

1999

## An examination of an interpersonal dominance construct.

John Griffin Cole  
*West Virginia University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Cole, John Griffin, "An examination of an interpersonal dominance construct." (1999). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 10409.  
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/10409>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact [researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu).

An Examination of an Interpersonal Dominance Construct  
John G. Cole

Thesis submitted to the  
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences  
at West Virginia University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Masters of Arts  
in  
Communication Studies

James C. McCroskey, Ed.D., Chair  
Brian R. Patterson, Ph.D.  
Ted A. Avtgis, Ph.D.

Department of Communication Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia  
1999

Keywords: Interpersonal dominance, Temperament, Trait measurement

**UMI Number: 1399089**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

**UMI Microform 1399089**  
**Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.**  
**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against**  
**unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**P.O. Box 1346**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

**UMI Number: 1399089**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

**UMI Microform 1399089**  
**Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.**  
**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against**  
**unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**P.O. Box 1346**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

## ABSTRACT

### An Examination of an Interpersonal Dominance Construct

John G. Cole

This study examines the validity and reliability of an interactional measure of Interpersonal Dominance. The study employed surveys from 202 college students, and examined self-report data with regards to two temperament measures (the Eysenck Personality Inventory and the Five-Factor Model of Personality), several trait communication variables (Socio-Communicative Orientation, Communication Apprehension, Self-Report of Immediacy, Shyness, and Verbal Aggression), and the interactional measure of Interpersonal Dominance as advanced by Burgoon, Johnson, and Koch (1998). The study determined that the Interpersonal Dominance measure advanced by Burgoon et al. may in fact be measuring trait communication variables, and not necessarily interaction. This study also outlines possible future research which should be able to resolve concerns raised by the current investigation.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following individuals. To Dr. James C. McCroskey, who took a chance on me when he didn't need to, to Dr. Brian R. Patterson, who cajoled me when I wouldn't have, and to Dr. Theodore Avtgis, who kept me from saying what I shouldn't have. I appreciate all the help that you have given me, especially with exhibiting a level of tolerance that I would never have been able to muster for someone like me.

I would also like to thank my parents, who despite 29 years of contrary evidence continue to support me in my sometimes questionable endeavors.

Finally, a special thanks to Alan Heisel, who held my hand and guided me through statistics I would never have understood on my own.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	
Trait Perspective	
Trait Criticisms from the Situationist Perspective	
Trait Criticisms from Interactionist Perspective	
Interpersonal Dominance	
Hypotheses and Research Questions	
CHAPTER 2	17
METHODS	
Participants and Procedures	
Measures	
CHAPTER 3	19
RESULTS	
Research Question One	
Hypothesis One	
Hypothesis Two	
Research Question Two	
Research Question Three	
CHAPTER 4	26
DISCUSSION	
Overview	
Research Question One	
Hypothesis One	
Hypothesis Two	
Research Question Two	
Research Questions Three and Four	
Summary	
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX A	36
APPENDIX B	38
APPENDIX C	45
APPENDIX D	46

APPENDIX E	47
APPENDIX F	48
APPENDIX G	49
APPENDIX H	50
APPENDIX I	51
APPENDIX J	52
APPENDIX K	53
APPENDIX L	54
APPENDIX M	55
APPENDIX N	56
APPENDIX O	57



## Chapter 1

### Interpersonal Dominance: Trait or the

### Product of Dyadic Interaction

The very nature of modern science and much of social science is the resolution of contentious propositions through sound research and heady statistical analysis. Ideas are generated in rapid succession and thrown into a pool of possible candidates, whereupon only those with the strongest ability to survive manage to do so, with the rest left in the ash heap of history with little left to offer but anecdotal evidence of what might have been. Science is, in fact, a struggle not unlike that of the evolution of mankind, and it should surprise no one that poor ideas, like unfit biological entities, may survive longer than would seem reasonable, but in the end suffer a similar fate.

Ideas, unlike the numerous biological species, are not naturally occurring, and hence owe a deference to their creators. This deference is reciprocated; it is sometimes difficult to separate author from idea. It is this relationship between idea and creator that is at the root of much contention in science. Ideas are given sponsorship, propped up, and allowed to exist much longer than facts and reason would predict. It is this personal aspect of science that Digman (1996) referred to when he stated that “recognition for the scientist comes when his or her name becomes attached to some finding or theory” (p. 14). Digman continues, stating, in essence, that our ideas become as much a part of us as our family, and that “a suggestion that a model with which we have been identified could profit from correction or that it is basically flawed can marshal a full range of defenses.”

It is thus the fallibility of the scientist and the frailty of human ego which is the source of

much conflict within the realm of ideas. This recognition of the oneness of research and researcher must create a need for a sense of caution. This caution should not necessarily have a chilling effect on the efforts of the curious, but should be a cry for objectivity in the portrayal of what is and conversely what is not. It is imperative that facts be treated as such, and not carefully molded into concepts that they are not. Whereas emotional capital is the mother's milk of the researcher, it should be stated that no scientist should ever be afraid of his/her findings, nor should ideas be reified for the sake of their sponsor.

### The Unit of Analysis

Communication Studies is concerned with all aspects of human communication. The boundaries appear simultaneously limitless and are inexorably tied to the human condition. It is the nature of our subject that leaves communication researchers bound to the same queries that dominate the fields of Psychology, Sociology, and more recently, Biology. Try as one might, no study can be detached from the subject.

Our goal then, in Communication Studies, is to generate theory with sound empirical evidence that will help us to explain, predict, and control the aspects of human behavior which govern how we communicate. With this in mind, an overview of the approach to be taken in this study is necessary.

### On the Nature of Traits

A discussion of trait research must include a working definition of what, in fact, a trait really is. As defined by Guilford (1959), a trait is "any distinguishable, relatively enduring way in which one individual differs from another" (p. 6). Eysenck (1985) defined traits as "essentially dispositional factors that regularly and persistently determine our conduct in many

types of situations” (p. 17). As defined by Mischel (1968), a trait “refers to the differences between directly observable behavior or characteristics of two or more individuals on a defined dimension” (p. 5). Mischel continues, noting that a “trait can be a personality construct created for its explanatory convenience and power,” in that “a trait is a construct or abstraction to account for enduring behavioral consistencies and differences.”

Any number of traits can exist concomitantly, yet there is a tendency of researchers to gather traits into larger and more useful groupings to understand behavior. Whereas it was noted by Daly (1987) that most traits are conceptually independent, the central tendency among researchers has been to arrange traits into groupings of what Eysenck (1985) would call a “type,” or a “supertrait.” This supertrait would be a collection of traits that at its simplest would provide an overall picture as to how individuals would behave most of the time.

Eysenck’s conceptualization of overall personality types is a three dimension model, consisting of Extaversion (E), Neuroticism (N), and Psychoticism (P). These supertraits, as Eysenck cleverly noted, are merely abstractions, groupings of smaller concepts that we are capable of understanding so as to better comprehend overall individual behavior better. As he stated, it would be foolhardy to make the assumption “that there is out there in the cosmos a real neuroticism having a unique correlation with extraversion, and that our tests attempt to approximate these real factors” (p. 31).

Eysenck is not alone in his attempts to create groupings of smaller (though not to say less relevant) “supertraits” or “temperaments”. Currently, much energy is being spent researching and arguing the Five-Factor Model (FFM). The Five-Factor Model bears much resemblance to the work of Eysenck, in that two of the dimensions are the same. The FFM still maintains the

dimensions of Extraversion (E) and Neuroticism (N), yet also includes the dimensions of Openness to Experience (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C). The FFM, as McCrae and Costa argue (1996), is capable of providing “a comprehensive system, a framework for organizing all personality traits” (p. 61).

Regardless of the model upon which we rely, it is evident that trait theorists and trait researchers are attempting to achieve similar ends. The apparent goal is to create constructs that can help us to understand individual behavior when looked at over a period of time. No mention in any review of the literature is given to the predictive power of either model concerning a specific behavior at a specific instance in a specific environment. Rather, the trait viewpoint is one that takes a more grounded viewpoint.

While there are some semantic differences in each of the preceding definitions of traits, it is clear that traits have been singled out because of their consistent, and some would say persistent, predictability across a wide degree of situations. This notion of cross-situational consistency lends credence to the explicit goal of trait-based research. It is recognized that trait research will not accurately predict all of the time what a given individual will do in a hypothetical situation. Expecting this type of predictive power borders on the nonsensical. Indeed, what is expected of trait research is the ability to generalize that a number of individuals, with given similarity among certain traits, will behave in a generally predictable manner. This recognition highlights both the rewards and pitfalls of trait-based research. It is imperative that we recognize the fallacy in the argument that trait theory, and hence research, is useless because it is incapable of predicting what people will do all of the time. The underlying assumption in this argument is that other approaches to human behavior do have such predictive power, which

they do not (Eysenck, 1985; Funder & Ozer, 1983). Well grounded researchers are aware of these limitations.

Trait-based research has been enormously productive in the field of Communication Studies. The early research into Communication Apprehension, which is now succinctly defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1977, p. 269) originated entirely from a trait-based perspective. Although the original research that was inherently trait-based has been broadened to include some state-like qualities, the dominant belief is that those states are a “manifestation of trait CA and other traits of the individual” (McCroskey & Beatty, 1998, p. 217).

Similarly, research into the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) construct is clearly cut from a trait perspective. As defined, WTC is “an individual’s predisposition to initiate communication with others (McCroskey & Richmond, 1998, p. 120). It is no accident that terms such as ‘predisposition,’ ‘propensity,’ and ‘tendency’ are included in virtually every working definition of trait-based communication constructs. All of these terms tap into the belief that these behaviors are partially the result of individually held trait foundations. Likewise, none of these terms connote absolutes, and there can be no illusion that a predisposition means that a person will behave in the same manner regardless of any other considerations.

Trait research in the field of Communication Studies is currently heading in a new direction, and that is towards the study of the origins of traits. This is certain to cause rise among some circles, as the trait perspective itself is enough to give rise to cries of heresy. However, there is far more than anecdotal evidence available in extant research to provide for support of the “Communibiological Perspective” (Beatty & McCroskey, 1997; Beatty, McCroskey, &

Heisel 1998).

### Trait Criticisms from the Situationist Perspective

The situationist perspective is defined as the belief that “situational factors generally overwhelm dispositional ones in the determination of behavior” (Funder & Ozer, p. 107). This simple assertion seeks to displace the emphasis on trait factors and instead claims that individual behavior will be a function of the environment. In other words, the assumption is that individuals will behave predictably and similarly if placed in the identical situations. The independent variable, along this line of thought, is always the situation, which must be controlled and manipulated accordingly.

There are numerous issues which contribute to the divide between those with a trait viewpoint and those who hold a situational viewpoint. Primary among them is the dismissal of the trait belief that individuals will act somewhat predictably across a variety of situations. Situationists believe that behavior is determined “almost exclusively by situational variables” (Epstein, 1979, p. 1099). This, too, is no small claim, and as Eysenck noted, “it fails entirely to account for what is the basis of all trait and type theories, namely individual differences in behavior in identical situations” (Eysenck, 1985, p.38).

Regardless of which viewpoint is held, it is important to take a short look at the criticisms of trait theory that are provided by situationists. A suitable starting point is a complaint that Snyder and Ickes (1985) pointed out, in that trait theory is relatively atheoretical. No grand theoretical claims are made by those with trait viewpoints, as they are able to build theory inductively around the observation and measurement of individuals. In essence, because there is little need for complex and contorted theoretical claims prior to examination or study, the results

of empirical analysis using these methods is somehow invalidated by the simplicity with which they were unearthed.

An additional criticism that has received much attention is that dispositional theories account for very little variance, and therefore do not answer the questions which they claim to have answered. The primary dissent is over the point that the trait approach does not frequently report correlations of over .30, which would account for less than 10% of the variance. This, of course, would imply that “dispositions would, in general, be expected to exhibit only weak predictive validity and only weak consistency across situations” (Snyder & Ickes, 1985, p. 895). As noted by Epstein (1979), much of this can be attributed to errors in measurement and that stability and higher correlations can be attained by measuring in more than one instance. Regardless, claims that the situation can account for more variance in behavior than the individual still remain.

The final criticism worth noting is described in detail by Epstein (1979). In short, the claim is that people “tend to attribute more stability to individuals across situations than is objectively warranted” (p. 1099). The idea is that individuals will attribute a manifestation of behavior to a stable trait-like quality that an individual might be presumed to hold, when in actuality the behavior was driven by the situation. The reasons for this sort of attribution error are multiple, to include the fact that it is simpler to classify individuals by behavior rather than situation, it is more appealing to believe that behavior is predictable, and because the observer of a behavior must be present upon observation, whereas he/she is not present throughout a broad spectrum of other situations, thus biasing the sample. Epstein continues on to note several other reasons for this type of attribution, but the general ideas of the genesis of this improper

attribution remain similar.

The end of a discussion regarding the situationist perspective must also include a brief recitation of the goals of theory and how they may pertain to this perspective. If theory is to explain, predict, and control, it is clear that the situationist perspective falls short in achieving these goals. Explanation, under the situationist perspective, is possible only if the situation is completely understood, for those are the variables which will drive individual behavior. Likewise, prediction of behavior is possible only if the situation is to be known in advance. Taken together, it is easy to recognize where the utility in such an approach is limited. Situations may only be manipulated in an experimental environment, and thus, the situationist perspective has utility only in that environment. As no situations will be the same in everyday life, how then can predictions of behavior be kept stable across a broad range of situations? Finally, as control is the third goal of theory, it is evident that the situationist perspective, with its dependence on situational and environmental variables, can in no way lead to measures that will control individual behavior. In essence, the situationist perspective is relativist in its very foundations, specific to one person in one situation, and while it may be interesting to understand specific behaviors by specific individuals in specific instances, that understanding has very little utility in the larger context of understanding the full range of human communication behaviors.

#### Trait Criticisms from the Interactionist Perspective

As defined by Epstein (1979), the interactionist position is one in which “ the question of which is more important, the situation or the person, is a meaningless one, as behavior is always a joint function of the person and the situation” (p.1101). The interactionist position is one of synthesis, taking into account the aspects of a trait perspective and a situationist perspective, and



accounting for variance in behavior from two sources.

The interactionist position accepts “the existence of behavioral stability, but only within situational constraints” (p.1101). It is clear that the intent of the interactionist perspective is to adopt what may be seen as the advantages of both perspectives to account for more variance.

As it was discussed earlier, the trait perspective in no way implies that internal trait attributes will account for all behavior in any situation. Likewise, the situation is an unacceptable unit of measure if standing alone, as no one has the capability of controlling every situation in which individuals behave. The question then arises, how is the interactionist perspective quantified and how much more variance can this perspective account for?

One criticism of the interactionist perspective that should be noted is provided by Eysenck (1985). According to Eysenck the interactionist perspective is, in a sense, merely expanding on what is already currently understood as part of the trait perspective. As he stated, “any trait theory implies a situational theory, and vice versa; hence there is an obvious degree of interactionism posited in classical trait theory” (p. 40). The implication is that trait theorists inherently recognize that no behavior, however strongly related to personality traits, can exist exclusive from situational pressures. As such, he states, “the belief of modern writers that they have discovered a compromise between trait theory and situationism in looking for interactions is mistaken; such interaction has always been part of trait theory” (p. 40).

Regardless of the criticisms, an interactionist perspective is arguably the most utilitarian approach to discussing personality and communication behaviors. There can be no mistake here, as the assertion that situational constraints have no effect on individual behavior is utterly unfounded and does not have at its disposal any empirical evidence. Likewise, no rigorous

analysis will provide an empirical basis for the situation as the sole motivator in causing/creating certain behavioral manifestations on the part of the individual.

### Overview of Perspectives

The previous pages have provided an overview of the trait perspective and some criticisms from other perspectives. It was necessary to review them, as it is vital to recognize which perspective is employed and how it was operationalized when examining the vast amounts of research that is at our disposal. Results of studies must be examined, and the background and perspective of an individual can have profound impacts on the nature and course of a particular study. When results are provided for a given study, the mistake should not be made to accept the results at face value. It is important to have a clear recognition that the way people think and view the world can shape the way with which they come to the conclusions they report. Because of the error generated as a result of human participation in science, it is important to analyze and re-analyze results to ensure that they indeed reflect what they are purported to reflect.

### The Nature of Dominance and the Burgoon Interpersonal Dominance Construct

Burgoon, Johnson, and Koch (1998) proposed that dominance should “be viewed as a relational, behavioral, and interactional state that reflects the actual achievement of influence or control over another via communicative actions” (p. 315). This statement is controversial for several reasons, not the least that it appears to disregard any conception of dominance as a trait-like quality that an individual may possess independent of or in conjunction with other trait like qualities.

Burgoon et al. provide a two part definition of dominance. The first aspect of the definition relies on relational issues, in that dominance may be exhibited only in relation to

subordination or submission. This is an interesting proposition, in that it means that this concept of dominance must transcend personality types, and that dominance must be something that someone gains from someone else. By this logic, people are not dominant nor exhibit dominant behaviors nor have inherently dominant trait like characteristics to their persona. Rather, dominance is a mutually negotiated construct whose lowest level of existence must be at the dyadic level. In essence, this states that in order for someone to be dominant, someone must be submissive.

Burgoon et al. also clearly delineate the difference between power and dominance. It is forwarded that power should not be confused with dominance, in that power is “the ability and potential to influence others and may be exercised through a variety of resources, such as offering rewards, controlling information, using ingratiation, or appeasement” (p. 315). Clearly, power is something that is held by an individual and exerted outward. The origins of such power are not discussed. Dominance, however, as conceptualized here, “consists of expressive, relationally-based strategies and is one set of communicative acts by which power is exerted and influence exercised” (p. 315). From these operationalizations of power and dominance, the authors continue to devise two measures that, if valid, might be used to measure the construct of interpersonal dominance as it has been defined.

The measures that were constructed were attribute based and behavioral based, respectively. The first measure consisted of 120 adjectives that were used to describe an individual as either dominant or submissive. The results of a preliminary study helped to hone the list to only 44 items, each of which had to have been reported at least 40% of the time for the appropriate condition. A correlation was then computed to examine the relationship between the

dominant and submissive items, and it was reported that the relationship was both negative and significant,  $r = -.51$ ,  $p < .01$ .

The second measure consisted of a 32-item Likert-type scale. The results were analyzed, and due to a low item-to-total correlation, one item was dropped. After this omission, a Cronbach's Alpha of .93 was reported.. After factor analysis, it was reported that the 32 item questionnaire was best understood as having four or five dimensions. The dimensions listed were that of Influence and Poise, Conversational Control and Panache, Task Focus, and Self-Assurance for the four factor solution. For the five factor solution, the dimensions were that of Influence, Conversational Control, Focus and Poise, Panache, and Self-Assurance.

The results of the study and a subsequent replication lead the authors to report that the two measures “offer means of measuring dominance in a more comprehensive manner” (p. 329). The authors conclude that the attribute measure provides a means to assess “dominance or submissiveness through use of impressionistic qualities,” and the behavioral measure “allows for a more precise assessment of what dominant and nondominant individuals actually do.”

The difficulty with this analysis is that it appears to measure some concept of dominance, but in regards to the operationalization of dominance as an interpersonal or relational device, it seems to fall short. If interpersonal dominance is decided through the interaction of at least two individuals, it would seem apparent that the unit of analysis would need to be the interaction.

The first scale does provide for a method of measuring “impressionistic qualities,” however, as conceived by the authors of this study, the impressions reported are static, and can not be construed to somehow report impressions based on a specific interaction. Indeed, the notion of attribution error that was discussed earlier would seem to come into play. It appears

that the impressions being reported with this measure possess a trait-like quality, and are not the product of interaction but are merely descriptive terms that reflect an individual's opinion of another. For example, several of the adjectives that are presented as reflective of dominance include that of argumentative, assertive, extroverted, and talkative. Each of these may represent or describe dominance, each coincidentally is recognized as a trait-like communication variable, with the exception of extroverted, which is recognized as one of Eysenck's three dimensions of temperament and as one of the five dimensions of the Five-Factor Model.

The second issue regarding the attribute scale is in regards to the actual conduct of the study. Students were asked to fill out the questionnaires, first with a dominant friend in mind, then with a less dominant friend in mind. The issue is, then, that the measure is catering to preconceived notions of who is and who is not dominant. Although the intent of the attribute measure is to provide a better understanding of what constitutes dominance, a better way of supporting the authors' claims might have been to ask the students to fill it out in regards to a person whom they had previously not met, and then had a short interaction with. The participant would then fill out the questionnaire in regards to his/her partner in the interaction. Again, this measure does not measure dominance as an interactional variable, but what appears to be merely a list of trait-like attributes that a person has exhibited over time.

The second measure is labeled as a behavioral measure, but does not appear to measure behavior in a specific instance or as the product of a specific interaction, but rather as behaviors exhibited over a period of time by a particular individual. No clearer evidence that this is the case can be presented that the first item of the measure, in which the participant is asked about an individual: "This person usually takes charge of conversations." Had the question "This person

took charge of the conversation” been asked immediately after a short interaction, then perhaps it might be measuring interpersonal dominance as defined earlier. However, it is clear that what is being tapped is a stable, cross-situational, trait-like quality of another individual.

The remainder of the questionnaire exhibited similar qualities as the first item, and it seems that interpersonal dominance is not being measured as an interactional variable, but rather as trait-like manifestations of behavior. This, then, begs the question, what actually did the 32-item measure assess?

After closer inspection, it appears that many of the items listed on the measure are similar to other common communication measures that have been accepted to reliably and validly measure trait-like behavior. Consider item numbers 21, 28, and 32, which ask whether the person in question has a dramatic way of interacting, shows a lot of poise during interactions, and has a memorable way of interacting respectively. All three items loaded between .52 and .54 on the four factor solution provided by the authors under the dimension of Influence and Poise and between .51 and .55 on the five factor solution under the dimension of Influence. The interesting point of this observation is that all three of these items on the surface seem to resemble items on current measures of immediacy and older measures of communicator style (Norton, 1978).

Additionally, several items appear to measure what could be clearly recognized as rewordings or concomitant aspects of assertiveness and responsiveness. Consider items #2, #10, #12, #20, and #24, which ask whether the individual in question is often turned to when decisions have to be made, is influential, makes his/her presence felt, is often the center of attention, and is more of a follower than a leader. Items #2, #10, #12, and #20 scored between .57 and .73 on the first dimension of the four factor solution presented. Item #24, as would be

expected because of the phrasing, scored a  $-.55$ .

Upon examination, it appears that the scales constructed by Burgoon et al. may not measure what they are purported to measure. As has been noted, the instrument suffers on both methodological and conceptual fronts. In terms of method, there has been no measure of interaction per se. The conceptual foundation is thus erroneous, as what dominance that may be reported as the product of these scales bears no resemblance to the operationalization of dominance as an interactional variable. Because of these issues, a number of hypotheses and research questions immediately arise, all with the intent to determine what is actually being measured.

As there is more than a passing similarity between many of the items on the 32-item measure and existing communication variable measures (e.g. SCO, Verbal Aggressiveness, PRCA-24, Shyness Scale, Self Immediacy):

**RQ1: What relationship is there between the 32 item measure of interpersonal dominance and existing trait like communication measures?**

It is believed that many of the communication variables that are being measured in the previous hypotheses are trait-like in nature. If this is the case, then additional hypotheses can be derived to explain the trait-like quality of the interpersonal dominance measure.

**H1: Significant correlations between sub-scores on Eysenck's temperament scale and the dimensions of interpersonal dominance listed in the 32-item measure will be observed.**

**H2: Significant correlations between sub-scores on the Five Factor Model and the dimensions of interpersonal dominance listed in the 32-item measure will be**

**observed.**

If it is to be believed that what is being measured in the 32-item measure is trait-like in nature, then this measure could have utility in future research regarding interpersonal communication and a construct of dominance.

**RQ2: Can re-wording of the 32 item interpersonal dominance measure into a self-report supply similar reliability as reported by Burgoon, et al.?**

Finally, if the three above hypotheses are accurate in their assumption, then it would appear that the interpersonal dominance construct as presented here is a fusing of existing communication variables. However, there may be evidence to suggest that the interpersonal dominance construct as defined by Burgoon et al. (1998) may represent and measure what is could come to be known as a higher order of personality trait in individuals. As such, interpersonal dominance may become a first-order construct with other traits acting as second order constructs.

**RQ3: To what extent do existing communication variables predict scores of the 32 item measure of interpersonal dominance?**

**RQ4: Can the notion of interpersonal dominance be reliably used as a self-report of a supertrait of dominance behaviors?**



## Chapter 2

### Methods

#### Participants

Participants for this survey were 202 undergraduate students at a large eastern university and were enrolled in a Communication Studies course. Of the 202 students, 102 reported their gender as male, 98 reported their gender as female, and two declined to report gender.

Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and extra credit for participation was offered. If students did not desire to participate in this survey, other extra credit options were provided.

#### Measures

The survey included several self-report measures designed to gauge individual perceptions regarding a variety of communication and personality variables. Included in the survey were the PRCA-24, which has been shown to have excellent reliability and validity (McCroskey, Beatty, Kearny, & Plax, 1985), the Assertiveness-Responsiveness Scale (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995), the Shyness Scale (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995), Self-Assessment of Immediacy, (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995), and Verbal Aggressiveness (Infante & Wigley, 1986).

In addition to the communication variable measures, the survey included the 32-item Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI), with the dimensions of Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Psychoticism, as developed by Eysenck et al. (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985; Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985). To further measure personality dimension, the 40-item Five-Factor Model (FFM) was included, as iterated by McCrae and John (McCrae & John, 1985). The final measure that was employed was the 32-item behavioral measure for interpersonal dominance, as employed by

Burgoon et al. (Burgoon, Johnson, & Toch, 1998). The Interpersonal Dominance scale was initially employed as an observer report, and it was necessary to reword the measure so that it could be utilized as a self report measure. The Interpersonal Dominance measure as used by Burgoon et al. and as reworded into a self-report measure appear in Appendix A.

The numerous individual items of the communication variables were placed on the survey in a mixed format, in that no two simultaneous questions are from the same measure. The complete survey, as it was presented, is attached as Appendix B. The Alpha Reliabilities of all measures used in the survey appear in Appendix C.

## Chapter 3

### Results

#### General Findings

An oblique factor analysis was conducted on the 32 item Interpersonal Dominance measure. One item, item #7, was dropped from the analysis to retain consistency with the procedures conducted by Burgoon et al. (1998). Unlike Burgoon et al., however, the results from factor analysis failed to depict either a four item or five item solution (The four item solution as presented by Burgoon et al. is depicted in Appendix E, and the five item solution is depicted in Appendix F), but a clearer two factor solution was evident. After examination of the items in accordance to their loadings, it was determined that the two factors represented a dimension that we labeled Dominance and a dimension that we labeled Competence (see Appendix G for complete listing). Due to insufficient loading on either dimension, five additional items of the original 32 item measure were discarded (items #7, 8, 16, 23, 27, 30), to create what could then be viewed as a two dimensional measure of perceived Dominance and Competence.

After determining that the data elicited a 26-item measure with two dimensions, that of Dominance and Competence, Alpha Reliabilities for the respective dimensions were generated. The reliability for the Dominance dimension was .89, for the Competence dimension it was .76, and for the combined 26-item measure it was .89. The correlation between the two dimensions was .37.

Because of the procedures undertaken by Burgoon et al., the 32-item measure as advanced by them is in actuality a 31-item measure, and will heretofore be referred to as the Burgoon Interpersonal Dominance (BIPD) measure. The 26-item measure that was constructed

from factor analysis will be referred to as simply the 26-item measure of Interpersonal Dominance (IPD-26). The two dimensions of the IPD-26 will be referred to as Dominance (DOM) and Competence (COMP).

### Research Question One

RQ One questioned the relationship between the Interpersonal Dominance measure and existing communication variables. As confirmatory factor analysis failed to produce either solution for Interpersonal Dominance as offered by Burgoon et al. (1998), Pearson correlations were generated between the BIPD as initially presented, as well as with the IPD-26, DOM, and COMP. All correlations, probability levels, and sample sizes are reported in Appendix H.

A number of strong correlations were observed. The BIPD, IPD-26 and the dimension of Dominance all exhibited similar relationships with Assertiveness. The correlations observed were  $r = .60$ ,  $p < .0001$  for the 32-item measure,  $r = .59$ ,  $p < .0001$  for the 26-item measure, and  $r = .57$ ,  $p < .0001$  for Dominance. The dimension of Competence by itself reported a much smaller but still relevant correlation of  $r = .36$ ,  $p < .0001$ .

Small to moderate correlations between the four measures and Responsiveness were exhibited. For the BIPD,  $r = .30$ ,  $p < .0001$ , for the IPD-26,  $r = .33$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The dimensions of Dominance and Competence had correlations of  $r = .28$ ,  $p < .0001$  and  $r = .29$ ,  $p < .0001$ , respectively.

Moderate to large negative correlations were observed between all four measures and the Shyness Scale. The BIPD and IPD-26 both had correlations of  $r = -.61$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The dimension of Dominance had a correlation of  $r = -.59$ ,  $p < .0001$ , and Competence had a correlation of  $r = -.37$ ,  $p < .0001$ .

The Self-Report of Immediacy also provided statistically significant, positive correlations with the measures in question. The largest correlation was with the IPD-26,  $r = .58$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The next largest correlation was with the BIPD,  $r = .56$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The dimensions of Dominance and Competence were  $r = .39$ ,  $p < .0001$  and  $r = .51$ ,  $p < .0001$ , respectively.

Strong negative correlations were observed between the PRCA-24 and all measures. The strongest correlation was between the BIPD,  $r = -.65$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The IPD-26 had a similar correlation of  $r = -.63$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The two dimensions of Dominance and Competence had correlations of  $r = -.56$ ,  $p < .0001$  and  $r = -.51$ ,  $p < .0001$ .

There were no significant correlations between Verbal Aggressiveness and any of the four measures. All but the dimension of Competence failed to elicit a correlation that was statistically significant, yet all correlations except for the dimension of Dominance were negative in nature. For the BIPD and IPD-26, the correlations were  $r = -.04$ ,  $p < .61$  and  $r = -.06$ ,  $p < .38$ , respectively. For Dominance, the correlation was  $r = .02$ ,  $p < .81$ , and for Competence,  $r = -.20$ ,  $p < .01$ .

### Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 was confirmed, with statistically significant relationships for all four measures and the three dimensions of the Eysenck Personality Inventory exhibited. The largest relationships were between the EPI dimension of Extraversion (E). The 31-item Burgoon Interpersonal Dominance measure and the IPD-26 had correlations of  $r = .63$ ,  $p < .0001$  and  $r = .64$ ,  $p < .0001$ , respectively. The dimension of Dominance had a correlation of  $r = .59$ ,  $p < .0001$ , while the dimension of Competence had a correlation of  $r = .46$ ,  $p < .0001$ . Appendix I has all relevant information regarding Hypothesis One, to include sample size, probability, and strength

of the relationship.

Small negative correlations were observed between the EPI dimension of Neuroticism (N) and the four measures. For the BIPD, the correlation was  $r = -.31, p < .0001$ , and for the IPD-26, the correlation was  $r = -.27, p < .0001$ . The dimension of Dominance had a correlation of  $r = -.23, p < .0001$  with Eysenck's Neuroticism, while the dimension of Competence had a correlation of  $r = -.24, p < .001$ .

Eysenck's third dimension of Psychoticism also exhibited small negative correlations with all four measures examined. The dimensions of Dominance and Competence had correlations of  $r = -.17, p < .02$  and  $r = -.30, p < .0001$ , respectively. Another small correlation was observed between the BIPD,  $r = -.21, p < .003$ . The IPD-26 had a correlation of  $r = -.25, p < .0004$  with Psychoticism.

### Hypothesis 2

An examination of the Five-Factor Model and the two dimensions and two measures produced results similar to what was observed with the Eysenck Personality Inventory. The dimension of Extraversion, as measured with the FFM, had correlations of  $r = .45, p < .001$  and  $r = .48, p < .0001$  with the BIPD and IPD-26, respectively. The variable Dominance had a correlation of  $r = .43, p < .0001$ , while Competence had a correlation of  $r = .35, p < .0001$ . Appendix J has the complete findings, to include sample size, probability, and strength of the relationship.

The FFM dimension of Neuroticism had statistically significant negative correlations with both measures and the two dimensions of Dominance and Competence, just as was observed with the Eysenck Personality Inventory. BIPD had a correlation of  $r = -.25, p < .0004$ ,

while the IPD-26 had a correlation of  $r = -.22$ ,  $p < .002$ . Dominance had a correlation of  $r = -.19$ ,  $p < .007$ , whereas Competence was correlated similarly,  $r = -.19$ ,  $p < .007$ .

Agreeableness provided no statistically significant relationships with either of the measures or the two dimensions. The BIPD had a correlation of  $r = -.02$ ,  $p < .77$ , and the IPD-26 had a correlation of  $r = .002$ ,  $p < .98$ . Dominance had a correlation of  $r = -.03$ ,  $p < .65$ , while Competence had a correlation of  $r = .05$ ,  $p < .34$ .

The FFM dimension of Openness to Change exhibited moderate positive correlations with both measures and both dimensions. The BIPD and IPD-26 had correlations of  $r = .33$ ,  $p < .0001$  and  $r = .35$ ,  $p < .0001$ . A correlation of  $r = .31$ ,  $p < .0001$  was observed for the dimension of Dominance and Openness to Change, and the correlation for Competence and Openness to Change was  $r = .27$ ,  $p < .002$ .

The final dimension of the FFM that was examined in relation to the two dimensions and the two measures was that of Conscientiousness. A correlation of  $r = .32$ ,  $p < .0001$  was observed with the BIPD, and a correlation of  $r = .33$ ,  $p < .00001$  for the IPD-26. The dimension of dominance had a correlation of  $r = .27$ ,  $p < .0001$  with Conscientiousness, while the dimension of Competence had a correlation of  $r = .27$ ,  $p < .0001$ .

### Research Question 2

Research Question Two examined whether the re-wording of the Burgoon et al. (1998) 32-item measure of interpersonal dominance could be re-worded into a self-report measure and exhibit similar reliability. As reported by Burgoon et al. (1998), the 32-item measure was observed to have a Cronbach's Alpha of .93 when used as an observer report when one item, item #7, was omitted.

The 32-item measure, when reworded into a self-report measure with item number 7 omitted, was observed to have a Cronbach's Alpha of .87. The 26-item measure that was reconstructed following factor analysis was observed to have a slightly higher Alpha, that of .89. The dimension of Dominance was also observed to have an Alpha of .89, and the dimension of Competence had a Cronbach's Alpha of .76.

### Research Question 3

RQ 3 probed the extent to which existing trait communication variables could predict scores on the measure of Interpersonal Dominance as forwarded by Burgoon et al. (1998). As was the case with all previous hypotheses and research questions, analyses were conducted on the BIPD, IPD-26, and the two dimensions of Dominance and Competence. Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted for the two measures and the two dimensions and the trait communication variables of Assertiveness and Responsiveness (Socio-Communicative Orientation), the Shyness Scale, the PRCA-24, a self-report of Immediacy, and Verbal Aggressiveness. Statistical significance,  $R^2$  scores, and other relevant information is presented in Appendix K.

For the BIPD,  $F(6,192) = 50.99$ ,  $p < .0001$ , with an  $R^2$  of .62. It was observed that Assertiveness accounted of 3% unique variance, Responsiveness contributed no unique variance, scores on the Shyness Scale accounted for 2%, the PRCA-24 accounted for 3% of the variance, scores on the Self-Report of Immediacy accounted for 4%, and Verbal Aggressiveness accounted for 1% of the variance. Colinear variance of the trait communication variables was determined to account for 49% of the variance in the BIPD. Beta Weights are presented in Appendix L.

The IPD-26 produced similar results, although the unique variance accounted for by the



trait communication variables was slightly larger. For the IPD-26,  $F(6,186) = 50.29$ ,  $p < .0001$ , with an  $R^2$  of .62. Assertiveness accounted for 4% of the variance, while Responsiveness accounted for 1% of the variance. Scores on the Shyness Scale accounted for 3% of the variance, Communication Apprehension accounted for 2% of the variance, Immediacy claimed 5% of the variance, and Verbal Aggression accounted for 1% of the variance. Colinear Variance for the communication variables in regards to the IPD-26 was determined to be 46%. Beta weights are presented in Appendix M.

For the dimension of Dominance that was isolated previously in factor analysis,  $F(6,186) = 35.59$ ,  $p < .0001$ , with an  $R^2$  of .53. In this analysis, Assertiveness accounted for 4% of the variance, Responsiveness, 3%, the Shyness Scale contributed 4% of the variance, The PRCA-24 accounted for 1%, the Self-Report of Immediacy contributed 3%, and Verbal Aggressiveness accounted for 1% of the variance. Colinear variance was determined to account for 37% of the variance in scores on the dimension of Dominance. Beta weights are presented in Appendix N.

The final analysis conducted was in regards to the dimension of Competence, in which  $F(6,188) = 17.97$ ,  $p < .0001$ , with an  $R^2$  of .36. Assertiveness accounted for 1% of the variance, Communication Apprehension accounted for 4% of the variance, and Immediacy accounted for 5% of the variance. Responsiveness, Shyness, and Verbal Aggressiveness all contributed no unique variance, and colinear variance was determined to account for 26% of the variance. Beta weights are presented in Appendix O.

## Chapter 4

### Discussion

#### Overview

This study provided a number of interesting results, and the analysis leads to a clearer picture of a perhaps supertrait of Interpersonal Dominance. The methods undertaken in this study make it difficult to discount completely the notion forwarded by Burgoon et al. (1998) that Interpersonal Dominance is an interactional construct, however, rather convincing evidence has been produced that the scores on the BIPD advanced by Burgoon et al. are in large part predictable by other traits. Indeed, 62% of the variance in scores on the 32-item measure of Interpersonal Dominance (as re-worded into a self-report, see Appendix A) can be accounted for with several existing trait communication measures. While that leaves 38% of the variance left unaccounted for, there is nothing in the construction of the 32-item measure that would suggest that the remaining variance is somehow a product of interaction.

One criticism of this study is the re-wording of the 32-item measure from an observer report to a self-report measure. This was done for several reasons, not the least to ease collection of data. However, a measure of Interpersonal Dominance, if observed to be valid and reliable, would be extremely useful in the context of examining trait communication behavior. It should also be discussed that the reliability of the of the 32-item measure as employed as a self-report attained an Alpha reliability of .86, which although not attaining the .93 reliability the measure was reported to have as an observer report (Burgoon et al., 1998), still lies substantially above the threshold necessary for considering a measure reliable.

Another interesting situation that arose while conducting this study was the failure to

replicate the results of the factor analysis offered by Burgoon et al. (1998). Repeated rotation analyses were conducted, but no three, four, or five factor solution for the measure of Interpersonal Dominance (BIPD) could be justified. It was abundantly clear that the best solution found for the reworded measure was one with two factors, which were labeled Dominance and Competence. There is no simple explanation for this inconsistency. There is the possibility that it is an artifact of the rewording of the measure from an observer report to a self-report. However, it is a common practice to use measures as both self-reports and as observer reports, and as is the case with the measure of Assertiveness and Responsiveness, rewording them to measure Socio-Communicative Orientation and Socio-Communicative Style creates no appreciable difference in the two independent dimensions when subjected to factor analysis. The reason for the failure of the BIPD to factor into the solutions offered by Burgoon et al. remains at this point unknown.

#### Research Question 1

RQ 1 examined the relationship of the BIPD and several trait communication measures. Pearson correlations were calculated, and if we assume that the measure of Interpersonal Dominance as advanced by Burgoon et al. is measuring a dominance supertrait, a rather clear picture of the communication behaviors of individuals who perceive themselves dominant is painted. For example, strong positive correlations were observed for both the BIPD and the IPD-26 with assertiveness, responsiveness, and a self-report of immediacy (See Appendix H). At the same time, there exist strong negative correlations between the two measures of Interpersonal Dominance and the scores on the Shyness Scale and the PRCA-24.

Thus, a person who believes herself/himself to be interpersonally dominant also finds

herself/himself to be more assertive, more responsive, and employ more immediacy behaviors.

This person also reports very low scores on a self-report of Shyness and Communication Apprehension. These findings are consistent and logical, and there is nothing to be inferred from these findings which could be considered antithetical to any of the individual trait communication variables. It is logically consistent that an individual who is more assertive would consider herself/himself more dominant, just as it is consistent for a person with high trait Communication Apprehension to view herself/himself less interpersonally dominant in regards to communication behaviors.

#### Hypothesis 1

Pearson correlations for the relationship of the Eysenck Personality Index and the two measures of Interpersonal Dominance and the dimensions of Dominance and Competence were calculated. The findings are consistent, and lend credence to the notion of a genetic component at play in any understanding of interpersonal dominance. The strongest relationship to be observed involved the large positive correlation between Eysenck's conceptualization of extraversion and the two measures and two dimensions of Interpersonal Dominance. Small to moderate negative correlations were exhibited between neuroticism and the two measures and two dimensions, and the same relationship was observed between psychoticism and the two measures and two dimensions.

This finding is again consistent and logical, as it would be hard to conceptualize someone who might be extremely introverted, highly neurotic, and highly psychotic as someone who would be Interpersonally Dominant. As scores on Eysenck's personality index have been shown to be genetically based, the results would again lead us to recognize that dominance may be

better characterized as an enduring personality trait, not a mutually created conceptualization that is situationally based.

### Hypothesis 2

The Five-Factor Model of Personality and its relationship with the measures of Interpersonal Dominance also provided results which provide a consistent and clear picture, and the results were compatible to those found with the Eysenck Personality Index. The FFM operationalization of extraversion exhibited moderate to large relationships with both the BIPD and the IPD-26. The dimensions of Dominance and Competence also exhibited similar correlations with this operationalization of Extraversion.

As with the Eysenck Personality Index, small negative correlations were observed in relationship to the operationalization of Neuroticism and the two measures and the two dimensions. The operationalization of Agreeableness provided no statistically significant relationship with either measure or either dimension.

The operationalizations of Openness to Change and Conscientiousness, the more positively worded components of the Five Factor Model which are supposed to subsume the dimension of Psychoticism as offered by the Eysenck Personality Index, behaved as would be expected. Whereas the Eysenck dimension of Psychoticism produced small negative correlations with the two measures and two dimensions, Openness to Change and Conscientiousness both produced small positive correlations with the two measures and the two dimensions, as would be expected.

### Research Question 2

RQ 2 simply probed whether the BIPD could be reworded from an Observer Report into a

Self-Report measure. The very nature of the measure made this a rather easy undertaking, and in large part the only changes necessary to accomplish this was to reword the Burgoon et al. scale (1998) from an orientation that asked about “This person” to “I,” or when grammatically accurate, “me.” Thus, it appears that there has been no substantive change to the scale. However, as was reported earlier in the results, the Alpha reliability of the reworded and shortened measure was reported to be .86, while the original Burgoon et al. (1998) measure was reported to have a reliability of .93. Also, the factor structure of the scale in the present study was substantially different from that in the original study. Thus, it appears that the reworded scale measures dimensions which are different from those in the original study. Additional replications are needed.

#### Research Questions 3 and 4

Regression analysis determined that up to 62% of the variance on the scores of both the 32-item and 26-item measures of Interpersonal Dominance could be predicted and accounted for with five existing trait communication variables. Consistently, scores on measures of Assertiveness and Responsiveness, Shyness, Immediacy, Communication Apprehension, and Verbal Aggression were able to predict small amounts of unique variance and large amounts of colinear variance on scores of the measure of Interpersonal Dominance.

This finding provides sufficient evidence that what may be at play in the larger context of communication behaviors is that there could be a supertrait of Interpersonal Dominance, one in which measurement shows clear and telling results that could not be merely attributed to one existing trait communication measure.

There are two reasons to come to this conclusion. The first is the enormity of the variance

that can be predicted through the unique and colinear variance of the trait communication variables employed in this study. Had the regression analysis been capable of accounting for only a small amount of the variance in the scores on the measures of Interpersonal Dominance, it would be imprudent and irresponsible to claim that Interpersonal Dominance is in large part a supertrait of communication behavior. However, this clearly is not the case.

The second reason to attribute to the measure of Interpersonal Dominance the operationalization of a supertrait is the large amount of colinear variance that accounted for the bulk of the variance in scores on Interpersonal Dominance. Had regression analysis attributed most of the variance to one existing trait communication variable, say of assertiveness, then it would have been possible to reach the conclusion that the 32-item measure of Interpersonal Dominance is merely a redundant construct which offers nothing new to the field. This is clearly not the case, as the largest amount of unique variance that could be accounted for was only 5%, in the case of a self-report of Immediacy Behaviors and the streamlined 26-item measure of Interpersonal Dominance.

### Summary

It appears that the results of this study have shown that the Burgoon Interpersonal Dominance measure may not be measuring interaction, but may be instead a trait measure that measures enduring trait-like qualities that individuals perceive themselves to hold. The results consistently paint a picture that, at least when asked to provide self-report data, individuals believe themselves to exhibit a level of interpersonal dominance just as they view themselves to exhibit certain trait levels of assertiveness and trait levels of responsiveness. The failure, then, of the Burgoon et al. measure may be that it does not measure what its creators claim it measures.

In short it may be a good trait measure, but not a situational or state measure.

Every analysis run throughout the course of this study lends credence to the notion that what is being tapped by the Burgoon et al. measure is some notion of trait like behavior.

Although Burgoon et al. (1998) “propose that interpersonal dominance be viewed as a relational, behavioral, and interactional state,” there is nothing in the construction of the measure that could be considered to measure a relational, behavioral, or interactional state (p. 315). Indeed, the large correlations between Burgoon Interpersonal Dominance Construct and the trait communication variables employed in this study and also the two temperament measures (the Eysenck Personality Inventory and the Five-Factor Model) would suggest that there is an inherent trait-like quality to the measure offered by Burgoon et al. Indeed, the personality measures might suggest a genetic link to the trait like qualities that Burgoon et al. are in fact measuring with their Interpersonal Dominance Instrument.

In closing, although it appears that the Burgoon et al. measure does not in fact measure what it is supposed to measure, it is difficult to assess whether or not the measure has any other utility from the data collected in this study. Future research is necessary to assess observer reports using the Burgoon et al. measure, and additional research should be conducted to examine the relationship between the Burgoon et al. measure and already existing measures of trait dominance.



## References

- Beatty, M. J., & McCroskey, J.C. (1997). It's in our nature: Verbal aggressiveness as temperamental expression. Communication Quarterly, *45*, 446-460.
- Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J.C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. Communication Monographs, *65*, 197-219.
- Burgoon, J. K., Johnson, M. L., & Koch, P. T. (1998). The nature and measurement of interpersonal dominance. Communication Monographs, *65*, 308-335.
- Daly, J. A. (1987). Personality and interpersonal communication: Issues and directions. In McCroskey, J.C., & Daly, J. A. (Eds.), Personality and interpersonal communication (pp. 13-31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Epstein, S. (1979). The stability of behavior: I. On predicting most of the people much of the time. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *27*, 1097-1126.
- Digman, J.M. (1996). The curious history of the five-factor model. In Wiggins, J.S. (Ed.), The five-factor model of personality (pp. 1-20). New York: Guilford Press.
- Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, M.W. (1985). Personality and Individual Differences: A Natural Science Approach. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. Personality and Individual differences, *6*, 21-29.
- Funder, D.C., & Ozer, D.J. (1983). Behavior as a function of the situation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *44*, 107-112.
- Guilford, J.P. (1959). Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Infante, D. A., & Wigley, C. J., III, (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. Communication Monographs, 53, 61-69.

McCrae, R.R., & Costa, Paul T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical Contexts for the five-factor model. In Wiggins, J.S. (Ed.), The five-factor model of personality (pp. 1-20). New York: Guilford Press.

McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. Journal of Personality, 60, 175-215.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Classroom consequences of communication apprehension. Communication Education, 26, 27-33.

McCroskey, J.C., & Beatty, M. J. (1998). Communication apprehension. In McCroskey, J.C., Daly, J. A., Martin, M.M., and Beatty, M.J. (Eds.), Communication and personality (pp. 215-232). Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.

McCroskey, J.C., Beatty, M. J., Kearney, P. & Plax, T. G. (1985). The content validity of the PRCA-24 as a measure of communication apprehension across communication contexts. Communication Quarterly, 33, 165-173.

Mischel, W. (1968). Personality & Assessment. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Norton, R. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Snyder, M., & Ickes, W. (1985). Personality and social behavior. In Lindzey, G., & Aronson, E., (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (pp. 883-947). New York, New York: Random House.

## Appendix A

The 32 item Interpersonal Dominance Measure as an Observer Report and as a Self-Report

## Observer Report:

1. This person usually takes charge of conversations.
2. People usually turn to this person when decisions have to be made.
3. This person rarely influences others.
4. This person is often responsible for keeping the conversation going when we talk.
5. This person usually does more talking than listening.
6. This person has very little skill in managing conversations.
7. This person never finds out what others think before taking a stand on an issue.
8. This person often stops to think about what to say in conversations.
9. It seems as if this person finds it hard to keep his/her mind on the conversation.
10. I am often influenced by this person.
11. This person often insists on discussing something even when others don't want to.
12. This person often makes his/her presence felt.
13. This person often wins any arguments that occur in our conversations.
14. This person is completely self-confident when interacting with others.
15. This person often acts nervous in conversations.
16. This person is often concerned with other's impressions of him/her.
17. This person has a natural talent for winning over others.
18. This person seems to have trouble concentrating on the topic of conversation.
19. This person is very expressive during conversations.
20. This person is often the center of attention.
21. This person has a dramatic way of interacting.
22. This person is usually relaxed and at ease in conversations.
23. This person often avoids saying things in conversations because he/she might regret it later.
24. This person is more of a follower than a leader.
25. This person often has trouble thinking of things to talk about.
26. This person has a way of interacting that draws others to him/her.
27. This person remains task oriented during conversations.
28. This person shows a lot of poise during interactions.
29. This person is not smooth verbally.
30. This person often acts impatient during conversations.
31. This person is usually successful in persuading others to act.
32. This person has a memorable way of interacting.

## Appendix A, continued.

## Self-Report:

1. I usually take charge of conversations.
2. People often turn to me when decisions have to be made.
3. I rarely influence others.
4. I am often responsible for keeping the conversation going when we talk.
5. I usually do more talking than listening.
6. I have very little skill in managing conversations.
7. I never find out what others think before taking a stand on an issue.
8. I often stop to think about what to say in conversations.
9. I sometimes find it hard to keep my mind on the conversation.
10. I believe I am influential to others.
11. I often insist on discussing something even when others don't want to.
12. I often make my presence felt.
13. I often win any arguments that occur in our conversations.
14. I am completely self-confident when interacting with others.
15. I often feel nervous in conversations.
16. I am often concerned with other's impressions of me.
17. I have a natural talent for winning over others.
18. I seem to have trouble concentrating on the topic of conversation.
19. I am very expressive during conversation.
20. I am often the center of attention.
21. I have a dramatic way of interacting.
22. I am usually relaxed and at ease in conversations.
23. I often avoid saying things in conversation because I may regret it later.
24. I am more of a follower than a leader.
25. I often have trouble thinking of things to talk about.
26. I have a way of interacting that draws others to me.
27. I think I remain task oriented during interactions.
28. I think I show a lot of poise during interactions.
29. I am not very smooth verbally.
30. I often act impatient during conversations.
31. I am usually successful in persuading others to act.
32. I think I have a memorable way of interacting.

## Appendix B

## Complete Survey

Please indicate the extent to which the following questions apply to you, using a 5 point scale, where:

- 5 = strongly agree  
 4 = agree  
 3 = undecided  
 2 = disagree  
 1 = strongly disagree.

- \_\_\_ 1. I prefer to go my own way rather than act by the rules.  
 \_\_\_ 2. I dislike participating in group discussions.  
 \_\_\_ 3. I am helpful.  
 \_\_\_ 4. I am a shy person.  
 \_\_\_ 5. I would call myself 'happy-go-lucky.'  
 \_\_\_ 6. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.  
 \_\_\_ 7. I defend my own beliefs.  
 \_\_\_ 8. Other people think I talk a lot.  
 \_\_\_ 9. I nearly always have a 'ready answer' when people talk to me.  
 \_\_\_ 10. I am tense and nervous when participating in group discussions.  
 \_\_\_ 11. I am independent.  
 \_\_\_ 12. I am a very talkative person.  
 \_\_\_ 13. My mood often goes up and down.  
 \_\_\_ 14. I like to get involved in group discussions.  
 \_\_\_ 15. I am responsive to others.  
 \_\_\_ 16. Other people think I am shy.  
 \_\_\_ 17. I enjoy meeting new people.  
 \_\_\_ 18. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.  
 \_\_\_ 19. I am forceful.  
 \_\_\_ 20. I talk a lot.  
 \_\_\_ 21. I am easily hurt when people find fault with me or my work.  
 \_\_\_ 22. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.  
 \_\_\_ 23. I have a strong personality.  
 \_\_\_ 24. I tend to be very quiet in class.  
 \_\_\_ 25. I enjoy cooperating with others.  
 \_\_\_ 26. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.  
 \_\_\_ 27. I am sympathetic.  
 \_\_\_ 28. I don't talk much.  
 \_\_\_ 29. I often feel 'fed up.'  
 \_\_\_ 30. Usually, I am calm and relaxed while participating in a meeting.

## Appendix B, continued.

- \_\_\_ 31. I am compassionate.
- \_\_\_ 32. I talk more than most people.
- \_\_\_ 33. I take much notice of what other people think.
- \_\_\_ 34. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
- \_\_\_ 35. I am assertive.
- \_\_\_ 36. I am a quiet person
- \_\_\_ 37. I am mostly quiet when I am with other people.
- \_\_\_ 38. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
- \_\_\_ 39. I am sensitive to the needs of others.
- \_\_\_ 40. I talk more in a small group (3-6 people) than others do.
- \_\_\_ 41. Do you often feel that life is very dull?
- \_\_\_ 42. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
- \_\_\_ 43. I am dominant.
- \_\_\_ 44. Most people talk more than I do.
- \_\_\_ 45. I am rather lively.
- \_\_\_ 46. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
- \_\_\_ 47. I am sincere.
- \_\_\_ 48. Other people think I am very quiet.
- \_\_\_ 49. I would take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects.
- \_\_\_ 50. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
- \_\_\_ 51. I am gentle.
- \_\_\_ 52. I talk more in class than most people do.
- \_\_\_ 53. I like mixing with people.
- \_\_\_ 54. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
- \_\_\_ 55. I am willing to take a stand.
- \_\_\_ 56. Most people are more shy than I am.
- \_\_\_ 57. I would call myself tense or 'high strung.'
- \_\_\_ 58. Ordinarily, I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
- \_\_\_ 59. I am warm.
- \_\_\_ 60. I do not worry if I know there are mistakes in my work.
- \_\_\_ 61. Ordinarily, I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
- \_\_\_ 62. I am tender.
- \_\_\_ 63. I think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with.
- \_\_\_ 64. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
- \_\_\_ 65. I am friendly.
- \_\_\_ 66. I like going out frequently.
- \_\_\_ 67. I am afraid to speak up in conversations.
- \_\_\_ 68. I act as a leader.
- \_\_\_ 69. I often feel lonely.
- \_\_\_ 70. I have no fear of giving a speech.
- \_\_\_ 71. I am aggressive.

## Appendix B, continued.

72. I try not to be rude to people.  
 73. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.  
 74. I am competitive.  
 75. I often make decisions on the spur of the moment.  
 76. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.  
 77. I am an irritable person.  
 78. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when giving a speech.  
 79. Good manners and cleanliness matter much to me.  
 80. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.  
 81. I am often troubled by feelings of guilt  
 82. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.  
 83. I can easily adapt to new and unusual situations.  
 84. It is better to follow society's rules rather than to go your own way.  
 85. I would like other people to be afraid of me.  
 86. I would call myself a nervous person.  
 87. Being in debt would worry me.  
 88. I like plenty of bustle and excitement around me.  
 89. I think people spend too much time safeguarding their future savings and insurance.  
 90. I sometimes feel 'just miserable' for no reason.
- 

Please answer the following questions as they pertain to you. For these questions

- 1 = almost never true  
 2 = rarely true  
 3 = occasionally true  
 4 = often true  
 5 = almost always true.
- 

91. I am extremely careful to avoid attacking individual's intelligence when I attack their ideas.  
 92. I use my hands and arms to gesture while talking to people.  
 93. When individuals are very stubborn, I use insults to soften the stubbornness.  
 94. I use a monotone or dull voice while talking to people.  
 95. I try very hard to avoid having other people feel bad about themselves as I try to influence them.  
 96. I look at people while talking to them.  
 97. When people refuse to do a task I know is important, without good reason, I tell them they are unreasonable.  
 98. I frown while talking to people.  
 99. When others do things I regard as stupid, I try to be extremely gentle with them.  
 100. I have a very tense body position while talking to people.



## Appendix B, continued.

- \_\_\_ 101. If individuals I am trying to influence really deserve it, I attack their character.
- \_\_\_ 102. I move away from people while talking to them.
- \_\_\_ 103. When people behave in ways that are in very poor taste, I insult them in order to shock them into proper behavior.
- \_\_\_ 104. I use a variety of vocal expressions while talking to people.
- \_\_\_ 105. I try to make people feel good about themselves even when their ideas are stupid.
- \_\_\_ 106. I touch people on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.
- \_\_\_ 107. When people simply will not budge on a matter of importance I lose my temper and say rather strong things to them.
- \_\_\_ 108. I smile while talking to people.
- \_\_\_ 109. When people criticize my shortcomings, I take it in good humor and try not to get back at them.
- \_\_\_ 110. I look away from people while talking to them.
- \_\_\_ 111. When individuals insult me, I get a lot of pleasure out of really telling them off.
- \_\_\_ 112. I have a relaxed body position while talking to people.
- \_\_\_ 113. When I dislike individuals greatly, I try not to show it in what I say or how I say it.
- \_\_\_ 114. I am 'stiff' while talking to people.
- \_\_\_ 115. I like poking fun at people who do things which are very stupid to stimulate their intelligence.
- \_\_\_ 116. I avoid touching people while talking to them.
- \_\_\_ 117. When I attack a persons ideas, I try not to damage their self-concepts.
- \_\_\_ 118. I move closer to people while talking to them.
- \_\_\_ 119. When I try to influence people, I make a great effort to not offend them.
- \_\_\_ 120. I am animated while talking to people.
- \_\_\_ 121. When people do things which are mean or cruel, I attack their character in order to help correct their behavior.
- \_\_\_ 122. I refuse to participate in arguments when they involve personal attacks.
- \_\_\_ 123. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence others, I yell and scream in order to get some movement from them.
- \_\_\_ 124. When I am not able to refute other's positions, I try to make them feel defensive in order to weaken their positions.
- \_\_\_ 125. When an argument shifts to personal attacks, I try very hard to change the subject.

## Appendix B, continued.

In the following section, a series of opposite adjectives (hot-cold, wet-dry) are presented. On a scale of 1-7, with 4 being neutral, please indicate how you would describe yourself in terms of these adjectives. Please circle only one response per item.

126. Calm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worrying
127. At Ease	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Nervous
128. Neurotic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Normal
129. Relaxed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	High-Strung
130. Secure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Insecure
131. Self-Satisfied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Self-Pitying
132. Not Envious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Envious/Jealous
133. Comfortable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Self-Conscious
134. Hardy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Vulnerable
135. Introverted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extroverted
136. Retiring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sociable
137. Sober	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fun-Loving
138. Reserved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Affectionate
139. Outgoing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Withdrawn
140. Loner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Joiner
141. Open to new Ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Closed to new Ideas
142. Conventional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Original
143. Down to earth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Imaginative
144. Uncreative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Creative
145. Narrow Interests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Broad Interests
146. Simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Complex
147. Unadventurous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Daring
148. Conforming	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Independent
149. Antagonistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Antagonistic
150. Agreeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Disagreeable
151. Ruthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Soft-hearted
152. Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Selfless
153. Callous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sympathetic
154. Suspicious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trusting
155. Critical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Lenient
156. Vengeful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Forgiving
157. Stubborn	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Flexible
158. Conscientious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not conscientious
159. Careless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Careful

## Appendix B, continued

160. Undependable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dependable
161. Reliable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unreliable
162. Lazy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Hardworking
163. Disorganized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Well-Organized
164. Weak-Willed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Self-Disciplined
165. Late	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	On Time
166. Quitting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Persevering

---

Answer the following questions as they relate to you. For these questions:

- 1 = strongly disagree
  - 2 = disagree
  - 3 = somewhat disagree
  - 4 = neutral
  - 5 = somewhat agree
  - 6 = agree
  - 7 = strongly agree.
- 

- \_\_\_ 167. I usually take charge of conversations.
- \_\_\_ 168. People often turn to me when decisions have to be made.
- \_\_\_ 169. I rarely influence others.
- \_\_\_ 170. I am often responsible for keeping the conversation going when we talk.
- \_\_\_ 171. I usually do more talking than listening.
- \_\_\_ 172. I have very little skill in managing conversations.
- \_\_\_ 173. I never find out what others think before taking a stand on an issue.
- \_\_\_ 174. I often stop to think about what to say in conversations.
- \_\_\_ 175. I sometimes find it hard to keep my mind on the conversation.
- \_\_\_ 176. I believe I am influential to others.
- \_\_\_ 177. I often insist on discussing something even when others don't want to.
- \_\_\_ 178.. I often make my presence felt.
- \_\_\_ 179. I often win any arguments that occur in our conversations.
- \_\_\_ 180. I am completely self-confident when interacting with others.
- \_\_\_ 181. I often feel nervous in conversations.
- \_\_\_ 182. I am often concerned with other's impressions of me.
- \_\_\_ 183. I have a natural talent for winning over others.
- \_\_\_ 184. I seem to have trouble concentrating on the topic of conversation.
- \_\_\_ 185. I am very expressive during conversation.
- \_\_\_ 186. I am often the center of attention.
- \_\_\_ 187. I have a dramatic way of interacting.
- \_\_\_ 188. I am usually relaxed and at ease in conversations.

## Appendix B, continued

- \_\_\_ 189. I often avoid saying things in conversation because I may regret it later.
- \_\_\_ 190. I am more of a follower than a leader.
- \_\_\_ 191. I often have trouble thinking of things to talk about.
- \_\_\_ 192. I have a way of interacting that draws others to me.
- \_\_\_ 193. I think I remain task oriented during interactions.
- \_\_\_ 194. I think I show a lot of poise during interactions.
- \_\_\_ 195. I am not very smooth verbally.
- \_\_\_ 196. I often act impatient during conversations.
- \_\_\_ 197. I am usually successful in persuading others to act.
- \_\_\_ 198. I think I have a memorable way of interacting.

199. I am: (1)\_\_\_Male (2)\_\_\_Female

## Appendix C

## Achieved Cronbach's Alpha for Measures Employed

---

Measure	Number of Items	Alpha Reliability
Shyness Scale	14	.91
PRCA-24	24	.94
Assertiveness	10	.81
Responsiveness	10	.86
Verbal Aggressiveness	20	.83
Immediacy	15	.83
Interpersonal Dominance	32	.86
EPI-Extraversion	10	.78
EPI-Neuroticism	10	.77
EPI-Psychoticism	12	.70
FFM-Extraversion	6	.84
FFM-Neuroticism	9	.86
FFM-Conscientiousness*	8	.82
FFM-Agreeableness	9	.86
FFM-Openness to Experience	8	.69

---

\*One item was removed because of low reliability.

## Appendix D

## Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviation for Variables Measured

---

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Shyness Scale	201	39.47	10.58
PRCA-24	201	63.29	16.09
Assertiveness	202	34.60	6.23
Responsiveness	202	39.00	6.20
Verbal Aggressiveness	197	52.46	10.90
Immediacy	200	54.97	8.67
Interpersonal Dominance	200	140.41	20.75
EPI-Extraversion	202	35.73	5.92
EPI-Neuroticism	201	26.80	6.57
EPI-Psychoticism	201	27.98	6.18
FFM-Extraversion	187	30.94	6.43
FFM-Neuroticism	194	28.83	9.10
FFM-Conscientiousness*	195	43.20	7.38
FFM-Agreeableness	188	38.94	8.15
FFM-Openness to Experience	191	39.10	6.25

---

\* One item was removed due to low reliability.

## Appendix E

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR THE FOUR FACTOR SOLUTION ON THE MOST  
AND LEAST DOMINANT CONDITIONS

Item	Factor 1: Influence & Poise	Factor 2: Conversational Control & Panache	Factor 3: Task Focus	Factor 4: Self-Assurance
17	.794			
26	.790			
2	.734			
31	.750			
10	.690			
13	.676	.345		
14	.629			-.441
20	.625	.541		
19	.602	.476		
24	-.546	.327	.356	.381
28	.539		-.462	
6	-.538		.394	
27	.529			
32	.522			
22	.503			
5		.820		
1		.700		
11		.662		
21	.520	.620		
4	.401	.601		
12	.569	.594		
8		-.586		
9			.742	
18			.703	
29	.441		.550	
30		.444	.496	
25		-.313	.491	
16				.764
23		-.369		.623
15	-.448			.481
Eigenvalue	11.5	3.4	1.5	1.4
Pct of Variance	35.9	10.6	4.8	4.5
Cum Percent	35.9	46.5	51.3	55.9

*Note: Items 3, 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, 29-30 have been reverse scored, i.e., 7=1, 6=2, 5=3, 2=5, 2=6, and 1=7. Higher scores on all dimensions should be associated with greater dominance.*

## Appendix F

CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS LOADINGS AND CORRELATIONS AMONG  
FACTORS FOR LEAST AND MOST DOMINANT TARGET

Item	Factor 1: Influence	Factor 2: Conversational Control	Factor 3: Focus & Poise	Factor 4: Panache	Factor 5: Self-Assurance
2	.81	.37	.57	.58	.52
3	.65	.29	.38	.43	.34
6	.64	.18	.48	.47	.36
10	.75	.27	.50	.51	.45
13	.74	.51	.40	.64	.55
17	.73	.32	.41	.62	.41
24	.76	.46	.58	.60	.64
31	.78	.44	.38	.66	.39
1	.64	.83	.36	.72	.49
4	.51	.75	.35	.62	.34
5	.31	.82	.02	.53	.24
8	.14	.63	.10	.29	.21
11	.19	.65	-.03	.30	.17
9	.33	.14	.66	.29	.33
18	.31	.12	.57	.19	.21
22	.36	.02	.56	.29	.30
25	.40	.37	.60	.39	.38
27	.47	.19	.57	.38	.36
28	.55	.30	.75	.49	.39
29	.52	.12	.74	.40	.42
30	.23	-.17	.57	.03	.18
12	.63	.65	.37	.82	.48
19	.62	.57	.47	.81	.43
20	.66	.62	.34	.85	.48
21	.54	.63	.28	.83	.44
26	.69	.39	.48	.73	.39
32	.51	.33	.43	.73	.36
15	.58	.34	.58	.53	.80
16	.27	.02	.17	.12	.69
23	.37	.36	.29	.37	.71
14	.64	.45	.49	.59	.79
Factor 1	1.00	.48	.63	.77	.62
Factor 2		1.00	.22	.67	.40
Factor 3			1.00	.49	.51
Factor 4				1.00	.54
Avg. correlation of items within cluster	.47	.43	.31	.55	.41

Note: Items 3,6,8,9,15,16,18, 23-25, and 29-30 have been reverse-scored, i.e., 7=1,6=2,5=3,3=5,2=6, and 1 = 7.



## Appendix G

## Two Dimension Factor Structure

Item	Factor 1- Dominance	Factor 2- Competence
1	.57	.43
2	.52	.36
3	.24	.41
4	.50	.20
5	.42	.02
6	.31	.60
7 (Discarded)	-.11	-.40
8 (Discarded)	-.12	.02
9	.06	.49
10	.60	.24
11	.47	-.10
12	.68	.13
13	.61	.12
14	.55	.46
15	.23	.57
16 (Discarded)	-.09	.00
17	.41	.22
18	.15	.44
19	.53	.41
20	.57	.20
21	.67	.13
22	.57	.42
23 (Discarded)	.06	.28
24	.21	.58
25	.21	.61
26	.69	.39
27 (Discarded)	.41	.34
28	.58	.44
29	.20	.55
30 (Discarded)	-.19	.39
31	.59	.23
32	.63	.45

Note- Items were considered to have loaded cleanly on one dimension if a loading of .40 was achieved and the other item did not exhibit a similar loading. If an item was loaded at over .50 on one dimension and .40 on a second dimension, the item was determined to be on the dimension with which it loaded at .50. Item #7 was discarded as per Burgoon et al. (1998).

## Appendix H

PEARSON CORRELATIONS, TRAIT COMMUNICATION VARIABLES  
AND THE MEASURES OF INTERPERSONAL DOMINANCE

Measure	Assertiveness	Responsiveness	Shyness	Immediacy	PRCA-24	Verbal Aggress.
IPD (32-item)	.60	.30	-.61	.56	-.65	-.04
P<	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.61
N	200	200	199	198	199	195
Dominance	.57	.28	-.59	.49	-.56	-.02
P<	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.81
N	200	200	199	198	199	195
Competence	.36	.30	-.37	.51	-.51	-.20
P<	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.006
N	202	202	201	200	201	197
IPD (26 item)	.59	.33	-.61	.58	-.63	-.06
P<	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.0001	.38
N	200	200	199	198	199	195

## Appendix I

PEARSON CORRELATIONS, EYSENCK'S PERSONALITY INVENTORY  
AND THE MEASURES OF INTERPERSONAL DOMINANCE

Measure	Extraversion	Neuroticism	Psychoticism
IPD (32-item)	.63	-.31	-.21
P<	.0001	.0001	.003
N	200	199	199
Dominance	.59	-.23	-.17
P<	.0001	.001	.02
N	200	199	199
Competence	.46	-.24	-.30
P<	.0001	.0005	.0001
N	202	201	201
IPD (26 item)	.64	-.27	-.25
P<	.0001	.0001	.0004
N	200	199	199

## Appendix J

PEARSON CORRELATIONS, FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY  
AND THE MEASURES OF INTERPERSONAL DOMINANCE

Measure	Extraversion	Neuroticism	Agreeableness	Openness	Conscientiousness
IPD (32-item)	.45	-.25	-.02	.33	.32
P<	.0001	.0004	.77	.0001	.0001
N	185	192	186	189	193
Dominance	.43	-.19	-.03	.31	.27
P<	.0001	.007	.65	.0001	.0001
N	185	192	186	189	193
Competence	.35	-.19	.07	.27	.32
P<	.0001	.007	.34	.0002	.0001
N	187	194	188	191	195
IPD (26 item)	.48	-.22	.002	.35	.33
P<	.0001	.002	.98	.0001	.00001
N	185	192	186	189	193

## Appendix K

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR THE 32-ITEM MEASURE, THE 26-ITEM MEASURE, THE DIMENSION OF DOMINANCE, THE DIMENSION OF COMPETENCE, AND OTHER COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

Model	DF	F Value	Prob.	R <sup>2</sup>
IPD (32)	(6,192)	50.99	p < .0001	.62
IPD (26)	(6,186)	50.29	p < .0001	.62
Dominance	(6,186)	35.59	p < .0001	.53
Competence	(6,188)	17.97	p < .0001	.36

## Appendix L

BETA WEIGHTS, UNIQUE AND COLINEAR VARIANCE FOR BIPD (BURGOON  
INTERPERSONAL DOMINANCE MEASURE) AND  
OTHER COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

Model	Comm. Var.	Beta Weight	Unique Variance
BIPD	Assertiveness	.82	.03
BIPD	Responsiveness	.28	.00
BIPD	Shyness	-.40	.02
BIPD	PRCA-24	-.32	.03
BIPD	Immediacy	.72	.04
BIPD	Verbal Agg.	.23	.01
Total Unique Variance			.13
Total Colinear Variance			.49
Total Variance			.62

## Appendix M

BETA WEIGHTS, UNIQUE AND COLINEAR VARIANCE FOR THE  
26-ITEM MEASURE OF INTERPERSONAL DOMINANCE (IPD-26)  
AND OTHER COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

Model	Comm. Var.	Beta Weight	Unique Variance
IPD-26	Assertiveness	.82	.04
IPD-26	Responsiveness	.39	.01
IPD-26	Shyness	-.40	.03
IPD-26	PRCA-24	-.25	.02
IPD-26	Immediacy	.72	.05
IPD-26	Verbal Agg.	.21	.01
Total Unique Variance			.16
Total Colinear Variance			.46
Total Variance			.62

## Appendix N

BETA WEIGHTS, UNIQUE AND COLINEAR VARIANCE FOR THE DIMENSION OF  
DOMINANCE AND OTHER COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

Model	Comm. Var.	Beta Weight	Unique Variance
Dominance	Assertiveness	.71	.04
Dominance	Responsiveness	.34	.03
Dominance	Shyness	-.38	.04
Dominance	PRCA-24	-.12	.01
Dominance	Immediacy	.45	.03
Dominance	Verbal Agg.	.23	.01
Total Unique Variance			.16
Total Colinear Variance			.37
Total Variance			.53



## Appendix O

BETA WEIGHTS, UNIQUE AND COLINEAR VARIANCE FOR THE DIMENSION OF  
COMPETENCE AND OTHER COMMUNICATION VARIABLES

<u>Model</u>	<u>Comm. Var.</u>	<u>Beta Weight</u>	<u>Unique Variance</u>
Competence	Assertiveness	.12	.01
Competence	Responsiveness	.05	.00
Competence	Shyness	-.02	.00
Competence	PRCA-24	-.13	.04
Competence	Immediacy	.27	.05
Competence	Verbal Agg.	-.03	.00
Total Unique Variance			.10
Total Colinear Variance			.26
Total Variance			.36