) Incestuous spouses will show less overall compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas.

Statistical Analyses

The first group of hypotheses (1-7) was tested by subjecting the raw data to a discriminant function analysis. Criterion for accepting or rejecting the

hypotheses was established at .05. Similarly, a discriminant analysis was used to test the corresponding set of hypotheses for the wives (8-14). Discriminant analysis is a multivariate procedure used to distinguish groups from one another when the variables subjected to analysis are correlated (Tatsuoka, 1970).

The third set of hypotheses (15-17) was tested by three one-way analyses of variance applied to the difference scores between expressed and wanted behaviors for each need area. The statistical significance level was set at .05.

The fourth set of hypotheses (19-21) was tested by subjecting the twelve compatibility scores to twelve one-way analyses of variance, also with a statistical significance level of .05.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Initially, 15 variables were collected on each subject. The variables consisted of the six FIRO-B scores and the following demographic and socioeconomic variables; age, race, number of marriages, duration of present marriage, number of children, length of education, income, occupation, and religion. For the analyses, religion was coded into four categories and occupation was coded into six categories drawn from those devised by Roe (1956). These coded variables and the raw values of the remaining variables totalled 23 variables which composed the original data base used for all subsequent analyses. Due to procedural necessity, the overall hypotheses analyzed using discriminant functions were stated in the null form. Alternative hypotheses were formulated with respect to the variables included in each function, to facilitate ease of expression. The results indicated that a combination of only eight of the variables were sufficient to clearly distinguish incestuous spouses from non-incestuous spouses.

Secondly, the results indicated that incestuous spouses' interpersonal control behaviors were strikingly compatible.

The first group of hypotheses was subjected to a discriminant function analysis (Table 1). The overall null hypothesis stated that there would be no difference between group centroids for incestuous and non-incestuous husbands. The analysis yielded a function composed of eight variables which significantly differentiated the incestuous husbands from the non-incestuous husbands, $\chi^2 = 42.410$, d.f. = 8, $p < .001$. The null hypothesis was subsequently rejected.

The first alternative hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would express higher levels of control behavior than non-incestuous husbands. Conversely, incestuous husbands expressed significantly lower levels of control behavior than non-incestuous husbands, consequently, this hypothesis was rejected. The second hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in wanted control behavior. Wanted control behavior was not included in the function, consequently, the second hypothesis was also rejected.

Table 1
Discriminant Function Analysis of Husbands

Source	Discriminant Function Coefficient		Wilks'	
	Standardized	Unstandardized	Lambda	P
Education	-0.83022	-0.30588	0.4017	*
Marriages	0.81393	1.25735	0.2983	*
\underline{e}^C	-0.62127	-0.24010	0.2261	*
Occupation 3 ^a	-0.41135	-1.19220	0.2133	*
\underline{w}^I	-0.63695	-0.25281	0.1990	*
Income	-0.39149	-0.00734	0.1878	*
Religion 1 ^b	-0.55640	-1.18883	0.1730	*
Occupation 5 ^c	0.30767	0.65738	0.1708	*
(constant)		5.19355		

Group Centroids for Husbands

Incestuous	2.12844
Non-incestuous	-2.12844

^aOccupation 3 is semi-professional and small business owners.

^bReligion 1 is Protestant.

^cOccupation 5 is semi-skilled.

* $p < .001$.

The third hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in expressed affection behavior. Expressed affection behavior was excluded from the function and this hypothesis was rejected. The fourth hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in wanted affection behavior. Wanted affection behavior was not a significant discriminating variable, hence, the fourth hypothesis was also rejected.

The fifth hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in expressed inclusion behavior. Expressed inclusion behavior was not a significant discriminating variable and this hypothesis was rejected. The sixth hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would significantly differ from non-incestuous husbands in wanted inclusion behavior. The analysis revealed that incestuous husbands wanted significantly less inclusion behavior expressed towards them from others than did non-incestuous husbands. The sixth hypothesis was accepted.

The seventh hypothesis stated that incestuous husbands would not differ significantly from non-incestuous husbands on demographic and socioeconomic measures. Of

the nine original demographic and socioeconomic measures, only four variables; age, race, duration of present marriage, and number of children, showed no significant differences between the two groups of men. The analysis revealed significant group differences for education, number of marriages, income, occupation, and religion. The incestuous husbands had fewer years of education, more previous marriages, and lower incomes than non-incestuous husbands. Incestuous husbands tended to be employed in semi-skilled occupations while non-incestuous husbands tended to be employed in semi-professional occupations. Finally, incestuous husbands tended to have religious preferences other than Protestant. A greater number of demographic and socioeconomic variables were included in the function than were excluded. Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

The second group of hypotheses was also subjected to a discriminant function analysis (Table 2). The overall null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences between group centroids for incestuous and non-incestuous wives. The analysis yielded a function composed of eight variables which significantly differentiated the incestuous wives, $\chi^2 = 38.154$, d.f. = 8, $p < .001$. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 2
Discriminant Function Analysis of Wives

Source	Discriminant Function Coefficient		Wilks'	
	Standardized	Unstandardized	Lamba	P
Education	0.89253	0.51206	0.4399	*
w^C	-0.50163	-0.16739	0.3677	*
w^I	0.40348	0.14143	0.3443	*
Occupation 5 ^a	-0.79417	-1.79734	0.3104	*
Income	-0.69451	-0.01595	0.2477	*
Religion 1 ^b	-0.43002	-0.88127	0.2322	*
e^I	0.47969	0.26368	0.2191	*
Children	-0.34381	-0.21283	0.2040	*
(constant)		-3.86487		

Group Centroids for Wives

Incestuous	-1.90849
Non-incestuous	1.90849

^aOccupation 5 is semi-skilled.

^bReligion 1 is Protestant.

* $p < .001$.

The first alternative hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would express significantly less control behavior than non-incestuous wives. Expressed control behavior was not a discriminating variable in the function, hence, this hypothesis was rejected. The second hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in wanted control behavior. Incestuous wives wanted significantly more control behavior expressed towards them from others than did non-incestuous wives. Consequently, this hypothesis was accepted.

The third hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would express significantly less affection behavior than non-incestuous wives. Expressed affection behavior was not a significant factor in the function and this hypothesis was rejected. The fourth hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in wanted affection behavior. Wanted affection behavior was excluded from the function and this hypothesis was also rejected.

The fifth hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in expressed inclusion behavior. Incestuous wives expressed significantly less inclusion behavior than did non-incestuous wives. Hence, this hypothesis was

accepted. The sixth hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would significantly differ from non-incestuous wives in wanted inclusion behavior. Incestuous wives wanted significantly less inclusion behavior expressed towards them from others than did non-incestuous wives. This hypothesis was also accepted.

The seventh hypothesis stated that incestuous wives would not differ significantly from non-incestuous wives on demographic and socioeconomic measures. Of the nine original variables, only four variables; age, race, number of marriages, and duration of present marriage, showed no significant differences between the two groups of women. The analysis revealed significant group differences for education, occupation, income, religion, and number of children. Incestuous wives tended to have fewer years of education, higher incomes, and more children. More incestuous wives were employed in semi-skilled occupations and preferred a Protestant religious affiliation. A greater number of demographic and socioeconomic variables were included in the function than were excluded. Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

The third group of hypotheses was subjected to three one way analyses of variance (Appendix B). The first of these hypotheses stated that incestuous spouses would show greater differences between the control

behaviors they expressed and wanted expressed towards them than non-incestuous spouses. No significant main effect for the difference between expressed and wanted control behaviors was found. This hypothesis was subsequently rejected. The second hypothesis stated that incestuous spouses would show greater differences between the affection behaviors they expressed and wanted expressed towards them than non-incestuous spouses. No significant main effect for the difference between expressed and wanted affection behaviors was observed. This hypothesis was also rejected. The third hypothesis stated that incestuous spouses would show greater differences between the inclusion behaviors they expressed and wanted expressed towards them than non-incestuous spouses. Again, no significant main effect was found for the difference between expressed and wanted inclusion behaviors. This hypothesis was also rejected.

The fourth group of hypotheses was tested by 12 one way analyses of variance. The first hypothesis stated that incestuous spouses would show less originator compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas. Incestuous spouses did not significantly differ from non-incestuous spouses in originator compatibility with respect to affection, inclusion, or control (Appendix B). This hypothesis was

subsequently rejected. The second hypothesis stated that incestuous spouses would show less reciprocal compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas. Incestuous spouses did not significantly differ from non-incestuous spouses in reciprocal compatibility with respect to affection, inclusion, or control (Appendix B). This hypothesis was also rejected. The third hypothesis stated that incestuous spouses would show less interchange compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas. Incestuous spouses did not significantly differ from non-incestuous spouses in interchange compatibility with respect to affection or inclusion (Appendix B). Contrary to prediction, however, incestuous spouses showed significantly greater interchange compatibility with respect to control than non-incestuous spouses (Table 3). This third hypothesis was rejected. The final hypothesis stated that incestuous spouses would show less overall compatibility than non-incestuous spouses in each of the three need areas. Incestuous spouses did not differ significantly from non-incestuous spouses in overall compatibility with respect to affection or inclusion (Appendix B). Again, incestuous spouses showed greater overall compatibility with respect to control than non-incestuous spouses (Table 4). This final hypothesis was rejected.

Table 3
 Analysis of Variance of Interchange
 Compatibility-Control

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	48.1333	5.320*
Within Groups	28	9.0476	

* $p < .05$.

Table 4
 Analysis of Variance of Overall
 Compatibility-Control

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	307.2000	8.078*
Within Groups	28	38.0286	

* $p < .01$.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The original hypotheses were, for the most part, unsupported. The findings which emerged, however, are striking in their implications for the diagnosis and treatment of incestuous families. As the present study was correlational in nature, caution must be observed in generalizing beyond this particular sample of incestuous spouses.

The first major group of hypotheses pertained to the differences between incestuous and non-incestuous husbands on two dependent measures; their interpersonal orientations and their demographic and socioeconomic status. Contrary to prediction, incestuous husbands were differentiated more by their demographic and socioeconomic status than by their interpersonal behaviors. This finding may have been due to biases in sample selection. An alternative explanation stemmed from previous studies which indicated that these men did not express their needs verbally and employed denial which may have led to inaccuracies in their self-reports of their interpersonal behaviors.

Demographically, incestuous husbands exhibited more previous marriages, and tended to have religious affiliations other than Protestant. Socioeconomically, they emerged as men who were less educated and who were employed in less skilled professions, earning less money than the non-incestuous husbands. Interpersonally, they were characterized by wanting to be included less and by expressing less control behavior.

The fact that incestuous husbands tended to express less control behavior and wanted less inclusion behavior expressed towards them added a previously unconsidered dimension. While these findings broadly supported the previous assumptions that they did not turn outside the family for sexual satisfaction, they did not support the notion that this behavior was due to a need to maintain a facade of patriarchy, nor that the incestuous husband was necessarily a family tyrant. An image of a man who was interpersonally more passive, and perhaps, preferred social isolation appeared more likely on the basis of the present findings.

The second group of hypotheses pertained to differences between incestuous and non-incestuous wives on the same dependent measures. The results yielded a discriminatory function which was somewhat more balanced with respect to the dependent variables. Demographically,

incestuous wives tended to prefer a Protestant religious affiliation, and tended to have more children. Socio-economically, they tended to have less education, tended to be employed in semi-skilled jobs, and tended to make more money than non-incestuous wives. Interpersonally, they both expressed and wanted less inclusion behavior expressed towards them. They also wanted more control behavior expressed towards them than did non-incestuous wives.

The fact that these women both expressed and wanted less inclusion behavior, but did not differ in affection behavior, suggested that these women were not necessarily women who were unloving and hostile, but rather women who chose social isolation. The finding that incestuous wives wanted more control behavior expressed towards them supported previous assumptions of their passivity and dependence, at least with respect to issues of authority and decision making. Again, biases in subject selection and inaccuracies in self-reports may have effected the results.

The third group of hypotheses pertained to differences between incestuous and non-incestuous spouses with respect to the differences between their expressed and wanted behaviors for each need area. Contrary to prediction, incestuous spouses did not show significantly

greater differences between their expressed and wanted behaviors for any of the need areas. Indications in the literature that incestuous spouses felt helpless and frustrated led to the assumption that they wanted to receive behaviors from others that they did not, or were not able to, express. These findings suggested that this assumption may have been erroneous or that the measurement methods may have been inappropriate. However, findings were in the hypothesized direction and approached significance in two of the need areas. Consequently, the presence or absence of consistency between the expressed and wanted behaviors of incestuous spouses may be a fruitful area for future investigation.

The fourth group of hypotheses pertained to the compatibility of incestuous spouses' interpersonal behaviors. Of 12 compatibility measures, only two showed significant differences which were contrary to those expected. Incestuous spouses showed both greater interchange and overall compatibility in the interpersonal need area of control. These findings indicated that incestuous spouses showed more agreement as to the amount of control they operated under as a dyad than non-incestuous spouses. Further, findings suggested that incestuous spouses expressed levels of control which were more commensurate with the levels of control

each wanted to receive from the other than that of non-incestuous spouses. At least with respect to control issues, i.e., issues of authority and decision making, these findings do not support indications of marital discord. Resolution of the degree and nature of intramarital compatibility in father daughter incest families must await further research efforts.

The composite results broadly supported the notion that both incestuous spouses interpersonal behaviors contributed to the occurrence of incest. Two previously cited family dynamics were supported; fear of intimacy and issues of dominance. However, the motivational factors behind these behaviors appeared somewhat different. First, both spouse's interpersonal behaviors indicated that they were well defended against intimacy, particularly the wife. By inference, this confirmed their fear of intimacy. Neither spouse wanted much inclusion behavior expressed towards them which would have served to prevent intimacy between them. Additionally, the wife did not express much inclusion behavior towards others. This supported the idea that the father and daughter perceived her as having abandoned and rejected them. Though her behavior may have been perceived as hostile and unloving, it appeared motivated by a fear of entering into close relationships. The

wives previously cited sexual withdrawal may have also been an artifact of this phenomenon.

Secondly, interpersonal behaviors of dominance, and consequently, of dependence were clearly implicated. Contrary to previous assumptions these husbands did not express much control behavior, nor did they need to, given their wives' desire to be controlled. These perceptions may have been an artifact of the observed compatibility between incestuous spouses with respect to control. By inference, this compatibility alluded to the previously cited collusion between spouses in the occurrence of incest.

Several previously cited interpersonal behaviors thought to be involved in the occurrence of incest were not observed in the present investigation. Consequently, indications in the previous literature which suggested that the occurrence of incest was primarily a product of characteristic interpersonal relationships, particularly those of the spouses, may have been erroneous. However, it seemed more likely that the characteristics mentioned may have insufficiently represented the interpersonal relationships which led to incest. Further, several sources of error may have effected the present findings. First, errors in sample selection, i.e., characteristics unique to these volunteers and/or volunteer

characteristics in general, may have contributed to the finding of significant demographic and socioeconomic differences. Secondly, the accuracy of a self-report measure has been questionable. Finally, Shutz's (1966) theory of interpersonal needs and/or the measure he designed to test the theory may have been an inadequate representation of interpersonal behavior.

Implications for Diagnosis and Treatment

Authorities have agreed that a conviction of father daughter incest was a necessary leverage for the engagement of incestuous families in treatment. Currently, the daughter's uncorroborated testimony is insufficient to gain a conviction. If the present findings can be replicated, then the assessment of demographic, socioeconomic, and interpersonal behaviors, particularly those of inclusion and control, may be a useful diagnostic aid in substantiating the occurrence of father daughter incest. Caution should be observed as several studies have found that demographic and socioeconomic features are not unique to incest per se, but rather, unique to populations likely to be caught and convicted for any sort of deviant behavior.

After public disclosure of incest all family members are frequently traumatized. This has resulted from the

actions of legal and social professionals as well as each family member's feelings of guilt, shame, and fear. The spouses in particular find it difficult to confront one another. This has led to the use of individual treatment as an initial intervention strategy. In the initial phases of individual treatment with the wife, her lack of inclusion behaviors may operate against the establishment of rapport. However, her desire to be controlled suggests that a therapeutic alliance may be more readily established through a directive approach. Similarly, with the husband, his lack of wanted inclusion behaviors may also hinder the establishment of a therapeutic relationship.

In subsequent phases of treatment, marital therapy has been used to strengthen the spouses' relationship. Their compatibility in the area of control can be used to support their relationship at a time when it is particularly fragile. Their mutuality in this area should be left intact while they struggle to work out a more compatible relationship in other areas. If the spouses so desire, a shift to more reciprocal compatibility with respect to control should follow improvement in other areas of compatibility. Either way, this compatibility could be used within the context of family therapy to strengthen the parental-child relationship.

The inclusion behavior of spouses suggests that group therapy would be appropriate in the final phases of treatment. Specifically, group therapy could be used for the development of social skills which would lead to the establishment of ongoing support systems for their continued healthy functioning.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Father daughter incest has generally been considered to be a homeostatic mechanism, i.e., an attempt made by the family to hold itself together (Lustig et al., 1966). Unfortunately, the family in which incest has been discovered has too often been dismembered as a result of social and legal intervention (Giaretto, 1972a). Consequently, the problems which led to incest have been left unresolved (Rosenfeld, 1979) and are likely to be repeated in subsequent generations (Raphling et al., 1967). The most successful rehabilitation efforts have been accomplished through reunion oriented treatment regimes which have included individual, marital, family, and group therapy (Giaretto, 1976b).

Investigatory efforts which have attempted to delineate the underlying difficulties which have led to incest have been varied and have resulted in socio-cultural, organismic, and familial theories (Cavallin, 1966; Lukianowicz, 1972; Lustig et al., 1966). The

familial theories have been the most consistently cited and have contributed substantially to the successful treatment of these families. The family dynamics which led to incest have been described similarly. The theories have generally included the following; (a) a dysfunctional marital relationship, characterized specifically by an absence of sexual relationships, (b) a mother who was absent or who abandoned her parental and wifely role, (c) a physically maturing daughter who has assumed the maternal role, including the role of sexual partner to the father, and (d) a father who has accepted the substitution (Justice & Justice, 1979; Lustig et al., 1966). These theories suggested that father daughter incest was the result of characteristic interpersonal relationships, particularly those of the spouses. Unfortunately, these theories have been based on case studies and psychotherapy samples. The present investigation was an attempt to objectively classify the interpersonal behaviors of the spouses in an empirical, replicable fashion.

Shutz's FIRO-B and a demographic and socioeconomic questionnaire were given to 15 couples referred to the Sexual Abuse Treatment Units of Dallas County Department of Human Resources and Dallas County Mental Health-Mental Retardation Center. Their data was compared with

15 control couples who had at least one school daughter and who were drawn from volunteers who responded to advertisements in the suburban area newspapers of Carrollton, Farmers Branch, Garland, and Irving. The FIRO-B was used to assess each subject's interpersonal orientations, the discrepancies within their orientations, and the compatibility of their orientations within marital dyads. The data was subjected to two discriminant analyses and 15 one way analyses of variance.

The results only partially supported the author's assumption that spouses in father daughter incest families exhibited characteristic interpersonal behaviors. While incestuous spouses were clearly differentiated by a combination of demographic, socioeconomic, and interpersonal characteristics, the interpersonal characteristics played a secondary role. Further, the interpersonal characteristics which emerged as significant were not those which were expected on the basis of the existing literature. Specifically, the interpersonal behaviors which characterized the incestuous husbands were lower levels of expressed control behavior and lower levels of wanted inclusion behavior. The interpersonal behaviors which differentiated the incestuous wives were lower levels of both expressed and wanted inclusion

behavior and higher levels of wanted control behavior. Finally, incestuous spouses showed greater intramarital compatibility with respect to control issues.

The findings broadly supported the notion that both spouses interpersonal behaviors contributed to the occurrence of incest. It was concluded that the findings contradicted the picture of a family characterized by a domineering father and a hostile mother who had an incompatible marriage. Instead, the present findings suggested that the father daughter incest family was more correctly portrayed by two fairly passive parents who chose social isolation due to a fear of intimacy. It was also concluded that incestuous spouses showed a great deal of compatibility with respect to issues of authority and decision making. Implications for the diagnosis and treatment of these families were discussed. Specifically, the usefulness of the present investigatory methodology as a diagnostic aid depends upon replication of these findings. Secondly, the results were discussed as to their usability in the frameworks of individual, marital, family, and group therapies.

Reference Notes

- Phillips, E., & Halley, K. Incest: Prevalence and management. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, Houston, October, 1978.
- Reed, K. Incest Synthesis. Dallas, Tx.: Mental Health Association of Dallas County, 1977.

References

- Anderson, L. M., & Shafer, G. The character disordered family: A community treatment model for family sexual abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1979, 49, 436-445.
- Bagley, C. Incest behavior and incest taboo. Social Problems, 1969, 16, 505-517.
- Bender, L. & Blau, A. The reaction of children to sexual relations with adults. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1937, 7, 500-518.
- Boekelheide, P. D. Incest and the family physician. Journal of Family Practice, 1978, 6, 87-90.
- Browning, D. H. & Boatman, B. Incest: Children at risk. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1977, 134, 69-72.
- Cavallin, H. Incestuous fathers: A clinical report. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 122, 1132-1138.
- Cormier, B., Kennedy, M. E., & Sangowicz, J. Psychodynamics of father daughter incest. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 1962, 7, 1-16.

- Giaretto, H. Humanistic treatment of father daughter incest. In R. E. Helfer & C. H. Kempe (Eds.) Child abuse and neglect: The family and the community. Cambridge: Ballinger Publications, 1976a.
- Giaretto, H. The treatment of father daughter incest: A psychosocial approach. Children Today, 1976b, 5, 2-5, 34-35.
- Gligor, A. M. Incest and sexual delinquency: A comparative analysis of two forms of sexual behavior in minor females. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27B, 3671.
- Goodwin, J., Sahd, D., Rada, R. T. Incest hoax: False accusations, false denials. Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law, 1978, 6, 269-276.
- Gutheil, T. G. & Avery, N. C. Multiple overt incest as a family defense against loss. Family Process, 1977, 16, 105-116.
- Heims, L. & Kaufman, I. Variations on a theme of incest. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 311-312.
- Henderson, D. J. Incest: A synthesis of data. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 1972, 4, 299-313.
- Herman, K. & Hirschman, L. Father daughter incest: Part I - A feminist theoretical perspective;

- Part II - A clinical report. Signs, 1977, 4, 735-756.
- Hersko, M., Halleck, S., Rosenberg, M., & Pacht, A. Incest: A three way process. Journal of Social Therapy, 1961, 7, 22-31.
- Justice, B. & Justice, R. The broken taboo: Sex in the family. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.
- Kaufman, I., Peck, A., & Tagiuri, C. The family constellation and overt incestuous relations between father and daughter. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1954, 24, 266-279.
- Lukianowicz, N. Incest I: Paternal incest; II: Other types of incest. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1972, 120, 301-313.
- Lustig, N., Dresser, J. W., Spellman, S. W., & Murray, T. Incest: A family group survival pattern. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1966, 14, 31-40.
- Machotka, P., Pittman, F., & Flomenhaft, K. Incest as a family affair. Family Process, 1967, 6, 98-116.
- Maisch, H. Incest. London: Andre Deutsch, 1973.
- Mieselmann, K. C. Incest: A psychological study of causes and effects with treatment recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1978.
- Nakashima, I. & Zakus, G. Incest: Review and clinical experience. Pediatrics, 1977, 60, 696-701.

- Poznanski, E. & Blos, P. Incest. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1975, 9, 46-76.
- Raphling, D., Carpenter, B. L. & Davis, A. Incest: A genealogical study. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1967, 16, 505-511.
- Riemer, S. A research note on incest. American Journal of Sociology, 1939, 45, 566-575.
- Roe, A. The psychology of occupations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Rosenfeld, A. A. Endogamic incest and the victim-perpetrator model. American Journal of Diseases of Children, 1979, 133, 406-410.
- Rosenfeld, A., Nadelson, C., Krieger, M., & Backman, J. Incest and sexual abuse of children. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 1977, 16, 327-339.
- Sholevar, G. P. A family therapist looks at the problem of incest. American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 1975, 3, 25-31.
- Shutz, W. C. The interpersonal underworld. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1966.
- Shutz, W. C. The FIRO scales: Manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1967.

- Summit, R. & Kryso, J. Sexual abuse of children: A clinical spectrum. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1978, 48, 237-251.
- Swanson, D. Adult sexual abuse of children: The man and the circumstances. Diseases of the Nervous System, 1968, 29, 677-683.
- Tatsuoka, M. M. Discriminant analysis: The study of group differences. Selected topics in advanced statistics: An elementary approach, (Vol. 6). Champaign: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.
- Tormes, Y. M. Child victims of incest. Denver: The American Humane Association, 1968.
- Virkkunen, M. Incest. Medicine Science and the Law, 1974, 14, 124-128.
- Weinberg, S. K. Incest behavior. In J. H. Edwards (Ed.), Sex and Society. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1972.
- Weiner, I. Father daughter incest: A clinical report. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1962, 36, 607-619.
- Weiner, I. On incest: A survey. Excerpta Criminologica, 1964, 4, 137-153.

APPENDIX A

Demographic and Socioeconomic
Questionnaire

Age: _____ Sex: M F (Circle one)
Race: _____ Number of previous marriages: _____
Number of years in current marriage: _____
Occupation: _____
Religious Preference _____
Number of children: _____
Approximate Monthly Income: _____
Education: (circle number of years completed)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20+

APPENDIX B

TABLE A

Analysis of Variance of Difference-
Inclusion

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	18.1500	3.440*
Within Groups	58	5.2764	

* $p = 0.0687$.

Table B

Analysis of Variance of Difference-
Control

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	38.4000	3.095*
Within Groups	58	12.4057	

* $p = 0.0838$.

Table C
Analysis of Variance of Difference-
Affection

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	11.2667	2.465*
Within Groups	58	4.5701	

*p = 0.1218.

Table D
Analysis of Variance of Originator
Compatibility-Inclusion

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	36.3000	2.929*
Within Groups	28	12.3952	

*p = 0.0981.

Table E
Analysis of Variance of Originator
Compatibility-Control

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	76.8000	3.033*
Within Groups	28	25.3238	

*p = 0.0926.

Table F
Analysis of Variance of Originator
Compatibility-Affection

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	36.3000	2.929*
Within Groups	28	12.3952	

*p = 0.0981.

Table G
 Analysis of Variance of Reciprocal
 Compatibility-Inclusion

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	4.0333	0.545*
Within Groups	28	7.4048	

*p = 0.4666.

Table H
 Analysis of Variance of Reciprocal
 Compatibility-Control

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	3.3333	0.280*
Within Groups	28	11.9238	

*p = 0.6012.

Table I
 Analysis of Variance of Reciprocal
 Compatibility-Affection

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	4.8000	0.464*
Within Groups	28	10.3524	

* $p = 0.5015$.

Table J
 Analysis of Variance of Interchange
 Compatibility-Inclusion

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	17.6333	1.847*
Within Groups	28	9.5476	

* $p = 0.1850$.

Table K
 Analysis of Variance of Interchange
 Compatibility-Affection

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	4.8000	0.402*
Within Groups	28	11.9429	

* $p = 0.5312$.

Table L
 Analysis of Variance of Overall
 Compatibility-Inclusion

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	0.0333	0.001*
Within Groups	28	34.4810	

* $p = 0.9754$.

Table M
Analysis of Variance of Overall
Compatibility-Affection

Source	df	MS	F
Between Groups	1	2.7000	0.054*
Within Groups	28	49.7000	

* $p = 0.8174$.