Published in final edited form as:

Curr Opin Psychol. 2017 February ; 13: 111–114. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.04.022.

Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy

Andrew Christensen^a and Brian D. Doss^b

^aAndrew Christensen, Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, 502 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563. Christensen@psych.ucla.edu

^bBrian D. Doss, Department of Psychology, University of Miami, PO Box 248185, Coral Gables, FL 33124-0751. bdoss@miami.edu

Abstract

Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy (IBCT) is based in part on traditional behavioral couple therapy but expands both the conceptualization of couple distress and of intervention. The efficacy of IBCT has been supported in three clinical trials, including one with five year follow-up. Additionally, the effectiveness of IBCT in the real world has been supported through a system-wide dissemination effort in the United States Department of Veteran's Affairs. The reach of IBCT has also been extended through an online program, www.OurRelationship.com, based on IBCT. A nationwide clinical trial with a representative sample of the US population demonstrated the effectiveness of this program on both relationship and individual variables.

Developed in the 1990s, Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy (IBCT) [1–2] was based in part on Traditional Behavioral Couple Therapy (TBCT) [3], a couple treatment with the most extensive empirical support at the time [4]. However, IBCT extended the conceptualization of couple distress beyond TBCT's notions of positive to negative exchange ratios and extended the conceptualization of intervention beyond TBCT's focus on positive behavior change through communication and problem solving skills. In this piece, we will briefly describe the IBCT conceptualization of couple distress and of couple intervention, review the empirical evidence in support of IBCT, and discuss recent innovations in treatment delivery.

Theoretical Notions in IBCT

IBCT suggests that couples often struggle with one or two broad themes in their relationship, such as a struggle over how interdependent or independent they should be. To understand this theme, IBCT borrows two central ideas from other close relationship research [e.g., 5]: a) the stuff of relationships is the interaction between partners and b) there are three broad factors that influence that interaction: the characteristics each partner brings

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Andrew Christensen, Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, 502 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563. Christensen@psych.ucla.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

to the interaction and the context in which that interaction occurs. As they relate to couple distress, IBCT conceptualizes these ideas through a simple mnemonic: the DEEP analysis or DEEP understanding of relationship problems. The D refers to key Differences between partners in personality, interests, goals, etc. The first E refers to emotional sensitivities or vulnerabilities that each partner brings to the relationship that may make the differences particularly problematic. For example, perhaps Bill wants a closer, more interdependent relationship than Sue wants, while she is more comfortable with greater independence than Bill is. This difference could be especially problematic if Bill tends to feel neglected when his partner is not close and interconnected with him. Likewise, this difference could be especially problematic if Sue tends to feel controlled or guilty by efforts to have more connection with her. The second E refers to external circumstances, particularly stressful circumstances, which may exacerbate the problems created by differences and emotional sensitivities. For example, if Sue's job is very demanding or if Bill and Sue live far away from Bill's circle of friends and family, these contextual factors may make the differences between Bill and Sue more problematic. Finally, the P refers to the Pattern of Interaction that couples get into as they try to navigate the problem created by the DEE. For example, perhaps Bill frequently complains about how disconnected they are while Sue defends her need to work. Although meant to solve the problem, the pattern of interaction that couples get into often makes the problem worse. Sue finds herself less interested in being with Bill because of all his complaining while Bill finds himself angry at her for her seemingly constant avoidance of contact with him.

The IBCT theory of intervention is based on the fundamental notion that all relationship problems result from the combination of a triggering action or inaction and a sensitive reaction. Therefore, relationship problems can be resolved by altering the triggering action or by altering the vulnerable response but a combination of the two is normally preferable. In contrast to TBCT, which focuses on making change in the triggering action or inaction, IBCT provides equal or greater emphasis on changing the vulnerable response (i.e., emotional acceptance), given that most troublesome actions or inactions in relationships are not egregious acts such as violence or verbal abuse. A second key part of the IBCT theory on intervention is that altering both the triggering events and altering the emotional reactions are best achieved through "contingency shaped processes" rather than "rule governed" processes. Based on original work by Skinner [6] and applied to therapy, rule governed change is deliberate change as a result of specific instruction or training by the therapist. For example, TBCT encourages couples to engage in more positive behavior with each other and teaches them communication and problem solving strategies. In contrast, contingency shaped change comes about spontaneously as a result of a change in the context and the resultant emotional and cognitive reactions. For example, one partner may become less blaming and more supportive when he or she sees that the other is in emotional pain or when he or she understands how they are both caught in a vicious cycle of interaction. Although IBCT employs both strategies, it relies more heavily on the later and assumes it will lead to more lasting change.

Evidence in Support of IBCT

The research on IBCT consists of efficacy research that established IBCT as an evidence-based treatment and effectiveness research that is attempting to extend its reach. The efficacy research includes three randomized clinical trials. In a pilot study of 17 couples, Wimberly [7] showed that a group format of IBCT was superior to a wait list control group. Jacobson, Christensen and colleagues [8] demonstrated that IBCT produced comparable or superior outcomes to TBCT in a study of 21 couples. These two small studies were followed by a two-site clinical trial of 134 seriously and chronically distressed couples randomly assigned to IBCT or TBCT [9] that included 5 year follow-up without additional treatment [10]. This clinical trial showed that IBCT and TBCT produced similar gains in relationship satisfaction by the end of treatment, but couples in IBCT evidenced significantly greater maintenance of gains than their TBCT counterparts during the first two years of follow-up. However, these differences between the conditions disappeared over the last three years of follow-up. Observational data on communication collected at pre, post, and two-year follow-up indicated that TBCT couples made greater gains by treatment termination but IBCT couples showed greater maintenance of their gains at the two year follow-up assessment [11]. Thus, the efficacy research demonstrated that IBCT is comparable or superior to TBCT, particularly in the maintenance of treatment gains.

As part of this efficacy research, there were several additional findings: couples with low-level violence could benefit from treatment without a danger for violence escalating [12]; couples experiencing infidelity could benefit from treatment in the short term and, although these couples are at greater risk for separation over the long-term, those who stay together benefit as much as non-infidelity couples [13–14]; for couples with children, treatment showed benefits for parenting [15]. Prediction studies demonstrated that, out of a number of possible variables, higher relationship commitment and longer length of marriage were independently predictive of long-term positive outcome [16–17]. Examination of mediators of change indicated that changes in frequency of targeted behavior, such as Bill being more affectionate with Sue, as well as acceptance of target behavior, such as Sue being more accepting of Bill's level of affection, were linked with positive outcome, with frequency more strongly linked early in therapy but acceptance more strongly linked later in therapy with outcome. As expected, TBCT generated greater changes in frequency of behavior while IBCT generated greater changes in acceptance of behavior [18].

There have been two broad efforts to extend and evaluate the effectiveness of IBCT in the "real world," - an effort to disseminate IBCT throughout the U.S. Department of Veteran's Affairs and an effort to extend the reach of couple therapy by translating IBCT into an online program for couples. In the VA program, mental health practitioners throughout the VA system, typically social workers and psychologists, are trained in IBCT through an intensive 6-month training program that includes: a) a several day workshop, b) weekly phone supervision while trainees are seeing couples, c) observation of at least 20 audio-recorded sessions of these trainees by IBCT consultants, and d) competence criteria based on ratings of these recorded sessions by IBCT consultants. Approximately 80% of trainees complete the training successfully. Preliminary evaluation of the outcome of couples treated during this training reveals that: a) partners in these couples have far more diagnosed

psychopathology than partners in the efficacy trials, b) couples complete an average of about 10 sessions, which is fewer than the average completed in the efficacy trials, c) couples evidence significant improvement even when they have as few as 4 sessions, d) the more sessions couples have, the greater the improvement, and e) effect sizes are in the low to moderate range and less than those found in the efficacy trial [Christensen, Glynn, Fehrenbach, & Lui, Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, Chicago IL, November 2015].

A second real world effort involved the creation of the OurRelationship program [19], an eight hour self-help program in which couples complete online activities consisting of text, audio, still graphics, animations, and videos. Partners complete the majority of this three phase program on their own and come together at the end of each phase for a key conversation with their partner. In the first phase of the program, “Observe”, partners complete assessments of their relationship and jointly decide on one or two core issues/problems to focus on during the program. The “Understand” phase leads each partner through a DEEP analysis of the problem, including how differences between partners, hidden emotions, external stressors, and patterns of communication might affect their core issue(s). These separate analyses are shared during the subsequent “Understand” conversation. During the “Respond” phase, partners develop a plan for ameliorating the problem by viewing information about acceptance and self-change, communication tips, and suggestions tailored to their presenting problem. During the “Respond” conversation, couples share their strategies to improve their patterns of communication and engage in problem-solving exercises specific to their core issue(s). In addition to the online activities, couples participate in up to four 15-minute calls via phone or videoconference with a staff “coach”. The purposes of these calls is to answer general questions about the program, to tailor the program to the couple’s needs, and to keep couples progressing through the program. The coach calls are carefully scripted and supervised to ensure that these calls do not develop into a therapy session.

In a nationwide randomized-controlled trial of 300 couples [20], the OurRelationship program was well-received, with 86% of couples completing the program and 97% of participants indicating they would recommend it to a friend. Indeed, couples were only slightly less satisfied (Cohen’s $d = -0.18$) with the program than they were with the in-person couple therapy provided as part of the original trial of IBCT and TBCT [9]. Furthermore, the OurRelationship program created significant improvements in relationship satisfaction ($d = 0.69$) as well as significant effects on depressive ($d = 0.50$) and anxiety ($d = 0.21$) symptoms.

The research on IBCT has clearly established it as a promising evidence based treatment for couples, even for those with serious difficulties. The large clinical trial focused on seriously and chronically distressed couples. The application to VA couples has included couples where almost all have at least one partner with existing diagnosed psychopathology. The exciting new development is the possibility of greater reach through the online program. In a 2015 national survey, 34% of married respondents with at least “some” thoughts of divorce sought to improve their marriage through a self-help website; in contrast, only 25% went to some form of marriage counseling, often with a religious leader [The National Divorce

Decision-Making Project, 2015, Provo, UT; URL: [https://familycenter.byu.edu/Documents/What are they thinking FINAL digital.pdf](https://familycenter.byu.edu/Documents/What%20are%20they%20thinking%20FINAL%20digital.pdf)]. Additionally, web-based resources – with their greater flexibility, reduced stigma, and lower costs – can reach many couples who would otherwise be unable or unwilling to seek in-person couple therapy. Indeed, of those under 50 years old, 79–98% of Hispanics, African-Americans, and those from lower-income households have either a home computer with broadband access or a smartphone with internet access [21–23]. Importantly, the online clinical trial [20] reached a national sample that was largely representative of the ethnic and income distribution in the country yet there was little variation in outcome based on ethnic or income subsamples. As a result, the promise of effective couple intervention may be open to many people who have in the past been largely overlooked.

Acknowledgments

The initial clinical trial comparing IBCT and TBCT was supported by Grant R01 MH499593 from the National Institute of Mental Health awarded to Neil S. Jacobson. The two site clinical trial comparing IBCT and TBCT was supported by National Institute of Mental Health grants RO1MH56223, awarded to Andrew Christensen at the University of California, Los Angeles and RO1MH56165, awarded to Neil S. Jacobson at the University of Washington. After Jacobson's death in 1999, William George took over as principal investigator at the University of Washington site. The development of the online program and clinical trial examining its effectiveness were supported by Grant R01HD059802 awarded to Brian D. Doss from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development. The ongoing research on the online program is sponsored by grant 90FM0063 awarded to Brian D. Doss from the Administration for Children and Families.

Drs. Doss and Christensen hold the intellectual property of the OurRelationship program and could gain royalties from any future commercialization of this intellectual property.

References

1. Christensen A, Wheeler JG, Doss BD, Jacobson NS, Barlow DH. Couple distress. *Clinical Handbook of Psychological Disorders* (5th). 2014 Guilford:703–731. ** This chapter describes the assessment and treatment strategies of Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy. A sample case study is included.
2. Jacobson, N.; Christensen, A. *Acceptance and change in couple therapy: A therapist's guide to transforming relationships*. Norton; 1996.
3. Jacobson, NS.; Margolin, G. *Marital therapy: Strategies based on social learning and behavior exchange principles*. Brunner/Mazel; 1979.
4. Christensen, A.; Heavey, CL. Interventions for couples. In: Spence, JT.; Darley, JM.; Foss, DJ., editors. *Annual Review of Psychology*. Vol. 50. 1999. p. 165-190. *Annual Reviews*
5. Kelley, H.; Berscheid, E.; Christensen, A.; Harvey, J.; Huston, J.; Levinger, G.; McClintock, E.; Peplau, LA.; Peterson, D. *Close Relationships*. Percheron Press; 2002.
6. Skinner, BF. *The behavior of organisms: An experimental analysis*. Prentice Hall; 1966.
7. Wimberly JD. *An outcome study of integrative couples therapy delivered in a group format*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering. 1998; 58(12-B): 6832.
8. Jacobson NS, Christensen A, Prince SE, Cordova J, Eldridge K. Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy: An acceptance-based, promising new treatment for couple discord. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2000; 68:351–355. [PubMed: 10780137]
9. Christensen A, Atkins DC, Berns S, Wheeler J, Baucom DH, Simpson LE. Traditional versus Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy for significantly and chronically distressed married couples. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2004; 72:176–191. [PubMed: 15065953]
10. Christensen A, Atkins DC, Baucom B, Yi J. Marital status and satisfaction five years following a randomized clinical trial comparing traditional versus integrative behavioral couple therapy. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2010; 78:225–235. [PubMed: 20350033] This paper describes the follow-up

data from a two-site clinical trial in which 134 seriously and chronically distressed couples were randomly assigned to Integrative or Traditional Behavioral Couple Therapy. Improvements in relationship satisfaction were largely maintained for the first two years of follow-up but with significantly greater maintenance in IBCT than in TBCT. Satisfaction deteriorated somewhat and the differences between the two treatments disappeared over the remaining three years of follow-up. The paper concludes that additional booster intervention may be necessary to maintain treatment gains and differential treatment effects for these couples.

11. Baucom KJW, Sevier M, Eldridge KA, Doss BD, Christensen A. Observed communication in couples two years after integrative and traditional behavioral couple therapy: Outcome and link with five-year follow-up. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2011; 79:565–576. [PubMed: 21942502]
12. Simpson LE, Atkins DC, Gattis KS, Christensen A. Low-level relationship aggression and couple therapy outcomes. *J Fam Psychol.* 2008; 22:102–111. [PubMed: 18266537]
13. Atkins DC, Eldridge K, Baucom DH, Christensen A. Infidelity and behavioral couple therapy: Optimism in the face of betrayal. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2005; 73:144–150. [PubMed: 15709841]
14. Marín RA, Christensen A, Atkins DC. Infidelity and behavioral couple therapy: Relationship outcomes over 5 years following therapy. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice.* 2014; 3:1–12.
15. Gattis KS, Simpson LE, Christensen A. What about the kids?: Parenting and child adjustment in the context of couple therapy. *J Fam Psychol.* 2008; 22:833–842. [PubMed: 19102604]
16. Atkins DC, Berns SB, George W, Doss BD, Gattis K, Christensen A. Prediction of response to treatment in a randomized clinical trial of marital therapy. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2005; 73:893–903. [PubMed: 16287389]
17. Baucom BR, Atkins DC, Rowe LS, Christensen A. Prediction of treatment response at 5- year follow-up in a randomized clinical trial of behaviorally based couple therapies. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2015; 83:103–114. [PubMed: 25265544]
18. Doss BD, Thum YM, Sevier M, Atkins DC, Christensen A. Improving relationships: Mechanisms of change in couple therapy. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2005; 73:624–633. [PubMed: 16173850]
19. Doss BD, Cicila LN, Georgia EJ, Roddy MK, Nowlan KM, Benson LA, Christensen A. A randomized controlled trial of the web-based *ourrelationship* program: Effects on relationship and individual functioning. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2016; 84:285–296. [PubMed: 26999504] This paper describes a nationwide clinical trial in which a sample of 300 distressed couples were randomly assigned to the 8-hour online program OurRelationship.com or to a wait list control. Eighty-six percent of participants completed the program and showed significant and medium effect size improvements in relationship satisfaction and individual functioning compared to the control condition.
20. Doss BD, Benson LA, Georgia EJ, Christensen A. Translation of Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy to a web-based intervention. *Fam Process.* 2013; 52:139–152. [PubMed: 25408094] This paper describes the theory and considerations that were involved in translating IBCT into the online program OurRelationship.com. A sample case study is included.
21. Lopez, MH.; Gonzalez-Barrera, A.; Patten, E. Closing the Digital Divide: Latinos and Technology Adoption. Pew Research Center; 2013. Downloaded from www.pewhispanic.org/2013/03/07/closing-the-digital-divide-latinos-and-technology-adoption
22. Smith, A. African Americans and Technology Use: A Demographic Portrait. Pew Research Center; 2014. Downloaded from www.pewinternet.org/2014/01/06/detailed-demographic-tables
23. Zickuhr, K.; Smith, A. Home Broadband 2013. Pew Research Center; 2013. Downloaded from www.pewinternet.org/2013/08/26/home-broadband-2013

Highlights

- Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy (IBCT) broadens the traditional behavioral theory of couple distress and of intervention.
- Three clinical trials support the efficacy of IBCT.
- IBCT has been successfully disseminated throughout the VA.
- A large, nationwide clinical trial demonstrated the positive impact of OurRelationship.com, an 8-hour online program based on IBCT.