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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The understanding of interpersonal communication is vital to marriage, family, job, and leadership relationships. Interpersonal communication involves exchanging information between individuals as well as defining the relationship between the communicators. In the report of the New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development in Speech Communication (1969), the following statement was written and accepted by the conference participants: research in speech communication focuses on the ways in which messages link participants during interaction. Emphasis is on the behavioral antecedents and consequences of messages and their variations, as well as on the ways that messages interact with communication participants to produce behavioral outcomes.

Brown and Keller (1973) concluded that any relationship between people, casual or important, always involves feelings of varying intensity—loving or hostile—as well as some sort of authority arrangement between them. At the heart of every relationship lie the self-images of the persons involved, each created by interaction with the other.

Mortensen (1972, p. 55) elaborated on the direct correlation between content and relationship in communication. He stated that:

... any activity that communicates information can be taken as synonymous with the content of the message regardless of whether it is true or false, valid or invalid. The aspect of relation-
ship in communication invariably and automatically imposes on the meaning of content, for in the act of exchanging message content, the communicants reveal something of themselves and the nature of their awareness of the other person.

This parallels very closely the view expressed by Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967).

Hawes (1973) devised a model of communication processes which included the following theorem:

If studied functionally, all communication interacts conceal, repeat, or disclose information about the relationship among symbol users enacting the symbol systems.

Hawes goes on to say that the clarity of the relationship depends on the degree to which sequences of acts disclose the information about the relationship.

Leary (1957) developed a systematic way of observing and classifying interpersonal behaviors. Several introductory textbooks in speech communication have referred to the Leary model or an equivalent. An adjective checklist based on the dominance-submission and friendliness-hostility dimensions of the Leary model has been presented by Brown and Van Riper (1973). Patton and Giffin (1974) used the D-A-S-H paradigm, the letters of which stood for dominance, affection, submission, and hostility. Wilmot (1975) presented the original Leary circumplex in its entirety. Brooks and Emmert (1976) referenced Leary's work and discussed the implications of the two axis model. In all four cases, the texts simply presented the model with no attempt to fit the dimensions to specifically communicative behaviors.

Leary's system presents real problems when applied to the communicative behavior of human subjects since the categories are not
always obvious and reliability suffers as a result. However, communication theorists have pointed out that all communicative acts or interacts disclose something about the relationship between persons. In verbal communication there are two aspects according to Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967): the report and the command. These terms were originally proposed by Bateson (1951). According to Watzlawick and his colleagues (1967, pp. 51-52):

The report aspect of a message conveys information and is, therefore, synonymous in human communication with the content of the message. It may be about anything that is communicable regardless of whether the particular information is true or false, valid, invalid, or undecidable. The command aspect on the other hand, refers to what sort of message it is to be taken as, and, therefore, ultimately, to the relationship between the communicants.

They go on to point out that the relationship aspect of the message is metacommunicational in the sense that it speaks about the information contained in the message. This leads Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967, p. 54) to present the following axion: Every communication has a content and a relationship aspect such as the latter classifies the former and is therefore a metacommunication.

There is, then, a report, content, informational, or communicational aspect of a message, but there is also a command, relationship, or metacommunicational dimension. Leary reported that as early as 1947 Harry Stack Sullivan said:

... Psychiatry is the study of processes that involve or go on between people. The field of psychiatry is the field of interpersonal relations under any and all circumstances in which there relationships exist.

Subsequently, Karen Horney (1945) listed neurotic character structure types which involved individuals' reactions to others. Fromm (1947)
also developed a theory of character based on ways in which the individual "relates" to his world. He listed four neurotic mechanisms (masochism, sadism, destructiveness, and automaton conformity) and five character types (productive, exploitive, receptive, marketing, and hoarding), all of which are directly interpersonal.

Persons can be understood in terms of their relationships to others in these views of human existence, and communication defines such relationships. The Leary system of classifying interpersonal behaviors ought to be useful in the study of human communication if it can be shown to be applicable in a consistent way. Leary's system consisted of eight major categories of behavior arranged on a circular continuum. Lists of transitive verbs were used to describe each behavior type. In effect, the arrangement consisted of two dimensions running at right angles to one another, one ranging from dominant to submissive and the other from friendly to hostile descriptors.

Each of the octants was divided into two segments representing two versions of the same behavior. The title of an octant consisted of a moderate and an extreme intensity label. For example, at the upper portion of the circle is the octant labelled Managerial-Autocratic. The adaptive behavior is Managerial, and its pathological equivalent is Autocratic. In addition, the circle was subdivided into three concentric rings. The inner circle presented illustrations of adaptive reflexes. The center ring indicated the type of behavior that the interpersonal reflex tended to "pull" or provoke from others. The outermost circle listed the extreme or rigid versions of the behavior. The general plan of the circumplex model is shown in Figure 1.
An octant was coded with two letters, the alphabet running in counterclockwise fashion around the circle. "A" was used to code one-half of the dominant sector, and the sixteenth letter, "P" coded the other half of the same sector.

Moving clockwise around the circle to describe the sectors, starting with AP, which was termed managerial-autocratic, the transitive verbs "manage, direct, lead, guide, advise, and teach" indicated the adaptive form of behavior. Rigid or pathological versions of the same behaviors would be described as "dominate, order, boss, seek respect compulsively, pedantic, dogmatic actions." Behaviors in this sector tended to provoke obedience or respect in the other person.

The next octant, NO, presented the verbs "help, offer, give, support, sympathize, treat gently" as adaptive and "takes responsibility compulsively, hypernormal activities, pity, dote on, soft hearted behavior" as pathological. The interpersonal reflex was reported as "provokes trust and acceptance." This octant was labelled responsible for the adaptive level and hypernormal for the extreme version.

Affectionate and friendly actions and "agree, participate, and cooperate" as adaptive behaviors, tended to provoke love and tenderness. The extreme versions of these behaviors were "seeks friendly feelings from others, effusive actions, over-conventional, agree at all times, compromise." The title for this octant, LM, was cooperative-over-conventional.

Within the JK octant, the behaviors of "respect, admire, conform, ask help, and trust" provoked advice or help. The rigid intensity was reported as "cling to, beg aid, depend on, act in an overrespecting
Figure 1. The Leary Circumplex of Interpersonal Behaviors.
manner, docilely conforms."

The HI octant presented, in the moderate intensity, "to act shy or sensitively, to be modest, do one's duty, obey" which provoked arrogance or leadership in the other. The overall classification was self-effacing-masochistic and included "anxious, guilty, or self-effacing actions, condemn self, weak and spineless action, submit" as extreme intensity versions of behavior.

To present "realistic or justified rebellion, unconventional" tended to provoke punishment and "realistic wariness, be skeptical" tended to provoke rejection in sector FG. The extreme versions of behaviors in this octant were "bitter, rebellious actions, complain, to act hurt or suspicious, distrustful." The octant was labelled rebellious-distrustful.

Within the DF octant, the adaptive level included "frank, forthright, critical actions, aggressive, firm actions" while the high intensity, rigid behaviors were "attack, unfriendly actions, punitive, sarcastic or unkind actions." The reflex which tended to occur was hostility or resistance. DF was titled the aggressive-sadistic octant.

Finally, the competitive-narcissistic sector, BC, included "compete, act assertively, act confidently, independent actions" in the moderate, adaptive range, and these behaviors were reported to provoke distrust or inferiority. The rigid versions were "exploit, reject, withhold, boast, act proud, narcissistically exhibitionistic."

The eight categories of interpersonal behavior represent an exhaustive description of possible states of relationship to another person. Leary pointed out that by placing a behavior at one place on
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of the literature review was to ascertain whether or not prior research had been done relating the Leary circumplex model to verbal communication acts and particularly in terms of the metacommunicational or command aspect of the communication act. Leary described interpersonal behaviors in terms of categories of acts and reflexes provoked by such acts. These reflexes were automatic and usually involuntary responses to interpersonal situations, i.e., the individual's spontaneous methods of reacting to others and they were often independent of the content of the communication. These behaviors on the Leary circumplex ranged from dominance to submission and from friendliness to hostility.

Leary devised five levels of personality data for the measurement of the specific behavioral categories: Level I, Public Communication or overt behavior; Level II, Conscious Description; Level III, Private Symbolism; Level IV, Unexpressed Unconscious; and Level V, Level of Values.

Level I consists of overt behavior of the individual as rated by others along the circular continuum. Level II included the verbal content of all the statements that the subject made about the interpersonal behavior of himself or "others." Level III consisted of projective indirect fantasy materials. The interpersonal themes of all
these symbolic expressions were rated along the sixteen-point circular continuum. Level IV was defined by the interpersonal themes which were systematically and compulsively avoided by the subject at all other levels of personality and which were conspicuous by their absence. Level V consisted of the data which reflected the subject's system of moral, "super ego judgments," his ego ideal. He referred here to the interpersonal traits and actions that the subject held to be "good," proper and "right"—his picture of how he should be and would like to be. These idealized interpersonal themes were obtained in the same manner as the conscious description of Level II.

Everett Shostrom (1967) has used the Leary paradigm for illustrating types of self-actualizing personalities. Shostrom, however, utilized the self-actualizing potentials as resulting from former aspects of manipulation, rather than specifying the classifications as merely results of adaptive reflexes. He also applied aspects of personality (Shostrom, 1972), utilizing the Leary continuum, in research fluctuations between actualization and abnormality, contending that the "wellness of actualizing persons begins with the ability to express themselves creatively on two basic polarities: strength-weakness and anger-love." However, Shostrom did not deal specifically with oral verbal communication acts in his work.

Schaefer (1959) described maternal behavior using factor analysis as similar to the Leary continuum, approximating a circumplex ordering. Schaefer's circular ordering of maternal variables was: Control, (Possessive), Overprotective, Protective, Indulgent, Overindulgent, Love, (Accepting), Cooperative, Democratic, Autonomy, (Freedom),
Detached, Indifferent, Neglecting, Hostility, (Rejecting), Demanding-
Antagonistic, and Authoritarian-Dictatorial. Lorr and McNair (1963, 1965)
developed a version of an interpersonal circumplex utilizing an Inter­
personal Behavior Inventory. Behavior ratings consisted of 140 statements
of interpersonal behaviors involving 15 variables along a circumplex order
after factor analysis. The categories which resulted included Dominance,
Exhibition, Sociability, Affiliation, Nurturance, Agreeableness, Deference,
Succorance, Submissiveness, Abasement, Inhibition, Detachment, Mistrust,
Aggression, and Recognition. In both of these studies, there was no
deliberate or obvious attempt to deal with verbal communication between
persons although some of the behaviors or descriptors included message
variables.

Argyle (1967) also used a version of the Leary system in explaining
social behavior and personality. However, Argyle abbreviated the
paradigm and showed motivations on a two-dimensional chart, including
the dominant, dependent, hostile, and affiliative traits. It was his
contention that the positioning of a communicant on the paradigm showed
the type of social relationship which he preferred and will try to
establish. Argyle did not add empirical or conceptual information to
the basic paradigm.

Foa (1961) presented a further explanation of the Leary
application. He stated that an interpersonal act was an attempt to
establish the emotional relationship of the actor toward himself and
toward the other, as well as to establish the social relationship of
the self and the other with respect to a larger reference group. In
addition, Foa argued that, embedded within the dominance-submission and
hate-love dimensions, there were three underlying facets: (1) content (acceptance vs. rejection); (2) object (self vs. others); and (3) mode (emotional vs. social). As Foa suggested, therefore, the eight types of interpersonal behaviors identified conveyed implicit messages that gave or denied love or status to the self or to the other person.

Carson (1969) implied that the idea of the Leary paradigm involved interpersonal behaviors as being, in part, security operations employed by persons to maintain relative comfort, security, and freedom from anxiety in their interactions with others. The purpose of interpersonal behavior, in terms of its security-maintenance functions, was to induce from the other person behaviors that were complementary to the behaviors preferred. In reference to the induced complementary behavior, it was assumed that it had current utility for the person inducing it, in the same sense that it maximized his momentary security. Leary suggested that we learn how to "train" others to respond to us in security-maintaining ways by acquiring the requisite behavioral "techniques," and that each of the eight categories of interpersonal behavior may be viewed as a distinctive set of learned operations for prompting desired behaviors from others. Generally speaking, complementarity occurred on the basis of reciprocity in respect to the dominance-submission axis (dominance tended to induce submission, and vice versa), and on the basis of correspondence in respect to the hate-love axis (hate induced hate, and love induced love).

Folger and Puck (1976), among speech communication researchers, devised a scheme for classifying questions and requests on a circular model based on Leary's model. The system was then used to code
medical interview communication. There was no attempt to sort acts other than questions onto the circumplex.

In summary, psychologists and psychiatrists have used a circumplex model to describe and classify interpersonal behavior. Speech communication has produced one study relating to the Leary circumplex model, but there have been no systematic attempts to place oral verbal communicative acts on the two dimensions of Leary's mapping system. Therefore, this research was focused on devising a series of statements which reflected verbal communication behaviors which could be used to develop a circumplex of interpersonal communication behaviors (1) to describe interpersonal communication in a systematic fashion and (2) as a way of adapting the Leary paradigm to interpersonal communication research and teaching.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Data were compiled with a questionnaire presenting various communication statements selected to range from dominance to submission and from friendliness to hostility on the Leary dimensions. Thirty-eight communication statements were used, selected from an original set of seventy-six. The number was reduced to make the questionnaire easier to administer and to reduce duplication.

Specific communication statements utilizing transitive verbs were written. However, subjects were asked to rate "a person who most of the time" exhibited such an act since the Leary system was intended to apply to persons and not behaviors. An attempt was made to write an equal number of acts on the dominance-submission and friendliness-hostility dimensions.

Each communication behavior was rated by the subjects on a five point scale, ranging from extremely dominant (1) to extremely submissive (5), with the ranges between rated somewhat dominant (2) or somewhat submissive (4), and allowing for a neutral selection (3). The friendliness-hostility range was presented in the same manner.

Each category included the adjective qualifications used by Leary in his checklist instrument. These qualifications appeared at the top of each answer sheet to allow subjects quick reference when rating each behavior. The moderate version range of adjectives from the
checklist was selected in the interest of objectivity, and the
questionnaire is shown in Appendix A.

Two sets of questionnaires were distributed. In the first set,
each statement was rated on dominance-submission and friendliness-
hostility on two adjacent scales on the same answer sheet. Due to
the possibility of contamination or confounding of ratings, a second
set was distributed with two separate answer sheets; each statement was
rated for dominance-submission first and then on another sheet, for
the friendliness-hostility rating. One-half of those questionnaires
had subjects rate dominance-submission first and friendliness-hostility
second. The order was reversed on the other half.

Subjects used for questionnaire data were students in communication
classes. For the total questionnaire distribution, 35 males and 52
females participated. Age ranged from 18 to 48, with the average age
21 years.

Reliability of the questionnaire items was checked in three
different ways. An internal test was available since Item 1 and Item
30 on each questionnaire were identical. Thus, a comparison could be
made for the ratings of these two items for the two different sets of
subjects who responded. In Study 1 with 49 subjects, the dominance-
submission ratings of Items 1 and 30 correlated 0.526 which was
significant at the .01 level. The hostile-friendy ratings correlated
0.321 which was significant at the .05 level. There were 38 subjects
in Study 2 who provided a correlation of 0.481 for the dominance-
submission ratings, significant at the .01 level. For the hostile-
friendly ratings, a correlation of 0.596 was obtained, significant at the
.01 level. These findings, although significant, indicated only a modest degree of analogous ratings within the questionnaire.

Since there were separate studies using different response sheet formats with the questionnaire, a comparison could be made between the mean ratings obtained from the two studies. The average dominance-submission ratings from Study 1 correlated 0.985 with the average ratings from Study 2. For hostile-friendly ratings, the correlation was 0.984. These data showed that the mean ratings between the two studies and using different answer sheets were highly reliable.

Finally, a test-retest reliability check was made in Study 2. The subjects who filled out the questionnaire early in the term were given the same form to complete two weeks later. A total of eleven subjects filled out both the first and second versions. The correlations are shown in Figure 2, and they show that the ratings, separated by two weeks, were fairly consistent. All of the product moment correlations of ratings were significant at the .01 level. In general, it was concluded that the questionnaire resulted in reliably consistent ratings of the 38 communication statements.

The two administrations of the questionnaire were treated as two separate studies, termed Study 1 and Study 2. Separate statistical analyses were run on the two studies. In the first administration, there were 49 subjects, and there were 38 in the second. Means and standard errors of the mean were computed for both the dominance-submission and friendliness-hostility ratings. The resulting data points were plotted on the Leary circumplex. This procedure resulted in two plots, one for
each study, consisting of each of the 38 questionnaire items mapped on the circular grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Reliability of Dominance-Submission Ratings</th>
<th>Reliability of Hostility-Friendliness Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Reliability of Dominance-Submission and Hostility-Friendliness Ratings for Eleven Subjects.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The findings of the two studies are presented here, showing a specific set of communication statements as exhibited by persons most of the time, plotted on the Leary circumplex. Figures 3 and 4 present the Leary grid and the results of the research. In order to report the findings in a coherent way, a procedure was established to permit classifying the behaviors. Any statement which was given a rating within one standard error of the mean of the neutral point on the scale was considered, for the purpose of reporting, to be relatively neutral on that dimension. This permitted the statements to be reported as primarily dominant, submissive, friendly, or hostile or a combination of dominant-friendly, dominant-hostile, submissive-friendly, or submissive-hostile or, finally, neither dominant nor hostile nor submissive nor friendly.

Study 1

Forty-nine persons completed the questionnaire in Study 1, and there were 26 females and 23 males in the sample. The mean age was 20.6 years; the median was 20 years.

In Study 1, the following statements were rated as dominant and relatively neutral on the friendly-hostile side of the circumplex: presents proposals to others, commands attention from others, debates with
Figure 3. Results of Study I Plotted on the Leary Circumplex
Figure 4. Results of Study II Plotted on the Leary Circumplex

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the other persons, presents proposals to others (a duplicate item),
convinces the other person, provides answers to the other person, and
states a fact.

The following statements were rated as friendly and relatively
neutral on the dominant-submissive scale: provides questions for the others,
requests information, praises the other person, senses the mood of the
other, upholds the other's statement, considers the other's opinion,
communicates openly with the other, discloses to others, empathizes with
others, and interacts with others.

One statement, ignores others, was rated as hostile and relatively
neutral on the dominant-submissive side of the spectrum. Two statements,
assesses the opinion of others and restates his/her own opinion, were rated
as close to neutral on both the dominant-submissive and hostile-friendly
scales.

The following statements were rated as being a strong combination of
dominant and hostile: interrupts the other, criticizes others, evaluates
others, disagrees with others, calls the other person names, argues with
others, delivers an ultimatum to the other person, demands an answer from
the other person, judges the other person, orders the other person to do
something, and rejects the other person. Conversely, these behaviors were
rated as being friendly and submissive: agrees with others, supports the
other's statement, sympathizes with the other person, thanks the other
person, shows sadness to the other, and listens to the other person.

One statement, expresses fear to the other person, was rated as
submissive and neutral on friendliness and hostility. Generally, the
statements used in this research were rated as dominant, friendly.
dominant-hostile, or friendly-submissive. Only one statement was found to be rated rather pure hostility and only one for simple submissiveness. There were no statements rated as dominant-friendly nor as submissive-hostile.

Study 2

In Study 2, there were 26 female respondents and 12 males. The mean age was 23 years, and the median age was 22. Results obtained with the modified questionnaire were relatively the same as results in Study 1. One statement, provides questions for the other, was rated dominant and less friendly in Study 1. Two statements, thanks the other person and listens to the other person, were rated more purely friendly and less submissive in the second study. Finally, one statement, requests information, was rated as relatively neutral on both scales in this study. The remaining items stayed in the classifications described for Study 1 using the same criterion for placing a behavior in a category.

The 38 statements were plotted as shown in Figures 3 and 4. In both cases, there is a strong visual evidence that a correlation between dominance-submission and hostility-friendliness ratings existed. In Study 1, the product moment correlation between the dominant-submissive and hostile-friendly ratings was 0.801, significant at the .001 level for 38 test items. The equivalent correlations for Study 2 was .799, also significant at the .001 level. These values indicated a strong correlation between the mean ratings on the two scales.
Summary

In summary, the results showed a tendency for the questionnaire items rated in the two studies to be perceived as dominant or friendly or as a combination of dominant and hostile or friendly and submissive. Most of the statements, 36 out of 38, fell into these general categories. No statements were found which represented combinations of dominant and friendly or submissive and hostile. Correlations showed a strong tendency for items to be rated as dominant-hostile or friendly-submissive, a trend which could be observed on the plots on the Leary circumplex.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Results of this research showed that communication behaviors associated with persons can be plotted on the Leary circumplex. Also, the results showed how people are likely to perceive and therefore react to certain behaviors in interpersonal relationships. For example, if a person acts in a dominant way, there is a high likelihood that the individual will also be seen as hostile. Similarly, if a person acts friendly, that person will be perceived as somewhat submissive.

Leary's model assumed that the two dimensions of dominance-submission and friendliness-hostility were independent of each other. However, data from this study showed a tendency for the two dimensions to be interdependent. There was evidence that the dimensions tend to overlap and become integrated in various communication acts rated by subjects. Pertinent to this finding is the fact that no acts were found which were rated as dominant-friendly or as submissive-hostile. In all cases, the subjects rated statements as dominant-hostile or submissive-friendly. Kertay (1976) found similar results in an unpublished study using seven behavior types.

Several possible explanations exist for these findings. In this study, the question was phrased such that the subject rated "an individual who most of the time" performed the action. This could have biased the ratings into more extreme ranges or caused the linkage of dominance with
hostility and friendliness with submission.

In addition, there could be an underlying factor involved in rating the acts from an interpersonal versus an intrapersonal perspective. The subjects were asked to rate how they would perceive a statement if another person did it most of the time. The ratings might have been quite different if the individuals had been asked to assess how they would intend such behavior. The subjects, for instance, could have perceived "presenting proposals to others" as being dominant-hostile when coming from another person but seen the same behavior as dominant-friendly when given off by self. By the same rationale, certain acts could be perceived as hostile and submissive if performed by the person doing the rating. A questionnaire designed to elicit such intrapersonal or intended meanings for communicative acts could give different results.

Another possible limitation of the findings is that such specific acts as "evaluating others," "criticizing others," and "assessing the opinion of others" might have negative connotations for individuals and thus affected the ratings given. Yet another factor to be considered is the selection of the population for the study. Students in interpersonal communication classes were selected as subjects for questionnaire data. It is possible that, using several different types of groups as the sample, more varied ratings would have emerged. As an example, if a group of politicians would have been used, it is possible that such communication acts as "debates with the other," "disagrees with others," and "demands an answer from the other person" would have been rated along the dominant-friendly dimension of the Leary circumplex.

Such limitations suggest possibilities for future research in
this area. A questionnaire needs to be devised in which single communication acts are rated rather than "a person who most of the time" performs such an act. Single acts might be rated quite differently than a pattern of behavior for an individual. The rationale for having subjects rate the pattern of behavior in this study is that the Leary model was intended to assess persons and personalities not single behaviors.

Additional work is needed to see if behaviors can be found which are rated as dominant-friendly or submissive-hostile. There might have been an unconscious bias in the writing of the items for this study, and a more deliberate conscious effort to write out dominant-friendly or submissive-hostile acts is needed. There is also the possibility that combinations of acts could be rated by subjects. For example, "presents proposals to others" and "communicates openly with others," which is a combination of dominant and friendly acts, might result in a dominant-friendly combined rating. This suggests that persons who are perceived as dominant and friendly may achieve that rating by alternating between assertive and agreeable acts or by attempting some form of integration of the two kinds of behaviors. This possibility is particularly important for an understanding of leadership behaviors.

Behavior statements could also be presented in various contexts. They could be rated in relation to a specific job category, such as doctor, nurse, or teacher. It is possible, within the context of the teaching profession, for instance, that a specific communication act could be perceived as dominant-friendly while the same act in an intimate relationship would be perceived as dominant and hostile.

Communication acts presented in terms of organizational and job-
related activities would provide valuable data in terms of rating and being able to predict the effect of certain behaviors within the authority hierarchy of businesses or institutions. Research has shown that, in addition to task-environmental aspects of group activity, there must be some type of interpersonal orientation in order to create effective group interaction and reach the desired goal satisfactorily (Collins and Guetzkow, 1964). Therefore, knowledge of how persons perceive various communication behaviors would be helpful in understanding the most effective ways of acting in committee meetings or task force meetings. It might also be possible to assess the compatibility of potential employees in an organizational work group.

Concepts of nonverbal communication could also be dealt with in the rating of communication behaviors. The nonverbal acts could possibly be presented as qualifications of the verbal acts to see if they made a difference in ratings. Different studies could be used to assess varied aspects of the communication behavior. Physical appearance could be presented as a qualification in a communication act. Physical distance could also be presented to modify the impact of an act. Relative position, determining the degree of intimacy, could also be a determining factor in communication acts plotted on the Leary circumplex. Distance and position would be particularly important in assessing behaviors in organizational meetings.

The hands, face, and eyes could also be incorporated, perhaps with pictographs, on a questionnaire presenting communication acts. Qualifications of voice intonation and various other paralinguistic cues could provide vital information when incorporated into verbal communication.
acts to be rated along the Leary dimensions. Nonverbal cues, when congruent with verbal messages, can provide valuable insights into the meaning of the relationship. It would seem that a separate study involving the relationship between the verbal and nonverbal entities of communication would provide valuable data pertinent to the mapping of communication acts on Leary's model.

Cross-cultural studies involving the presentation of nonverbal cues with verbal acts could result in vital information regarding the plotting of these acts and applicability to the Leary model. It has been shown that various other cultural groups "read" nonverbal cues differently. Physical distance, for example, would have varied meaning in relationships to the French, Italians, Spanish, and Far-Eastern cultures when presented with a verbal communication act (Knapp, 1972). Perhaps a study in cross-cultural aspects of nonverbal cues, incorporated with verbal acts, would be beneficial in the understanding and possible prediction of response.

Since extensive studies involving Leary's concepts have not been attempted as yet, the research possibilities in this area are large. This study has shown that specific communication acts can indeed be plotted on the Leary circumplex. Extensions of this study are definitely in order, for the purpose of more comprehensive understanding and prediction of communication behaviors in relationships and in the furtherance of research and teaching in interpersonal communication.
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THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a questionnaire that is to be used in conjunction with a Master's Thesis at Western Michigan University.

Please read the instructions carefully and take your time answering the questions.

Thank you for your cooperation.

INSTRUCTIONS:

FOR EACH BEHAVIOR STATEMENT, FIRST CIRCLE THE CATEGORY FROM DOMINANT TO SUBMISSIVE WHICH YOU THINK BEST FITS THE STATEMENT AS IT IS DESCRIBED.

THEN CIRCLE THE CATEGORY FROM HOSTILE TO FRIENDLY WHICH FITS BEST.

YOU WILL MAKE TWO RATINGS FOR EACH STATEMENT IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
TEST QUESTIONS

1. A person who most of the time presents proposals to others.
2. A person who most of the time ignores others.
3. A person who most of the time interrupts the other.
4. A person who most of the time evaluates others.
5. A person who most of the time disagrees with others.
6. A person who most of the time criticizes others.
7. A person who most of the time calls the other person names.
8. A person who most of the time assesses the opinion of the others.
9. A person who most of the time argues with others.
10. A person who most of the time commands attention from others.
11. A person who most of the time debates with the other person.
12. A person who most of the time provides questions for the others.
13. A person who most of the time agrees with others.
14. A person who most of the time requests information.
15. A person who most of the time supports the other's statement.
16. A person who most of the time sympathizes with the other person.
17. A person who most of the time thanks the other person.
18. A person who most of the time expresses fear to the other person.
19. A person who most of the time shows sadness to the other.
20. A person who most of the time praises the other person.
21. A person who most of the time senses the mood of the other.
22. A person who most of the time upholds the other's statement.
23. A person who most of the time considers the other's opinion.
24. A person who most of the time communicates openly with the other.
25. A person who most of the time discloses to others.
26. A person who most of the time empathizes with others.
27. A person who most of the time listens to the other person.
28. A person who most of the time interacts with others.
29. A person who most of the time restates his/her own statement.
30. A person who most of the time presents proposals to others.
31. A person who most of the time convinces the other person.
32. A person who most of the time delivers an ultimatum to the other person.
33. A person who most of the time demands an answer from the other person.
34. A person who most of the time judges the other person.
35. A person who most of the time orders the other person to do something.
36. A person who most of the time provides answers for the other person.
37. A person who most of the time rejects the other person.
38. A person who most of the time states a fact.
ANSWER SHEET

1. EXTREMELY DOMINANT  2. SOMEWHAT DOMINANT  3. NEITHER  4. SOMEWHAT SUBMISSIVE  5. EXTREMELY SUBMISSIVE

Able to give orders
Forceful
Good Leader
Likes Responsibility

Can be obedient
Usually gives in
Easily Led
Modest

1.  1  2  3  4  5
2.  1  2  3  4  5
3.  1  2  3  4  5
4.  1  2  3  4  5
5.  1  2  3  4  5
6.  1  2  3  4  5
7.  1  2  3  4  5
8.  1  2  3  4  5
9.  1  2  3  4  5
10.  1  2  3  4  5
11.  1  2  3  4  5
12.  1  2  3  4  5
13.  1  2  3  4  5
14.  1  2  3  4  5
15.  1  2  3  4  5
16.  1  2  3  4  5
17.  1  2  3  4  5
18.  1  2  3  4  5
19.  1  2  3  4  5
20.  1  2  3  4  5
21.  1  2  3  4  5
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22.  1  2  3  4  5
23.  1  2  3  4  5
24.  1  2  3  4  5
25.  1  2  3  4  5
26.  1  2  3  4  5
27.  1  2  3  4  5
28.  1  2  3  4  5
29.  1  2  3  4  5
30.  1  2  3  4  5
31.  1  2  3  4  5
32.  1  2  3  4  5
33.  1  2  3  4  5
34.  1  2  3  4  5
35.  1  2  3  4  5
36.  1  2  3  4  5
37.  1  2  3  4  5
38.  1  2  3  4  5
**ANSWER SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY HOSTILE</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT HOSTILE</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT FRIENDLY</td>
<td>EXTREMELY FRIENDLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can be frank and honest  
Critical of others  
Irritable  
Straightforward and direct  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX B

**ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF THE MEANS**

#### STUDY 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DOM-SUB</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>HOS-FRI</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# STUDY 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DOM-SUB (mean)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>HOS-FRI (mean)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>COR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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