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This study focused upon four response styles and four variables viewed as being inherent, thus crucial to reciprocal relational development between dyadic partners. Specifically, the effects of one confirming and three disconfirming (interrupting, impervious, and tangential) response styles on subject's perceptions of confederate's behaviors were tested. Dependent measures were interpersonal attraction, self-disclosure, and empathy, as well as a three-item measure concerning subject's desires for future exchange with confederates.

Three hypotheses were presented:

\( H_1 \): Subject's perceptions of confederate's willingness to self-disclose will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

\( H_2 \): Subject's perceptions of confederate's empathic awareness will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

\( H_3 \): Subject's feelings of interpersonal attraction toward confederates will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

It was also posited that subjects would rate confederates in the confirming conditions more favorably on the dependent measures, as compared to confederates eliciting either of the three disconfirming responses.

Results indicate that of the three disconfirming response styles, only the impervious condition had noticeable disconfirming effects. The confirming condition, on the other hand, had almost opposite effects: Subjects rated confirming confederates more favorably on all dependent measures except interpersonal attraction.

Numerous problems are discussed relative to the training of confederates to elicit response styles (and subsequent manipulation checks), as well as the training of judges to analyze taped subject-confederate interactions. Plausible interpretations of the results and implications for further research in this area of study are provided.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

It is the purpose of this study to test the perceived effects of confirming and disconfirming response styles on the communication constructs of self-disclosure, empathy, and interpersonal attraction. These four variables are viewed as being of crucial significance in determining the rate and degree of reciprocal relational development between dyadic partners.

Empirical evidence supporting the reciprocity phenomenon has been reasonably well demonstrated (Jourard, 1959; Jourard and Landsman, 1959; Worthy et al., 1969; Ehrlich and Graeven, 1971; Cozby, 1972; Derlega et al., 1973). However, as noted by Irwin Altman, (1972):

For the most part, conceptualizations have been vague, point to the phenomenon as fairly universal, say little about factors which may accelerate or slow down its occurrence, and grossly identify potential underlying mechanisms. (Altman, 1972, p.251)

It can be assumed that how an individual responds to another predisposes the other to draw inferences about his behavior. Such a process involves the mutual assignation of meanings, which, according to the transactional nature of communication (Wenburg and Wilmot, 1973; Stewart, 1973; Wilmot, 1975), affects not only our assessments
of others, but our subsequent behaviors as well. Positive and negative responses during interaction have numerous consequences—especially those that affect reciprocal relational development.

Little research has been conducted which attempts to identify those 'underlying mechanisms' mentioned by Altman (1972). As will be shown, confirming-disconfirming behaviors have been theorized to affect the behaviors of schizophrenics. But the extent to which this occurs in normal, "healthy" relationships, regardless of the degree of intimacy involved, has for the most part been ignored. Furthermore, the effects of confirming and disconfirming behaviors on reciprocal relational development has not been explored. The communication variables of self-disclosure, empathy, and interpersonal attraction have been studied, but these attempts also seem to lack the integration necessary to more accurately depict transactional communication behavior as the core of relational development.

It was the intent of this study to facilitate a better understanding of those factors which accelerate or retard reciprocal dyadic exchange. By integrating and directly measuring the perceived effects of actual communication behavior on significant communication variables, it is hoped that future research can more accurately reflect the dynamics of relational growth in a dyadic context.
Hypotheses

The hypotheses concerning the effects of the four response styles are:

\( H_1 \): Subject's perceptions of confederate's willingness to self-disclose will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

\( H_2 \): Subject's perceptions of confederate's empathic awareness will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

\( H_3 \): Subject's feelings of attraction toward confederates will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

Combined, the above hypotheses posit that subjects will rate the confederates in the confirming response conditions more favorably on self-disclosure, empathy, and interpersonal attraction scales as compared to confederates eliciting either of the three disconfirming responses.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions of Variables

Reciprocity.—The process whereby an individual reveals information of himself in proportion and in relation to another's revealing behaviors. Viewed as a conceptual base in providing a theoretical rationale for study, this phenomenon will not be measured per se. However, as noted previously, the following variables represent underlying factors which affect such relational processes.

Confirmation.—Any behavior emitted by an individual which causes another to value himself more (Sieburg and Larson, 1971). More specifically, confederates in the confirming condition will convey
positive feelings about what the subjects say or do during interaction.

Disconfirmation.— Any behavior emitted by an individual which causes another to value himself less (Sieburg and Larson, 1971). The two confederates in each of the three disconfirming conditions will elicit one of the following responses:

- **Tangential:** Confederates will acknowledge subject's response, but quickly shift the direction and content of the conversation.
- **Impervious:** Confederates will offer no verbal and minimal non-verbal recognition of subject's response.
- **Interrupting:** Confederates will not allow subjects to finish any comments being made.

Self-Disclosure.— Deliberate or intentional communication which allows another to learn of something about one's self (Pearce and Sharp, 1973; Pearce et al., 1974). Confederate's willingness to disclose information will be measured by post-test scales concerning subject's perceptions of confederate's behaviors.

Empathy.— A sensitivity to the needs and values of others (Gief and Hogan, 1972). Confederate's empathic awareness will be measured by post-test scales concerning subject's perceptions of confederate's behaviors.

Interpersonal Attraction.— Experiencing positive feelings toward another person for reasons of social, task, or physical characteristics. The degree to which subjects are attracted toward
confederates will be measured by post-test scales concerning subject's perceptions of confederate's behaviors.

The diversity of implications to be drawn from the reciprocal nature of human behaviors and relationships is evident in the following literature review. When empirically measuring the effects of response styles upon communication variables, considering that this specific orientation is not evident in past research, an inclusive conceptual framework becomes a necessity.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Behavioral Reciprocity

The reciprocal aspects of man's behavior are relatively new to the study of human development. When considering that these phenomenon did not gain strong recognition until the late nineteen fifties and the early nineteen sixties, it can be seen that development has been quite rapid. In 1959, Howard Becker published a book entitled *Man in Reciprocity*, representing a series of lectures given on culture, society, and personality at the University of Wisconsin. Although reciprocal human interaction was focused upon in these lectures, the true interpersonal orientation of man's reciprocal behaviors did not begin until several years later.

Also in 1959, Sidney Jourard performed a study which became a foundation for further research to build upon in the years to come. Focus was directed toward two major inquiries: 1) the relationship between a person's cathexis for the other and amount of personal information that he knows (from past disclosures) about the other person; and 2) the extent to which disclosures to others involve reciprocal relations between people. As hypothesized, it was found that individuals disclosed most to those colleagues who most confided in them. This further implied that the level of intimacy experienced by partners in a relationship was determined by the
degree of reciprocal exchange occurring. Jourard termed this the 'dyadic-effect' one year later (1960) in a similar study performed with M. J. Landsman, and confirmed two further hypotheses: 1) Disclosure becomes a reciprocal type of behavior which proceeded to a level of intimacy agreeable to both parties and then stopped; and 2) people disclose more to those they know than to those they like. In addition, Jourard and Landsman asked the following question: "If a man (A) likes another (B), does it necessarily follow that the other person will then confide in him?", and found that only two of nine dyads confirmed this issue...not a strong determiner of B's disclosures to A.

An interesting, almost basic aspect associated with these two studies was that if people wish to become known and understood, and engage in intimate or even less-intimate relations with others, they must disclose of themselves. This assumes circular reciprocity in terms of meaningful feedback, both given and received.

As Jourard suggested that disclosure-begets-disclosure, he also noted that impersonableness induces a similar response from another. As both imply an exchange process which is reciprocally revealing, it is seen that the former, being more oriented toward personalizing interaction, would become normative or obligatory in nature. Gouldner (1960) utilized this distinction in specifying two minimal demands which define the 'norm of reciprocity' in its universal form: 1) People should help those who have helped them; and 2) People should not injure those who have helped them. In discussing the perceptions of the individuals involved in reciprocal exchange, he states:
Obligations of repayment are contingent upon the imputed value of the benefit received. The value of the benefit and hence the debt is in proportion to and varies with—among other things—the intensity of the recipient's need at the time the benefit was bestowed ("a friend in need"), the resources of the donor ("he gave although he could ill afford it"), the imputed motives of the donor ("he gave without thought of gain"), and the nature of the constraints which are perceived to exist or be absent ("he gave of his own free will").

Perceptions of intent seem obvious in Gouldner's discussions. As a process, a theory of attribution deems recognition concerning daily reciprocal interactions.

**Attribution Theory and Reciprocal Exchange**

The role of attribution theory in Gouldner's discussion of 'imputed' values of benefits received is clearly seen. Briefly, attribution theory proposes that individuals initially assign meanings not to another's behaviors, but to the intentions which you believe led him to committing a certain act. We then attribute to the other certain dispositional properties, mainly as a result of the inferences drawn relative to our perceptions of his intentions for behaving in a certain manner (Jones and Davis, 1965).

The value of reciprocating a favor, then, or being responded to in a way which makes one feel like reciprocating in return is entirely dependent upon the subjective meanings attributed by the individuals involved.

In terms of initial relational development, intimacy is attained due to the constant reciprocal confirmations occurring over time. The more reciprocal or mutual a relationship may be, the less distorted one's attributions toward another become. As partners in a relationship learn to know of each other, and...
become more accustomed to the relationship itself, opportunities to define those subjective feelings which create doubts occur more frequently...via reciprocal interaction.

Several studies have been conducted which further clarify the relationship between reciprocal exchange and attribution theory. Schopler and Thompson (1960) conducted an experiment to determine whether manipulating the interpersonal context of a standard interaction, in a manner which assumed to effect attributions, would reduce or enhance reciprocation. Results showed that merely being a recipient of a favor is not sufficient for arousing the reciprocity norm. Such findings are similar in scope to those mentioned earlier as conducted by Jourard and Landsman (1960): liking another is not necessarily a strong indicator of a willingness to disclose information.

Schopler and Thompson suggest, as did Gouldner, that the critical feature affecting reciprocation is the recipient's attributions regarding the donor's motives. In specifying attributions which a recipient would likely consider, they further state that "The basic task for the recipient is to distinguish the extent to which his own needs or circumstances were the proximal cause of the donor's act, from those motives attributed to the donor himself". (Schopler and Thompson, 1960, p. 214). If the recipient perceives the donor as having intentions which are not overly based upon the donor's fulfillment, (except in certain 'giving' situations), reciprocity will likely increase. In essence, as the recipient opens himself to the acceptance of the donor's act,
he is actually increasing the likelihood that further exchange will be promoted.

Previous research has focused upon a number of variables which directly or indirectly enhance reciprocal exchange, although these orientations are by no means dominant when compared to other types of studies in this area. As found by Brehm and Cole (1966), the less reactance aroused during interaction, the greater the recipro­cation. Similar to the findings of Schopler and Thompson (1960), if a recipient does not suspect the donor's motives (Lerner and Lichtman, 1968), perceives his actions to be voluntary (Goransen and Berkowitz, 1966), and intentional or deliberate (Leventhal, Weising, and Long, 1969), interaction will most often continue rather than terminate.

As the basis of attribution theory rests on the phenomenon of intentionality, Greenburg and Frisch (1972) measured its effect on willingness to reciprocate a favor. Their purpose was twofold: to examine the influence of deliberate vs accidental help, and, to a lesser extent, high vs low help on the magnitude of reciprocity; and to clarify the role of obligation and attribution of motivation as mediators of reciprocity. Obligation was viewed as a motivational state presumed to mediate both receipt of a favor and reciprocation. Findings revealed that the variables of intentionality of help, and magnitude of reciprocation each affected the amount of felt obligation, as well as attributions of motivation.

Given the research I have cited thus far, it is interesting to note the insight revealed by Gouldner in 1960. It seems as
though the theoretical rationale he suggested as accounting for the reciprocity phenomenon, has to a large extent been supported by later research conducted in this area. As with all theory building, however, more specific aspects have been focused upon in more detail. For example, Gouldner mentioned that the resources of the donor, ("he gave although he could ill afford it"), was one key aspect to consider when weighing the value of a benefit given by one and received by another. Pruitt (1958) found the magnitude of reciprocation to be a positive function of the amount received, the percentage of the donor's resources relinquished, and the donor's future resources—all extended variables from Gouldner's initial proposition.

Another area relative to the earlier works of Gouldner is that of positive attraction and reciprocal liking (e.g., Jones, Jones, and Gergen, 1963; Jones, Stires, Shaver, and Harris, 1968; Regan, 1969). Kiesler (1968) attempted to find if a relationship existed between perceived role requirements and reactions to a favor doing. It was concluded that the amount of attraction the recipient will feel for the donor will depend upon the appropriateness of the favor to the role requirements linking the participants.

The importance of positive reciprocal liking cannot be questioned. Lowe and Goldstein (1970), however, criticize previous research for its near exclusive focus on relational attraction:

This would seem to be an important omission because the case of negative reciprocation introduces some interesting complexities. When an evaluator is perceived as honest and sincere, his evaluation should be taken at face value. Accordingly, we could expect reciprocation to hold when
a sincere evaluator gives a negative evaluation. But suppose that an evaluator who renders a negative evaluation is known to be trying to seek approval. What kinds of attributions might result?

Lowe and Goldstein (1970) attempted to measure the extent to which personal involvement, the giving of high positive or negative evaluations, and the intent behind giving such evaluations had on reciprocal liking. Results indicated that liking was reciprocated. Perceived intent attributed to the evaluator (i.e. accuracy or gain approval) affected amount of liking or disliking toward the person evaluating, and involved subjects not only showed stronger feelings toward positive or negative evaluators than did role players, but attributed ability toward the direction of their feelings as well.

It would seem likely, considering the effects which evaluations showed to have on reciprocal liking, that a correlation could be drawn between reciprocating behaviors and evaluative responses. By investigating the effects of verbal evaluation and authority on total verbal utterance, as well as incidence of nonfluency in a two-person group, Davis (1967) discovered that certain forms of evaluations can alter the verbal behaviors of dyadic members. In altering types of reinforcements, i.e., reward, same, and punishment conditions, groupings given higher evaluation reciprocated with higher total utterance.

Confirming, Disconfirming, and Evaluative Responses

Given the definitions provided earlier of confirming and disconfirming behaviors, such responses can become synonymous with positive and negative evaluations elicited during a dyadic exchange.
If one confirms another, his response may not only be perceived by the other as being a positive evaluation of self, but of the situational context as well. It may very well be that interactions which prove to be personal, constructive, understanding, etc., are due to the underlying effects which the participant's own and perceived evaluations have on the immediate communicative atmosphere.

Being disconfirmed, on the other hand, can cause the receiver to question the intentions of the source, as well as the degree to which he may feel his own behaviors were a cause of the disconfirmation. Basically, such doubt largely occurs because of the perceived negative evaluations associated with the exchange.

In this light, two crucial behavioral characteristics become apparent. First of all, when a person is confirmed, it allows him more freedom to reflect upon the positive aspects of the interaction, increasing the likelihood that he will reciprocate in a positive fashion, rather than disconfirm another who has just confirmed him. Secondly, the emittance of a disconfirming response detracts from a supportive atmosphere, being requisite for personal and relational growth. Although like behaviors may very well be reciprocated in such a case, no understanding is attained beyond the awareness that the source wants no more to do with the receiver, after perceiving that an evaluative disconfirmation has been directed towards him, wants to do with the source. Reciprocal disconfirmation, however, is less likely to occur in ongoing relationships rather than encounters in which no personal commitment is involved. (unless, of course, partners in a relationship engage in
such behaviors as an understood form of interaction, as will be discussed in a later section.)

Social Exchange Theories and Reciprocity

For years scholars have been focusing upon the effects of costs and rewards in relational development. In fact, the dominant psychological orientation over the years has been behavioristic in nature, i.e., learning processes are viewed as being regulated by the degree to which behaviors are rewarded or punished as they occur.

The interpersonal approach to behavioral rewards and punishment is termed exchange theory, formulated largely by the writings of John Thibaut, H.H. Kelley, and G.C. Homans.

Thibaut and Kelley (1959) based their viewpoint upon the effects which contextual, i.e., social settings have upon the individual perceiver. Within a dyad, for example, each person serves as both a stimulus and a rewarder, possessing some control over the situation and the other due to one's ability to reward or punish another's actions. Inherent in such an approach is the assumption that the magnitude of one's behaviors, and in turn, the types of interactions leading to further relations between individuals, are most frequently determined by those behaviors which reward or are rewarded.

Homans (1961), on the other hand, approached the complexities of human interactions by specifying three basic guidelines. When combined, the following provide a fairly simplified explanation of man's behaviors in social situations. According to
Homans: 1) social behavior is rewarded or punished by the behavior of another person; 2) when a person acts in a certain way toward another person, he is punished or rewarded by that person; and 3) the behavior must be actual behavior and not a norm of behavior.

One further viewpoint considered by Homans is the economic concept of the payoff. As applied to human behavior, one's actions toward another are determined by what might be gained from the transaction. As summarized by Swenson (1973):

To put it simply, exchange theory sees the interaction between two people as a function of what each person gets out of the relationship; no payoff in the relationship, no relationship. Or if there has been payoff, and the payoff stops, the relationship stops. Love and stock manipulation, altruism and huckstering, all are at base motivated by the same force: profit. (Swenson, 1973, p.214)

Peter Blau (1967) carried the concept of payoff one step further in his book The Structure of Social Associations. He suggests that an explanation of social structures and collectivities, as well as personal relationships, can be achieved by understanding how social life becomes organized into increasingly complex structures of associations between men. The processes of social exchange provides an answer to such a proposal, in terms of the degree and types of interactions which occur between individuals, groups of individuals, and varying sizes of collectivities. As rewards and costs are involved, Blau considered reciprocal forces of balance to govern social relations:

Whereas the conception of reciprocity in exchange implies the existence of balancing forces that create a strain toward equilibrium, the simultaneous operations of diverse balancing forces recurrently produce imbalances in social life, and the resulting dialectic between
reciprocity and imbalance gives social structures their distinctive nature and dynamics. (Blau, 1967, p.14)

The balancing forces referred to by Blau seem to indicate that the frequency of kinds of responses and the effects which they have on further responses and perceptions becomes crucial when attempting to account for the reasons why societies function as they do. The mere fact that the need for reciprocal exchange exists, causes balance and imbalance in differing levels of human associations.

Social Power and Reciprocity

When considering that interaction between persons of any number involves balanced as well as imbalanced exchange, the concept of social power cannot be overlooked. Neither Thibaut and Kelly nor Homans could discuss costs and rewards in everyday life without acknowledging that some individuals are in better positions to bestow rewards upon others, and experience fewer costs in being rewarded for their actions in return. As McCall and Simmons (1966) defined power as an 'imbalance of exchange resources', it is as though dominant individuals have the right to 'do something for nothing'. To exploit another is to consistently receive far more benefits than given in return, or to reciprocate only for the sake of enhancing the possibilities that you would reap the benefits you would not otherwise experience. In fact, imbalances in any kind of relationship can and do occur. Such situations can lead to relational termination,
However, it is often the case that 'coping' with another's behaviors involves not having one's need or intentions reciprocated as desired.

Harsanyi (1962) provided a model for social power in reciprocal power situations. In so doing he made a distinction between the amount and strength of an individual's power. He contended that the amount of power possessed by a person was a measure of the probability of his being able to achieve adoption of joint policies agreeing with his own preferences. One's power strength, on the other hand, was determined by the strength of the incentives he could provide for the other participants to agree to his policy proposals, and more generally, the strength of his bargaining position against the other participants.

Another perspective from which the reciprocal effects of social power can be foreseen was illustrated by Tedeschi, et al. (1969). Subjects were placed in roles representing various degrees of power, i.e., strong, weak, or equal, with respect to a simulated player. In measuring the subject's attitudes toward cooperation and perceived credibility of promises from another, the player sent ten unilateral, noncontingent assimilations of intent to cooperate. His projected intentions (promises) were further manipulated to be credible either ten, fifty, or ninety per cent of the time. It was found that those in a position of equal power, rather than being in a stronger or weaker position, promoted more behavioral cooperation from subjects in reciprocation to an expression of an intent to cooperate. More specifically, subjects in powerful roles ignored the initiatives, and
were least cooperative during interactions, whereas weak subjects were more exploitative as the credibility of promises increased.

These results seem to further indicate that relational structures are governed by exchange which is confirming or disconfirming in nature. Again related to aspects associated with attribution theory, assumed and perceived roles can regulate one's felt need to reciprocate or ignore intentions, and in this study, even heed credible promises to cooperate.

Further research explores the reciprocal effects of bargaining (Nemeth, 1970), bargaining and commitment to a relationship (Marlowe et al., 1966), generosity (Harris, 1970), and sharing (Staub and Shiek, 1970).

Personality Classification Systems

Approaches have been undertaken which attempt to classify interpersonal needs and personality traits. Of these, the works of William Schutz (1958) and Timothy Leary (1957) seem to be the most widely noted and accepted. Inherent in each are implications directly related to the phenomenon of reciprocal exchange. In addition, as will be discussed in the following pages, other scholars have narrowed their focus to classifying reciprocal behavior patterns of interacting dyads.

Schutz (1958) devised a tool to measure an individual's orientations to what he considers to be three basic interpersonal needs---inclusion, affection and control. His primary purpose was twofold: to construct a measure of how an individual
acts in interpersonal situations; and to construct a measure that will lead to the prediction of interaction between people, based on data from the measuring instrument alone. According to Schutz, the FIRO B scale (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation) not only measures individual characteristics, but measures characteristics that may be combined in particular ways to predict relations between people.

In essence, the basis of this scale lies in reciprocal exchange, in that it assesses what behaviors the individual expresses (e) toward others, and how he wants (w) others to behave toward him. By matching the e's and w's, Schutz contended that the compatibility of individuals can be determined. If, for example, two individuals have a strong desire to control a person whom they are in relation with, and begin to know of one another, a power struggle may arise in which affection toward one another could be seriously affected. This illustrates how mutual, i.e., reciprocal actions can lead to problems when considering the need for control in a relationship. It also suggests that relational imbalance can occur as a result of, rather than a lack of reciprocal reactions...depending upon those attempts to satisfy different needs by the participants. Thus, reciprocal actions, at least in this area of control in a relationship, can imply non-mutuality of influence.

Similar to Schutz' categorization of interpersonal needs, Timothy Leary (1957) developed a system for classifying personality traits, in hopes of being able to more effectively diagnose psychiatric patients. After observing and recording interactions
of groups composed of individuals receiving psychiatric care and others that were not, as well as mixed groups, subjects were asked to describe themselves and others, contribute any writings, thoughts, or dreams they have had, and fill out psychological inventories. Leary found that four basic personality traits arose from the descriptions received during the experiment: those of dominance, submission, hostility and affection. By transferring these traits to two personality dimensions, each dimension illustrating opposite traits, Leary depicted dominance-submission and love-hate on a circular behavior classification system (see Appendix 1). Interestingly enough, discussions of these traits are based on reciprocalness.

By focusing more exclusively upon the interactional patterns in social exchange, rather than the fulfilling of needs, Jones and Thibaut (1958) considered the effects which degrees of contingency have upon the actor's behaviors. By acknowledging that social situations often determine the extent to which one's behaviors and perceptions affect another, they proposed three formal types of interaction: noncontingent, asymmetrically contingent, and reciprocally contingent.

As with manifested behaviors in ceremonial contexts, noncontingency implies that one's behavior is independent of others. Or, as stated by Jones and Thibaut (1958, p.155), "In such a situation, we can say that the behavior of each actor is determined by a clearly defined S.O.P. (from the military nomenclature, 'standing operating procedure') and thus the content of the other's
behavior is irrelevant to the unfolding of his own responses." Extreme behavioral preservation and intense personal occupation were also cited as being indicative of noncontingent interaction.

If an interaction is asymmetrical, "...the behavior of one actor is fully contingent on the behavior of another, but the other's behavior is independently determined...", (Jones and Thibaut, 1958, p.155). As may be true of an interviewing situation, the interviewee must rely heavily upon the behaviors of the interviewer (fully contingent), whereas the interviewer need not rely upon the interviewee's behaviors to determine the content areas he will cover during the session (noncontingent).

Reciprocal contingency, however, represents a mutual interaction in the sense that "...the full range of human emotions is most likely to be engaged, and the intricate complexities of shared and nonshared perspectives become critically relevant.", (Jones and Thibaut, 1958, p.157).

By contrast, Jones and Gerard (1967, Chapter 13) determined contingent responses according to the internal states of the participants, as well as what occurs between the actors during the interaction itself. Four classes are specified: pseudocontingency; asymmetrical contingency; reactive contingency; and mutual contingency.

Pseudocontingency represents an interaction in which the actors involved are not affected by the dynamics of exchange, but only by their internal thoughts. A response is emitted due only to the finishing of a response by another. Such a state is similar
to viewing communication as a stimulus-response phenomenon, in which mutuality of meaning has no bearing upon the continuance of exchange.

An example of asymmetrical contingency may be a mass classroom lecture. The speaker, unless questions are asked and discussions take place, is cognizant mainly upon the presentation of his own thoughts rather than any feedback which may be coming from the audience. An involved audience member, however, would be aware of the speaker's thoughts as well as his own internal responses to them.

Communication spirals are indicative of reactive contingency, (see Wilmot, 1975). By ignoring what may be best for themselves, participants react spontaneously to what is taking place between them. Heated arguments and fights are good examples of such interaction.

Finally, mutual contingency implies that the outcome of an exchange is determined fairly equally. Internal and external responses are given consideration by both actors, resulting in exchange which is truly reciprocal and caring in nature.

Capacities of Attention During Interaction

From the time of birth, and even before, man's behavior becomes explainable according to reciprocal patterns of interaction. One apparent example of the need for reciprocity lies in mother-infant communication patterns, being very applicable to daily interactions of humans involved in differing kinds of relationships.

It was the intent of Brazelton et al., (1974) to determine the extent to which early infants (up to four months of age) promoted
responses from their mothers, and vice versa. By utilizing detailed film studies, it was their purpose to describe: several of the significant components of mother-infant interaction; the patterns of behavior used by each member of the dyad; and the rhythms and cycles that underlie these patterns. The specific attributes focused upon during exchange became cycles of looking (attention) and non-attention.

Segmented interactional periods often seemed to follow a certain pattern: initiation; orientation; state of attention; acceleration; peak of excitement; deceleration; and withdrawal or turning away. As observed, it was found that of crucial importance to maintaining an interaction was that the mother become sensitive to several of the infants needs: his capacity for attention and his need for withdrawal after being attentive toward her. If such sensitivities were developed, it was suggested that a mother would not only feel more comfortable in allowing the infant to turn away from her, but be assured of longer attention spans when he shifts his attention back again.

Of major interest to the senior author was the rhythmic, cyclic quality observed in reciprocal behaviors between mothers and their infants:

There appeared to be a kind of attention, non-attention, behavioral cycle—-arhythmic attention-withdrawal pattern present in differing degrees in each participant. Usually, the mother's pattern was synchronized with that of the baby. Occasionally, however, initial synchrony ended in dyssynchrony after a difficult or tense interaction. (Brazelton et al., 1974, p.49)
The underlying assumptions made by Brazelton et al. seem applicable beyond the context of mother-infant response characteristics. Daily interactions frequently involve period segments beginning with the initiation of a discussion, experiencing a 'peak' of attention or excitement, and ending in a withdrawal by the individuals involved. The specific characteristics and durations of each segment, however, are a result of each individual's behaviors and how they are perceived and reacted to by another. If, for example, a person's response is ignored or treated in some way harsh, the sender of the message may likely assign negative connotations to the receiver's ability or willingness to pay attention. This, in turn, may not only lessen the degree of excitement which could be experienced in a dyadic encounter, but cause the interaction itself to be viewed, at least by the source being threatened, to be quite negative in its outcome. Upon their next meeting, by choice or by chance, the entire interactional pattern would likely be altered due to the assessments of their last exchange. Thus, it can be seen that perceived capacities of attention when relating to another can affect entire patterns of behavior, both during an exchange in reflection of a past exchange, and upon subsequent encounters. The basis of such alterations of behavior lies in the fulfillment of interpersonal needs, and the ability to not only become aware of one's own desires, but pay attention to and fulfill other's as well.
Reciprocal Interpersonal Development

In tracing the development as well as the rationale which has governed research in the area of reciprocity of verbal self-disclosure, Irwin Altman (1973) suggested that two conceptual approaches have guided current thinking: a norm of reciprocity idea, based on social obligations to reciprocate self-disclosures; and a social exchange idea, based on self-disclosure as involving positive social consequences. The former approach is synonymous with the propositions of Gouldner (1960); the latter represents the basis of social exchange theory as proposed by Thibaut and Kelly (1959), and Homans (1958).

As mentioned earlier, Altman suggested that although reciprocity is empirically 'reasonably well demonstrated', and that no further research is needed to demonstrate its occurrence, there still exists a need to conduct research on factors which affect degrees of reciprocity. A variety of these factors have been mentioned in the literature review thus far, but it is evident that they are by no means all-inclusive in nature. Therefore, from the perspective of the role which interpersonal trust plays as related to mutual self-disclosure, and the experiencing of positive consequences as a result of such reciprocal exchange, e.g. social approval, heightened compatibility, etc. (p.255), Altman specified four factors which he feels retard or accelerate reciprocity: stage of a relationship; level of exchange; topical intimacy; situational factors; and personal factors and group composition.
The implications of these factors are such that "...the concept of a 'norm of reciprocity' plays a role." (Altman, 1973, p.255).

Stage of a Relationship

Altman speculated that an inverse relationship exists between the extent to which a relationship has progressed, and the degree of reciprocity. As persons initially learn to know of one another, adherence to social norms seems to be more dominant than in later development stages. Thus the 'norm of reciprocity', created feelings of obligation, is more likely to affect behaviors as a relationship is being formed, rather than after the participants have adjusted to being in relation to one another.

Level of Exchange: Topical Intimacy

In citing the findings of Cozby (1972), and further studies discussed in Altman and Taylor (1973), it is hypothesized that reciprocity increases with superficial, non-intimate subject matters and decreases when focus is upon personal, intimate topics of discussion. Less risk is involved in disclosing superficial aspects of one's self to others, and revealing non-intimate items is less affected by social consequences. Thus, Altman posits four additional implications: 1) Reciprocity operates more as a social norm during non-intimate rather than highly intimate disclosures of self; 2) A relationship exists between topical intimacy and extent of relational engagement, in that the less you know a person, the more frequent the reciprocal disclosures of non-intimate matters, and the better you know a person, the likelihood
of reciprocating non-intimacies diminishes; 3) Becoming close friends implies that as initial high trust is perceived, reciprocity of intimate materials reaches a peak; and 4) After a relationship becomes advanced, e.g., close friends, lovers, spouses, reciprocity is highly contextual, occurring only in specialized circumstances. (Refer to Appendix 2 for a summary of the effects of topical intimacy and stage of a relationship on reciprocity).

**Situational Factors**

The degree of personal commitment to a relationship seems to have marked effects on the reciprocity phenomenon. It would seem that the shorter the term of a relationship, and the less committed the participants are to one another, the higher will be the levels of intimacy discussed and the greater will be the reciprocation between individuals. As Altman notes (1973, p.257), 'the difference in reciprocity between intimate and non-intimate objects will not occur.' Such a hypothesis is based on two previous studies in which Altman was involved: Taylor, Altman, and Sorrentino (1969), and Altman (1973). Each focused on the degree to which reward/cost factors and degree of freedom/commitment to a social bond had on the process of self-disclosure. Caution to disclose information was indicative of long-term committed relationships, whereas attitudes toward being open, willing to disclose freely, and evaluate another were apparent in short-term relationships where one could leave a situation.

Altman cited other situational factors which would likely
lower reciprocal exchange (1973, p.258): 1) formal, public situations vs. private, informal ones; 2) among persons of different social status; and 3) in situations where it is not expected by virtue of role relationships, e.g. physicians and patients, priests and confessors.

**Personal Factors and Group Composition**

When considering specific characteristics which presumably affect individual behaviors as well as group environments, the conditions under which reciprocity may be considered high or low become quite diverse in nature. Merely combining these four factors listed by Altman in differing degrees supports this assumption:

For example, maximum reciprocity is predicted to occur under the following combination of conditions: positive outcomes to disclosure, interaction in non-intimate topical areas, among those with low commitments to the relationship who are predisposed to reveal, and in informal, relatively private situations, at early stages of the relationship. Minimal reciprocity is expected in later stages of a social bond, with expectations of commitment to the relationship, discussing relatively intimate topics, etc. (Altman, 1973, p.258-259)

Altman further noted that research thus far in the area of reciprocal exchange has focused upon maximum reciprocity conditions; no research has, comparatively speaking, dealt with factors causing minimal reciprocity. He continues by stating:

Moreover, there has not yet been a concerted attempt to measure directly the variables associated with this framework—subjective trust, perception of rewards and costs of interaction, projected outcomes of exchange...With empirical demonstration of reciprocal disclosure now relatively well established, the time is ripe to study the role of such factors on the process, and to begin measuring directly some of the underlying hypothesized mechanisms of reciprocity.
Transactional Variables in Human Communication

Before providing a rationale for the need to integrate confirming-disconfirming response styles with the communication variables of self-disclosure, empathy, and interpersonal attraction, (and vice-versa), attention must be given to the transactional nature of human behavior. Only by doing so can an integration be accomplished which reflects the perceptual implications which need to be considered.

As obvious as it may sometimes be, people often negate the fact that all human perceptions are purely subjective. There are no set 'standards' for judging other's behaviors—no objectified measures to apply to one's perceptions—which determine right or wrong evaluations of the ways in which people act and interact in communicative contexts. The uniqueness of each individual can be translated into being personal 'criteria' which aid in determining those with whom we wish to associate, as well as those with whom we would like to be most intimate.

Therefore, we do react to a person as though his behaviors are truly "real", even though they only have the appearance of reality. They may only appear to be so at any given moment. (See Wilmot, 1975, Chapter 2). Our reactions to others, then, are based on our experiences of their behaviors...being determined by our perceptions of self. Naturally, some appear to be more acceptable than others, as will be shown in the discussion of confirming-disconfirming response styles. Yet what is acceptable
to one person, or within one relationship, may be totally rejected in other circumstances.

The meanings we assign to other’s behaviors determine our reactions to them. In a dyadic context, this process involves a mutually shared field (Taguiri, 1958). Each participant sees the other seeing him, and the dynamics of exchange, whether verbal or nonverbal in expression, are a result of these perceptions.

According to Taguiri (1958) person perception minimally involves (1) the perceiver, (2) the person, and (3) the situation. As in the comparison to object perception employed by Wilmot (1975), it is clearly seen that objects cannot respond, thus limiting the reciprocal nature of mutual meaning assignations. Again, 'humans-as-objects' also seems quite obvious; but it is important to remember that of all living things, humans have the unique ability to treat members of their being as though they are not—simply because they do not care for them to be as they are.

The five communication variables I will be focusing upon will be approached from the viewpoint that each in themselves affect, and are affected by the perceptions of the participants of a communicative exchange. Finally, since behaviors elicited by individuals affect subsequent communications with one another, certain behaviors can be seen as being far more conducive to reciprocal relational development than can others.
Confirming and Disconfirming Response Styles

An integral component of Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory, are those factors which hasten or restrain the growth of interpersonal relationships. The dynamics of interaction, from this viewpoint, can be accounted for from three general perspectives: 1) personality characteristics of the participants; 2) outcomes of exchange; and 3) the situational context. Combined, these factors represent actual behaviors which are elicited, perceived, and assigned meaning to by the individuals engaged in interaction. The rate and degree of any form of relational development, is dependent upon this process of meaning assignation. But what factors further determine whether such development is regressive or progressive in nature?

The Tangential Response

A variety of answers to this question seem to be found in research directed toward the problems of schizophrenia. According to Swenson (1973, p.51), certain peculiarities are indicative of the manners by which schizophrenics express themselves:

Their speech is circumstantial, that is, it wanders from topic to topic without ever arriving at a destination. It is often characterized by delusions (tales that no one in his right mind would believe), by neologisms, (invented words whose meanings are unknown), or by "word salad", (jumbled words which communicate little or nothing to the hearer).

The implications of such means of communication are quite obvious: the likelihood of an effective communicative exchange,
i.e., interaction conducive to high levels of understanding by the participants, is at a minimum. Communication thus breaks down due to what Jergen Ruesch (1958, p. 356) termed the tangential response: a disturbance which arises out of certain selectivities which a recipient of a message can exercise in replying to the statement of the sender. He continues to state that "If in terms of language, content, and emotional concomitants the reply fits the initial statement as a key fits a keyhole, then the sender experiences pleasure and feels that he has been understood; however, if the reply does not fit, various degrees of tension are experienced."

Depending upon the type of response one receives, such tension can lead an individual to question his own feelings and emotions. Any communication which occurs can thus become not only troublesome, but very threatening to an individual perceiver: Why did he respond that way?; Did he understand what I was trying to tell him?; Does he even want to understand me?. If an individual fails to find acceptable answers to those questions which have arisen out of an interactive sequence, serious problems may arise:

Subjectively, the individual experiences failure in communication as frustrating. If the frustration is very intense, of long duration, or repeated, the individual's thinking, feeling, and reacting become progressively more disorganized and inappropriate. In turn, such behavior is regarded by others as abnormal. Prolonged frustration diminishes the individual's ability to establish and maintain social relations, regardless of whether the frustration is the result of central nervous system disease or social interaction. The basic hypothesis—that information and
feedback direct human behavior—has therefore to be amplified to state that defective feedback involving intraorganismic, interpersonal and group networks is responsible for abnormal behavior. (Ruesch, 1958, p.356)

In short, Ruesch (p.363) characterized four basic criteria associated with the tangential response: 1) The reply inadequately fits the initial statement; 2) The reply has a frustrating effect; 3) The reply is not geared to the intention behind the original statement as it is perceivable through work, action and context of the situation; and 4) The reply emphasizes an aspect of the statement which is incidental.

It can be seen how these criteria are associated with a study conducted by Sieburg and Larson (1971). In attempting to find out which kinds of responses are most and least confirming in daily human interactions, members of the International Communication Association were asked to describe the behaviors of those whom they most and least enjoyed interacting with. By combining the results of this survey, the following rank-ordering of responses emerged:

**Most Confirming:**

**Direct Acknowledgement.**—The other person acknowledges and gives a direct verbal response to your behavior.

**Positive Feeling.**—Another conveys his own positive feelings about what you have said.

**Clarifying Response.**—The other attempts to get you to clarify certain aspects of your message.
Agreeing Response.—What you say is affirmed or reinforced by another.

Supportive Response.—Involves the giving of comfort, understanding or reassurance to what you have said.

**Most Disconfirming**

Tangential Response.—Your previous statement is acknowledged, but the other quickly shifts the direction of the conversation.

Impersonal Response.—Represents speech which is impersonal and intellectualized.

Impervious Response.—No verbal and minimal nonverbal recognition is given to another's response.

Irrelevant Response.—As with the tangential response, the subject is changed, but no attempt whatsoever is made to relate the response to your previous comment.

Interrupting Response.—Does not allow a person to finish what he was saying.

Incoherent Response.—Represents rambling, disorganized, or incomplete speech.

Incongruous Response.—Verbal and nonverbal messages conflict one another.

The main differences which seem to be depicted by the confirming and disconfirming response styles noted above is the immediacy and relevance of a response which is given in reaction to one's behavior. Implied is the notion of communicating with a person, rather than an object of or for discussion. These types
of responses, as will be specified when dealing with behavioral
correlation, are not often present in behavior which tends to be
schizophrenic or abnormal in its effects.

Driving Others Crazy

Harold Searles (1959) further elaborated on the aspects
associated with "tangentiality" by proposing that "...the individ­
ual becomes schizophrenic partly by reason of a long-continued
effort, a largely or wholly unconscious effort, on the part of
some person or persons highly important in his upbringing, to
drive him crazy." (Searles, 1959, p.1).

Stressing the unconscious level of an individual's function­
ing, Searles delineated four modes or techniques which are
utilized in one's effort to drive another crazy. The first
refers to any initiated action which tends to foster emotional
conflict in the other person. Emotional conflict, in this sense,
refers to the resulting activation of various areas of another's
personality in opposition to one another. The second mode is
dealing with the other person on two or more unrelated levels of
relatedness simultaneously. As an example of this mode, Searles
described his experience with an attractive female patient, who
engaged in politico-philosophical debate while strolling around
the room in a sexually inflaming manner.

Another mode is the sudden switching from one emotional
wavelength to another. Such behavior does not fully allow
another to grasp onto any specific feelings of an individual for
any period of time. Finally, an individual who consistently
switches from one conversation topic to another, without revealing
any marked shift in feeling-content, can also affect others in a
negative fashion.

Transactional Disqualification and the
Double Bind Hypothesis

In studying the peculiarities of individuals who display
schizophrenic tendencies, past research seems to be oriented toward
the integration of two related fields of study: interpersonal re-
lations and clinical psychology. In this case, the former repre-
sents more effective communication with self, hence, more fulfilled
relations with others. The latter focuses more upon specific ob-
served behaviors which consistently occur in the family of the
schizophrenic. Such behaviors are viewed as causing perceptual
distortions of self, due to the contextual environment within
which such communications occur.

The widely noted "double-bind" hypothesis, which originated
from the work of Bateson et al., (1956), proposes a theoretical
approach to schizophrenic communication behaviors. Basically,
this theory suggests that children learn to communicate in an
abnormal manner via interactions with their parents. Messages
received by a child from his parents may tell him to do one thing
on an overt, verbal level, and simultaneously do something contra-
dictory to what the original message represents on a second level.
Regardless of which message he adheres to, he will be disobeying
the other message in his attempt to do what is desired and expected of him. Needless to say, a 'damned if you do and damned if you don't' situation leads the child to question his own decision-making competencies, as well as the demands made upon him by his parents. And, of equal concern, are the attitudes created toward the cost/reward factors of communication at such a crucial stage of personal development.

The complexity of levels of communication, and the effects associated with the double-bind hypothesis, become clarified in an article written by J. Haley in 1959. As Haley was one of the authors who had earlier written with Bateson, Jackson, and Weakland (1956), he further posited that communications between people occur on at least two levels, and consist of four basic elements. The two levels are: 1) the direct communication; and 2) the qualification of that communication by tone of voice, gestures, behavior, etc. The four elements between people interacting are: 1) the person communicating; 2) what the person is communicating; 3) the person communicated to; and 4) the situation in which the communication takes place.

Thus, the example 1) I 2) am discussing interpersonal behavior 3) with you 4) in my office, illustrates the four elements. To deal with the two levels of communication, however, Haley considered the use of affirmation and disqualification. As in the example used by Swenson (1973, p.57), when a man gave his wife a Christmas present, she opened it and exclaimed, "Oh, you stinker, you!" The verbal level might suggest, if one did not
know the context of its usage, that she was saying: "(1) I (2) think badly (3) of you (4) for giving me this present." Whereas, if one were to observe the wife as she was opening the present, it would be obvious that she was in fact disqualifying her overt, verbal statement and actually meaning: "(1) I (2) think you must love me and be very sensitive to me (3) for you (4) to have brought me this present."

As is seen, the overt (direct) communication level can be disqualified by the second level, i.e., tone of voice, gestures, behaviors, etc. However, it is not uncommon for the overt level to be affirmed by the second level, as when a person says "I love you.," in an honest and sincere manner.

Schizophrenia, then, is indicative of the disqualifying aspect between two levels of communication. If affirmation is not frequently experienced, an individual would likely confuse not only the message sent and the source of the message, but also himself as a receiver and discriminator of the information contained in the message.

Transactional disqualification, one of numerous forms of the double bind, is defined by Sluzki et al. (1963, p.500) as "Discontinuity of content without accurate indication of reception." In other words, when two persons are verbally interacting with one another, there may be an "...incongruity in the response of one speaker in relation to the thesis (content) of the previous message of another." (Sluzki et al., 1967, p.496).

As the previous discussion implies, the double-bind hypothesis represents patterns of interaction—most generally a series of
ineffective exchanges from a communication viewpoint. Transactional disqualification, or one 'pattern' of this kind, leads to incongruencies between the messages of the individuals involved. Sluzkie et al. specify four types of verbal disqualifications (1967, p.497-499):

Evasion-Change of Subject--If A is a statement which does not clearly end a topic of discussion, and B, the next statement, is in a new subject area but contains no labeling of this switch, then message B disqualifies A, being incongruent in the fact that it is in content not a response to A, while in context it must be.

Sleight-of-Hand--A change of subject is labeled as an answer. That is, as in evasion, B is in content a new subject, but additionally it is labeled as an answer to A. Such labels need not be literal (I am answering you."), but rather include, broadly, all overt indicators of reception of the first message.

Status Disqualification--The subject is changed from content to speaker (either A or B), with the added invocation of (relative) status; that is, B implies that A (the message) is not valid either because of A1 (the person) or because of B1's superior knowledge, right, etc.

Redundant Question--Message A is a declarative statement; B is a question on the same level as A, (not a metacomment such as "how", "why", etc.), repeating at least part of what has been previously said in A. This implies doubt or disagreement without openly stating it.
The "victim", according to Sluzki et al., has four alternatives to choose from in responding to such disqualifying messages: explicit comment, withdrawal, acceptance, or counter-disqualification. The first two would lessen the probability that the double-bind would continue, whereas the latter two would likely add support to its continuation.

The importance of explicating message patterns of schizophrenic individuals lies not only in the treatment and hopeful alleviation of such tendencies, but also in the applicative value to 'normal' human beings as they lead their daily lives. Although the double-bind hypothesis (and behaviors relative to it) represent reoccurring sequences of distorted communications between individuals, similar behaviors and response styles can and do occur in even the most healthy of interpersonal relationships---some of the differences being that they occur less frequently and to a much lesser degree. Therefore, much remains to be seen that it is assumed that certain schizophrenic behaviors originate only within total schizophrenic personalities.

Confirmation, Rejection, and Disconfirmation

It might be legitimately hypothesized that the dynamics of human interaction, to a large extent, rest upon the participant's identities of self in a given situation. Furthermore, current theory suggests that individuals gain self-identities through other's reactions to them. In this light, all behaviors elicited by persons can be perceived as having a direct effect on one's definition of self.
From this viewpoint, the types of responses which are employed during interaction with others become crucial variables in determining the outcomes of interpersonal exchange. Watzlawick et al. (1967) suggested that individuals simultaneously offer one another a definition of self during interaction. Such a process allows the receiver of another's self-definition three alternatives: confirmation, rejection, or disconfirmation.

To confirm another is to accept his definition of self. Or, as viewed by Sieburg and Larson (1971), any response which causes another to value himself more is basically confirming in nature. Vital to the functioning and stability of all human beings, is the reinforcement gained by subjecting one's ideas and feelings to those who are encountered on a daily basis. In fact, it might be said that it is this reinforcement which determines the extent to which individuals are willing to experience others in a variety of situational contexts. (See Buber, 1957).

The second alternative is to reject the person who the other thinks he may be. Although such an act would in most cases be quite threatening and hard to accept, it still involves some degree of recognition as to the reasoning behind such a negation of personality. In other words, to reject another's view of himself is to acknowledge his reality as a person.

Relative to the phenomenon of transactional disqualification, disconfirmation differs markedly from either of the other alternative responses available when perceiving another's definition of self. To disconfirm another means not only rejecting his view of
self, but negating his existence as a person as well. The result is a reduction of a person's feelings of self-worth (Sieburg and Larson, 1971). As relationships are built and maintained by confirming responses, they are severely damaged and often destroyed by disconfirming attitudes and behaviors. And, before a relationship even begins, or possibly during a brief encounter, one's perception of the "alienation" associated with disconfirming behaviors would likely cause negative impressions to be formed. Since one's level of ego-involvement would be high in defining the core areas of his personality, perceived negation would not easily be compensated for during an interaction.

Other written work also accounts for behaviors which are, in essence, confirming and disconfirming in scope. Jack Gibb's classic article on "Defensive Communication", (1961), for example, contrasts behavioral differences in supportive v. defensive interpersonal climates. In discussing patterns of interactions which occur in marital relationships, Lederer and Jackson (1968) focus upon a variety of transactions which often lead marriages to be less fulfilling than they should be. Piaget (1932) isolated some forms of communication behavior as "collective monologues" and "parallel play". And, in attempting to provide a clear description of the attributes associated with communicative unclarity, Paul H. Wender (1967) classified communication into spontaneous (monologue) and responsive (dialogue) speech. As his analysis is oriented toward schizophrenic tendencies, general cognitive dysfunctioning is also taken into consideration.
To this point it has been shown that confirming behaviors represent factors which would promote reciprocal interpersonal development. On the other hand, such relational progression would be hindered, i.e., retarded, depending upon the frequency and degree to which disconfirming responses occur. However, one further qualifying aspect needs to be considered at this time. It is crucial that it is understood that the effects of confirming and disconfirming responses are highly dependent upon the relationship which exists between individuals. The levels of understanding and mutual expectations shared by the participants, (determined largely by past experiences), allows for certain behaviors to occur which, as with transactional perceptions, may in fact be very damaging when employed in other relational situations. Therefore, the focus of attention concerning response styles is not necessarily on one's behavior per se, but rather on the relationship shared in a mutually experienced contest. Confirmation and disconfirmation, in this light, become altogether relationally bound.

There is little doubt that a myriad of other communication variables play a role in the process explained; however, for the purpose of this analysis, the behavioral concepts of self-disclosure, empathy, and interpersonal attraction merit special recognition from a transactional viewpoint.
DEPENDENT VARIABLES

The Perception of Self-Disclosing Attributes

Of all communication variables, self-disclosure represents one of the most alluring processes in the realm of interpersonal transactions. Defined as deliberate (Pearce and Sharp, 1973) or intentional (Pearce et al., 1974) communication which allows another to learn of something about one's self, its role in becoming fulfilled as a person is clearly seen:

Various writers have identified individual's ability and willingness to self-disclose as determinants of their personal health and satisfaction, success in being understood and working competently with others, and ability to provide communicative experiences which others find satisfying and therapeutic. (Pearce and Sharp, 1973, p.409).

In a positive light, the uniqueness of self-disclosure as a process can thus be identified from three distinct, but interrelated perspectives: self-reinforcement; self-other reinforcement; and other reinforcement. Being circular in nature, an individual who is effective in his communicative disclosures can increase his own perception of self worth via positive interactions with others. Implied is a progressive rate of relational development, dependent upon reciprocal behaviors elicited by the other. And, when reinforced by such behavior, both participants become increasingly confident in their abilities to trust others with otherwise unknown information about themselves.

However, if reciprocation does not occur when expected, or if elicited behaviors during a transaction are viewed as being somewhat negative (manipulative) in nature, such confidence can be
severely affected (Beach and Wilmot, 1975).

Past research concerned with self-disclosing communication has been quite diverse (see Cozby, 1973; Egan, 1970; Jourard, 1971; Pearce and Sharp, 1973; Pearce et al., 1974). For the purpose of this study, however, a variety of attempts to classify behavioral attributes associated with self-disclosure are of special concern. A person's mental health, for example, can be related to self-disclosing responses which can be received or given in interactive contexts. And, concerning the phenomenon of reciprocity, self-disclosure tends to foster similar responses from another—although this is by no means always the case. Cozby, (1973, p.80-81), integrated the concept of self-disclosure into several theoretical approaches mentioned earlier, i.e., social exchange and social penetration theories.

Pearce et al., (1974) noted that several terms have been used synonomously with self-disclosure. For example, Rogers (1961) referred to congruency during interaction; Jourard (1971) spoke of transparency, whereas Truax and Carkhuff (1967) described genuineness as being indicative of the intentions behind disclosing messages; and Moustakos (1962) preferred the word 'honesty'.

As a rationale for excluding much of the literature relative to self-disclosure, Pearce and Sharp (1973, p.416) referred only to materials which: 1) reflect the view of communication from a transactional point of view (see Wenburg and Wilmot, 1972; Stewart, 1973); and 2) used a methodology which, from their opinion, was likely to measure honesty. Characteristics discussed as being
indicative of these two perspectives included: 1) The relatively infrequent occurrence of high levels of disclosure in communication transactions; 2) The highest occurrence of self-disclosure as being in the dyadic arena; 3) The symmetrical aspects of self-disclosure within positive social relationships; 4) The likelihood of self-disclosure occurring within dyadic contexts; and 5) The tendency for self-disclosure to be incremental.

Cozby (1973, p. 75) suggested that self-disclosing processes involve three parameters: 1) Breadth or amount of information disclosed; 2) Depth or intimacy of information disclosed; and 3) Duration or time spent describing each item of information. As Cozby discussed self-disclosure and mental health, it is seen that each parameter both affects, and is affected by the individual's ability to self-disclose to others. By integrating the work of Jourard (1959) and Maslow's (1954) concepts and description of self-actualizing tendencies, it is shown that consistent self-disclosure at a low level retards individual growth and development, especially when considering that an individual cannot reveal his real self to a "significant" other. Implied is the fact that relational development is also hindered, since movement toward the participant's knowing of one another's 'core' areas of personality would be at a minimum.

However, for a variety of reasons, Cozby was hesitant to state that there is a direct relation between self-disclosure and mental health, even though the work by Jourard would seem to suggest that there is. (Cozby noted that although available
literature is diverse, no correlation reported has been greater than .50, and most are much lower.) Therefore, he suggested further hypotheses:

Persons with positive mental health (given that they can be identified) are characterized by high disclosure to a few significant others and medium disclosure to others in the social environment. Individuals who are poorly adjusted (again assuming a suitable identification can be made) are characterized by either high or low disclosure to virtually everyone in the social environment. (Cozby, 1973, p.78).

Similar to much of the literature focusing upon schizophrenic behaviors, Cozby seemed to specify positive mental health and poorly adjusted individuals as being on opposite ends of a continuum. Needless to say, humans are, by their very nature, quite changeable in their cognitive states. A "normal" human being may feel little conflict within himself today, but find that in a few hours he is in a state of imbalance, i.e., inner-conflict. To account for all possible reasons for such change is an impossible task. Yet one answer may lie in the area of the quality of communicative exchanges experienced by any one individual within differing periods of time. Since moods and perceptions are often determined by other's reactions to our behaviors, it would seem likely that the implications of confirming-disconfirming behaviors should not be overlooked. If one is confirmed by another, in most cases it is doubtful that negative reactions will arise. Since confirmation may be viewed as being synonymous with reinforcement, the probability of one seeking continued support of his own self-concept would be increased when self-disclosure is viewed as a means to such an end.
Being disconfirmed, on the other hand, could easily cause one to be hesitant in revealing more information to another—merely because the risk of being rejected further would be too great. It might also be posited that the source of a disconfirming response would not be associated with self-disclosing behaviors which would be honest and sharing in their intention by the receiver.

The tendency for self-disclosing behavior to be reciprocated is also quite evident in current research (see Altman, 1972; Cozby, 1973; Pearce et al., 1974). As mentioned earlier, the "dyadic effect" labeled by Jourard and Landsman (1960) reveals not only that disclosure begets disclosure, but that persons disclose most to those who disclose to them. Worthy, Gary, and Kahn (1969) suggested that the reception of information disclosed by another is rewarding, resulting in the feeling of being trusted by another. Therefore, perceived trust is shown to be a strong prerequisite for disclosing behaviors to be directed toward one another; it might also lead one to believe that the discloser is also worth of trust.

As the literature is quite extensive concerning the reciprocal aspects of self-disclosure, several further aspects need to also be specified. The types of responses elicited by an individual can be viewed as representing invitations for further exchange, based on those perceptions created by assigning meanings to those behaviors and responses of another. If levels of trust are not seen as being reciprocated, it is doubtful that perceived or actual levels of disclosure will be mutual. Relative to disconfirming responses, Pearce and Sharp (1973, p.422) state that "...transactions in which..."
disclosure is asymmetrical or hostile, aggressive, competitive relationships are not likely to be efficient, comfortable, or characterized by high levels of understanding."

Thus, one's feelings toward another's willingness or ability to disclose information in a responsible manner, are contrived in at least two ways: 1) By interacting with or observing another and experiencing his behaviors and dispositions; and 2) By reflecting upon the differences between another's behaviors as compared to your own and others you associate with. Such perceptions are a means of gauging the expected value of a future relationship, and perceived self-disclosing attributes become significant criteria when forming evaluations of other's imputed worth to one's self.

Empathic Ability

To empathize with another might simply be described as putting one's self in another's shoes and looking outward. The basis of understanding in interpersonal communication rests not only on the ability to experience the other's thoughts and feelings, but to internalize such information for the sake of more effective communication. Few things would be more damaging to a person's growth and functioning, than relying solely upon one's own perspectives when attempting to interact in any context involving the sharing of ideas and emotions.

Defined by Gief and Hogan (1972, p.280) as "...a sensitivity to the needs and values of others", they further add that the concept of empathy assumes a "major element in role-theoretical accounts of
interpersonal behavior." Few, if any, communication texts focusing upon daily human encounters disregard this facet of human behavior. It has been viewed by Gibb (1961) as a supportive behavior which helps to minimize defensiveness; by Maslow (1954, 1962) as being a personality correlate which must be present for the process of self-actualization to occur; and by Mead (1934) as the very essence of social intelligence, due to the role demands which are present when engaged in different kinds of relationships with different kinds of people.

Research in the area of empathic ability has generally been oriented toward therapist-client relationships. Effective therapists have been shown to demonstrate high levels of facilitative empathic ability, while ineffective therapists do not (Berensen and Carkhuff, 1967; Rogers, 1967; Truax, 1966). Such assessments of empathic ability have been made from the viewpoint of nonverbal behavior (Shapiro et al., 1968); therapist's perceptions (Burstein and Carkhuff, 1968); client's perceptions (McWhiter, 1973); judge's perceptions utilizing written responses (Butler and Hanson, 1973); and judge's perceptions dealing with oral empathic responses (Vesprani, 1969).

However, the concept of empathy has also been related to social interaction. Hogan and Mankin (1970) asked 32 evening college students, who were forced into interaction for one semester, to rate others according to likability. Final correlations between likability and the California Psychological Inventory empathy scale was .60. A correlation of .60 was also discovered by Hogan
and Henley (1970) when testing the relation of empathy and communication competence. Subjects were asked to describe ten abstract designs with the written descriptions. Scores were assigned to subjects according to the number of descriptions correctly identified by others. As summarized by Grief and Hogan (1972, p.281), "...relative to non-empathic people, those who are empathic may anticipate the information requirements of their listeners and guide their remarks accordingly."

Also relative to social interaction is the definition proposed by Pearce and Newton (1963), in that empathic sensitivity is indicative of

...perception and communication by resonance, by identification, by experiencing in ourselves some reflection of the emotional tone that is being experienced by the other person. (Pearce and Newton, 1963, p.52).

As noted earlier, Howard Searles (1959) suggests that one means of 'driving another crazy' is by suddenly switching from one emotional wavelength to another during a conversation. Such behavior represents only an acknowledgement of one's personal needs at the time such a response is elicited. To reflect upon the 'emotional tone' experienced by another implies a striving to direct interaction for the mutual benefit of the participants. Little empathic ability is demonstrated by allowing another to question the intent behind any type of response which is disconfirming in its effects.

In describing levels of understanding associated with empathic ability, Barret-Lennard (1962), focused upon being aware
of the other's needs at a given moment:

The extent to which one person is conscious of the immediate awareness of the other...an active process of desiring to know the full present and changing awareness of another person, of reaching out to receive his communication and meaning, and of translating his words and signs into experienced meaning that matches at least those aspects of his awareness that are most important to him at the moment. (Barret and Lennard, 1962, p.3).

Such a description would tend to foster the belief that accurate empathy requires more than just giving attention to another—it often requires being perceptive of another's level of awareness before meanings can be assigned to his behaviors in a non-distorted fashion. An empathic disposition undoubtedly heightens one's sensitivity to the expectations of others. In terms of being responsive during interaction, such sensitivity can lead to a recognition of the need to confirm other's behaviors in different situational contexts. A lack of empathic sensitivity, then, might also be manifested during interaction. The literature concerning disconfirming response styles appears to identify such an absence.

Interpersonal Attraction

From the transactional perspective, as briefly discussed earlier, the process of meaning assignation plays a dominant role when perceiving one's own and the other's behaviors. The fact that behaviors are mutually influenced in a given communicative context, suggests that the degree of attraction in a relationship will be dependent upon the perceptions held by it's participants...both toward themselves and toward one another. It is interesting
indeed to view the variable of interpersonal attraction as an indicator and regulator of relational enhancement and growth.

The work "attractive" is often used in daily life when referring to one's feelings toward another person. If a person is attracted to someone, it is used in a positive sense. If not, it usually implies varying degrees of how a person is not drawn to another for any of a number of reasons. McCroskey and McCain (1974), in summarizing their review of literature in this area, suggested that the variable of interpersonal attraction is composed of at least three dimensions: 1) a social or liking dimension; 2) a task or respect dimension; and 3) a physical or appearance dimension. This breakdown suggests that attraction is not a unidimensional construct when considering human perceptions and behaviors as they occur in different kinds of situations and relationships. As either of the three properties can add or detract from one's feelings toward another, it is important to note that their combined effects are most important when attempting to eliminate any distortion associated with this variable. Of the three, however, physical attractiveness seems to receive the most attention. In a study conducted by Walster et al., (1966), for example, in attempting to find the relationships between romantic and other aspirations, it was found that the physical appearance of a dating partner was much more important than personal attractiveness and how considerate another may be. As discussed by Wilmot (1975), attractiveness is less determined by similarity of social standing, since early stages of a relationship are more strongly affected by
appearance (Bercheid and Walster, 1966), as compared to its importance in the selection of marital partners (Duck, 1973).

Interpersonal attraction has also been discussed as being dependent upon perceived similarities in personalities. Izard (1960) posited that people tend to be attracted to one another on the basis of such similarities, mainly because friendship depends upon the communication of positive affect, and personality similarity facilitates such communication. Winch (1955) also focuses upon complementary personalities, in suggesting that behavior dictated by the needs of one person supplies the kind of responsiveness that meets the needs of the other.

The potential for further communication to occur, as well as the actual dynamics of exchange, are both relative to interpersonal attraction. Being attracted toward someone can cause communication to occur, or can be viewed as an effect of interacting with another (Berscheid and Walster, 1969). Implied is that attraction affects communication outcomes. As part of a rationale for studying the effects of interaction behavior on source credibility, homophily, and interpersonal attraction, McCroskey et al., (1974) note that all three variables have been shown to be significantly related to voluntary exposure to communication, and the processes of influence during communication exchange.

Needless to say, a wide variety of factors deem recognition in addition to those already discussed as affecting an individual's perceptions of attractiveness toward another. (See Taguiri, 1968; Lindzey and Byrne, 1968). Wilmot (1975) singled out propinquity
(physical closeness), attitude similarity, and a person's actual behaviors as being of importance in understanding better the perceptual aspects associated with dyadic attractiveness. The latter characteristic, the behaviors occurring during interaction, are of crucial significance.

As incomplete as our knowledge and understanding of another person may be, people have little choice but to assign meanings to the behaviors of others whom they might be interacting with. Naturally, things such as the type of relationship, the content being discussed, and the awareness of evaluating and judging, etc., play obvious roles in so doing. Yet, as stated by Wilmot (1975, p.11), "We humans respond to the behavior of another as if it is an index of his emotional state." In other words, people tend to act on what they perceive according to what information they feel they have to act upon.

It is highly unlikely that disconfirming responses would foster interpersonal attraction in a relationship. Although physical attraction may exist, having to work with another, or wanting to frequently interact with them on a social basis, may not occur because of their mannerisms and modes of dealing with others in different situations. As noted, such responses are relationally bound—individuals can use disconfirmation successfully if it is accepted and understood by the persons involved—however, such understanding is usually not present as people initially meet one another, or are only acquaintances. Negating another's self worth would seem to be one obvious reason for disliking another for his
behaviors projected toward one's self. To reinforce another for his ideas and actions, however, would tend to cause a feeling of liking within an atmosphere which would be supportive rather than defensive in nature. It is the creation and maintenance of this type of an atmosphere which increases the likelihood of being fully attracted toward another human being.

Summary

The study of human behavior in interpersonal relationships has been approached from a diverse number of areas. When considering these perspectives, the phenomenon of reciprocity seems to underly a large majority of theories which account for the reasons why individuals, in relation to one another, behave in certain ways in different circumstances. Progressive relational development seems to have a continual series of reciprocal patterns of behavior, whereas reciprocity does not seem to function in this fashion in relationships which are relatively stagnant or unhealthy.

Inherent in relational development are a host of communication variables which define the dynamics of interaction. For the purpose of this study, four such variables are being focused upon as being of crucial significance to the rate and degree of reciprocal growth in dyads. More specifically, as the reciprocity phenomenon has been shown to exist in past research, there exists a need to seek out those factors which accelerate or retard such development. Considering the transactional nature of human behavior, person perception also seems of utmost importance:
Since the perceptions that communicators have of others have such a major impact on the outcomes of communication, the variables effecting these perceptions are of concern to the communication theorist interested in determining how these perceptions operate in human communication systems. (McCroskey et al., 1974, p.43).

It is believed that the effects which (1) confirming and disconfirming response styles have on the variables of (2) self-disclosure, (3) empathy, and (4) interpersonal attraction are aimed toward this goal. Seeing how these variables are intermeshed in a given, communication transaction allows one to better foresee human actions and reactions as being the true core of reciprocal relational development. And, the implications lie beyond a single transaction, in terms of personal fulfillment, the attainment of goals, rational decision making, assumptions of risk, and levels of trust.

These variables were chosen because they can can and do have a major impact on a daily living basis. Much of the past research isolates these variables, e.g., disconfirming response styles have mainly been associated with schizophrenic behavior, and empathic ability has been largely studied in the therapeutic setting. This study supports the notion that it is also relevant to everyday transactions, and in line with the transactional perspective stressed in current communication theory, to test the perceptual effects which occur as these variables simultaneously cause perceptions to be created and altered in daily communication exchanges. The results of these effects are of crucial significance in light of the dynamics involved as relational partners interact.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects consisted of a total of sixty male students. The majority of subjects were Interpersonal Communication (INCO) students involved in either INCO 110 (Introduction to Communication Relationships), INCO 111 (Public Speaking), or INCO 112 (Rational Decision Making) classes. The remaining subjects were enrolled in an introductory psychology course (110). All subjects volunteered for the study after a brief explanation of the experiment was given them prior to the beginning of their classes. The experimenter's explanation specified that the study focused upon the degrees to which persons shared similar feelings concerning their daily communications with others. It is important to note that students from INCO 111 (Public Speaking) courses were used minimally, since four of the eight confederates were Graduate Teaching assistants of this course. If a confederate was paired with someone he knew (e.g., a student or acquaintance of his), the subject was excused and not used in the study.

Individual subjects were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions (fifteen subjects per group): one group in which the confederates will respond to the subjects in a personal, confirming manner; and three treatment groups, each of which involved one of
three disconfirming responses by the confederate to the subjects.

Since confirming and disconfirming response styles can be quite complex and diverse in nature, as illustrated in several of the examples in the review of literature, four basic kinds of responses were utilized. As mentioned previously, each of these four were acknowledged by Sieburg and Larson (1971).

The confirming response employed by the confederates was one of positive feeling. The three disconfirming conditions involved tangential, impervious, and interrupting response styles (see Appendix 3).

Training of the Confederates

Eight male (six graduate and two undergraduate) confederates were selectively chosen by the experimenter on the basis of their involvement and insightfulness displayed in graduate and undergraduate Interpersonal Communication classes. Each confederate was randomly assigned to one of the four response conditions using a table of random numbers, and there were two confederates in each treatment group.

An evening training session took place prior to the experiment, involving the eight confederates, the experimenter, and a number of Interpersonal Communication 110 and 111 students who were not going to participate in the experiment. The experimenter carefully explained the purpose of the study, as well as the types of responses each of the two confederates were to emit in their assigned condition. For each response, a list of example responses was used to clarify their task (see Appendix 3). Confederates thus had an
opportunity to practice their assigned response styles with InCo students brought in for this purpose.

Design

The experimental design of this study was a fixed effects randomized group design. Response styles were chosen according to interest, as well as simplicity of confederate employment. The random assignment of subjects and confederates to conditions aided in controlling for the effects of extraneous variables.

Materials

Discussion Questionnaire

Subject-confederate interaction was based on the following three-item list presented to the subjects:

1. The people I trust are most always willing to listen to the things I have to say.

2. I am usually attracted to people who seem to show attraction toward me.

3. I am hesitant to reveal feelings about myself to another unless he/she appears genuine and honest.

A specific written description of the experiment appeared as a cover page to the subject-confederate discussion items (see Appendix 4).

Dependent Variable Test Measures

The post-test only design involved the testing of perceived levels of confederate's willingness to self-disclose, empathic ability, and interpersonal attraction by the subjects. In
addition, a brief three-item questionnaire was employed concerning subjects' desires for future reciprocal exchanges with confederates.

Self-Disclosure

The most widely used instrument for assessing an individual's willingness to disclose information of himself is the Jourard self-disclosure inventory (Jourard and Lasskow, 1958). By asking respondents to indicate the degree of past disclosures to recipients (i.e., mother, father, male friend, female friend), a total score is used to represent actual self-disclosing behavior. Yet this assumption has been questioned by Baxter (1974). A factor-analytic investigation revealed that "...shorter versions of the self-disclosure inventory inadequately reflect self-disclosure as defined in the Jourard measure.", (Baxter, 1974, p.9). The reliability of the full sixty-item instrument also seems to be questionable.

Because this study focused on subject's perceptions of confederate's behaviors, the Jourard measuring forms were not appropriate. Therefore, the scales employed by Fahs and Reinhard (1973) were adapted for use. To insure reliability of measurement, all scales used in their study were factor analyzed by means of a principal components solution with varimax rotation. Although no specific statistical data were given, it is assumed that their use of these scales was based on reliable factor analytic results. Thus, the confederate was rated for degree of perceived self-disclosure on five scales (was very candid/was not candid; was very open/was not open; was very frank/was not frank; was very revealing/was not revealing; disclosed much about himself/disclosed little about himself)
involving a seven point semantic differential continuum.

Empathy

The Truax-Carkhuff (1967) Relationship Questionnaire is one of the most widely used instruments in measuring a counselor's empathy, regard, warmth, and congruence in communicative settings (Lin, 1973). Consisting of 114 items, it measures five facilitative characteristics: accurate empathy; nonpossessive warmth; genuineness; intensity; intimacy of interpersonal contact; and concreteness.

As noted by Lin (1973) this longer form not only lacks reliability and validity indices, but is found to be annoying and tedious when administered. In attempting to shorten and validate this questionnaire, Lin utilized an item-analysis procedure which was scored according to the original key (1 for true, 0 for false) (see Appendix 5). Items having correlations of .30 or less were deleted. To ascertain whether any information was lost by deleting items, the product-moment correlations were also computed for each scale. Revised empathy scores were .88. The 28 item shortened version to be used for this study, on the basis of these results, can be seen in Appendix 6.

Interpersonal Attraction

Fifteen Likert-type scales developed by McCroskey and McCain (1972) were employed to measure interpersonal attraction on three dimensions: social, physical, and task. Internal (test-retest) reliability scores of these three dimensions were r=.84, r=.86, and r=.81 respectively. The factor structure of these scales have
also been replicated across several studies (Quiggins, 1972; Wakslag, 1973; McCroskey et al., 1974). The instrument offers a seven point strongly agree/strongly disagree response field (See Appendix 7).

Tape Recordings

All subject-confederate interactions were taped by means of a recorder in full view of the participants. Discussions were played back to check confederate response styles (by means of eight naive judges), and for any additional insights.

Procedures

Conducting the Experiment

As subjects appeared for the experiment, discussion questionnaires were randomly stacked, by use of a table of random numbers, according to room numbers. Seven different rooms were utilized during the experiment: four representing each of the four interactional conditions; one for initial briefing and instructional purposes; one for post-test completion; and one for personal debriefing of the subjects.

Each subject was informed by the experimenter prior to subject-confederate interaction that the items that they would be discussing represented different ways in which their daily communications with others could be explained. More specifically, it was mentioned that the items were important because sharing similar feelings about these topics of discussion often times aids one in determining those with whom they choose to associate. For extra
incentive, subjects were asked to be as open and involved as possible during interaction.

Subjects were also informed that the student they would discuss with was assigned by a co-experimenter in yet another room, instructed in the same manner, and was already there or would be shortly. If, by chance, a subject arrived before the confederate, the confederate was instructed to act as though he too were just arriving, introduce himself, and suggest that they begin their discussion. On the other hand, if the confederate happened to be walking out of the room after a previous interaction with another subject, or felt he was being held under suspicion for any other reason by the immediate subject, he had been instructed to ask the subject if he was the person he was to interact with---implying that he had paired with the wrong person before.

After subjects had been briefed verbally concerning the orientation of the study, they were given the five discussion items, and asked to carefully read the cover to them. When completed, they were asked to go to the room designated at the top of their discussion questionnaire, and interact for ten minutes. Upon initial meeting, confederates were instructed to initiate conversation to help in eliminating any tensions which might have been present. When subject-confederate interaction terminated, directions at the bottom of their discussion list asked subjects and confederates to go to the post-test completion room. However, room numbers for confederates were fictitious, and they returned
to the room after the subject had gone to a lower floor to fill out post-tests.

The room in which initial instructions were revealed was not located near the "condition" rooms, therefore helping to minimize the chance that a subject would notice "his" partner-to-be going into another room upon his arrival. Only one room was used for post-test completion, so that each subject would assume that the confederate was performing the same task as himself in another room.

When post-tests were returned by subjects, they were asked to go to the debriefing room, where the real purpose and value of the experiment was explained to them. Because the experimenter was giving initial instructions, it was necessary for others to conduct the debriefing sessions. During debriefing, subjects were informed of the following: the response styles employed within the experiment; the dependent variables being focused upon; the need for taping interactions; and the applicative value such a study has on daily relational behaviors. Subjects were thanked nicely for their help before their departure, and asked not to reveal the purpose of the experiment to others.

Initial Selection and Training of Judges

Initially, four judges from the University of Montana were employed to analyze the tapes of the experimental conditions. They were students in a class taught by the experimenter during the winter quarter, 1975, and were asked to participate on the basis of their involvement in Interpersonal Communication 110: Introduction to Communication Relationships.
A meeting was conducted for the purpose of instructing them of their task(s). Examples of confederate response styles were given them two days prior to the meeting (see Appendix 3). All judges were naive: they were told only that they would each be identifying four different kinds of responses and levels of verbal involvement. They were not told what taped condition they would be listening to, nor was it revealed to them that each taped condition contained only one response condition.

The overall purpose of the meeting was to clarify any questions which might be raised concerning the four responses, as well as methods of identifying them. It was explained to the judges that for each interaction listened to they should: identify the responses they heard by number and type, and rate each interaction according to verbal involvement (scored on a one-to-ten basis). If unsure as to the type of response elicited, judges were further instructed to make decisions as best possible, never ignoring a response because it was hard to identify, and subsequently fail to record it.

Although this procedure seemed credible at the time, the results proved to be questionable. In short, each of the four judges was trained to listen for all response conditions, making it difficult to assess inter-rater reliability.

The following procedures were adapted as a second check on the responses elicited by confederates.

**Final Selection and Training of Judges**

The final selection and training of judges, aimed at establishing measures of inter-rater reliability, occurred during Spring
Semester, 1976, at the University of Colorado in Boulder. Judges employed in this procedure were also students of the experimenter, being enrolled in Communication 315/Discussion classes, and were also chosen according to their class involvement in the study of interpersonal communication.

Eight were employed in this analysis, and were randomly assigned to listen for a particular response so that there were two judges for each response condition. They were then trained to listen for only the response style to which they were randomly assigned, as well as rating level of verbal involvement. For example, there were two judges trained to identify confirming responses who listened to all tapes and rated the numbers of confirming responses elicited. The order in which each judge listened to the tapes was also determined by randomization.

The judges were trained at four separate meetings, with each meeting involving the (two) judges randomly assigned to each of the four conditions. And, rather than asking them to review Appendix 3 entirely, they were only given the example response styles for their assigned condition. Since each judge had only one response type to focus upon, this series of meetings entailed discussions of such responses in more depth. The experimenter and the judges practiced responding to one another as examples of the condition assigned to them. (Of course, judges were unaware of the experimental conditions in this analysis, and also were instructed to identify levels of verbal involvement).
Statistical Analyses

Four one-way analyses of variance were employed in this study. Analyses were performed on the dependent measures of interpersonal attraction, self-disclosure, and empathy, as well as an additional three-item scale concerning subject's desires for future reciprocal exchange with the confederate. Mean scores of response conditions were compared by means of a Scheffé multiple comparison process, and appropriate omega squared ($\omega^2$) calculations were computed.

Also, chi square ($\chi^2$) analyses were run between each of the (two) judges randomly assigned to assess responses in each of the four conditions. The purpose of this test was to test the independence of the judge's ratings in each condition.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Analyses of Variance

One-way analyses of variance results, as displayed in the following tables, revealed significant differences among means in each of the four response conditions. The .05 level of significance was set for all tests.

Hypothesis #1: Subject's perceptions of confederate's willingness to self-disclose will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>766.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>255.48</td>
<td>6.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2240.80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3007.25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05 level, F(3,56)=2.78

Table 1 indicates a significant F-value for the variable of self-disclosure. Three Scheffé (S) multiple comparisons were found to be significant, leading to a rejection of the null hypothesis in
their case, (requiring a value of $S=8.34$ to be significant at the .05 level): confirming v. impervious (13.66); interrupting v. impervious (10.65); and impervious v. tangential (13.67). Omega squared ($\omega^2$) calculations revealed that .21 of the variance was accounted for by the effects of the independent variables.

Hypothesis #2: Subject's perceptions of confederate's empathic awareness will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>330.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110.07</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1559.73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1889.93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level, $F(3.56)=2.78$

Two multiple comparisons were found to be significant ($S=8.34$), partially rejecting the null hypothesis: confirming v. impervious (9.07); and impervious v. tangential (8.45). The $\omega^2$ value for the empathy variable is .13.

Hypothesis #3: Subject's feelings of interpersonal attraction toward confederates will differ significantly among the reception of confirming and disconfirming response styles.
TABLE 3
EFFECTS OF RESPONSE STYLES ON INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>4333.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1444.59</td>
<td>7.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>10858.40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>193.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15192.18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level, F(3.56)=2.78
N=60

Three significant comparisons were revealed (S=8.34), two of them being quite large: confirming v. impervious (15.17); interrupting v. impervious (9.50); and impervious v. tangential (17.94). The null hypotheses was also partially rejected for these comparisons. The \( w^2 \) was also the highest among dependent variables at .24.

Mean Score Values

The computed mean (\( \bar{X} \)) scores, representing the four response conditions and each of the four dependent variables, are displayed in Table 4.
TABLE 4
MEAN (X) SCORE VALUES FOR FOUR RESPONSE CONDITIONS
AND FOUR DEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Disclosure</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Interpersonal Attraction</th>
<th>Future Reciprocal Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>12.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>64.13</td>
<td>14.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangential</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>10.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Range for Self-Disclosure Scores, 5-35.

a) High $\bar{X}$ scores for self-disclosure represents subjects perceiving confederate's willingness to disclose at a minimum.

Possible Range for Empathy Scores, 0-28.

a) High $\bar{X}$ scores for empathy represents subjects perceiving confederates as being highly emphatic.

Possible Range for Interpersonal Attraction Scores, 15-105.

a) High $\bar{X}$ scores for interpersonal attraction represents subjects being minimally attracted to confederate.

Possible Range for Future Reciprocal Exchange Scores, 3-21.

a) High $\bar{X}$ scores for future reciprocal exchange suggest that subjects have minimal desire to interact with confederate in the future.

Means scores for confirming, interrupting, and tangential response styles differ minimally across each dependent variable—except for a slight difference associated with the variable
interpersonal attraction. The impervious condition, however, has a noticeably larger $\bar{X}$ in the self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction groupings, and a much smaller $\bar{X}$ than the other three conditions as related to empathy.

Additional Dependent Measure

As noted earlier, a three-item scale was also completed by subjects concerning their desires for future reciprocal exchange with the confederates they interacted with. ANOVA results for this additional measure appear in Table 5.

### TABLE 5

**EFFECTS OF RESPONSE STYLES ON FUTURE RECIPROCAL EXCHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>282.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>5.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1009.33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1292.18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level, $F(3,56)=2.78$

$N=60$

Also revealing a significant $F$ for this study a Scheffe test resulted in only one significant comparison ($S=8.34$): confirming $v.$ impervious (13.70). An $w^2$ calculation showed that .17 of the variance was accounted for by the four response conditions.

High mean scores for future reciprocal exchange means subject has minimal desire to interact with confederate in the future.
Significant and non-significant effects for comparisons among response conditions are displayed in Table 6 below.

**TABLE 6**

**COMPOSITE TABLE FOR SCHEFFE MULTIPLE COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONSE CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal Attraction</th>
<th>Self-Disclosure</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Future Reciprocal Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirming v. Interrupting</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming v. Impervious</td>
<td>15.17*</td>
<td>13.66*</td>
<td>9.07*</td>
<td>13.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming v. Tangential</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting v. Impervious</td>
<td>9.50*</td>
<td>10.65*</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting v. Tangential</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious v. Tangential</td>
<td>17.94*</td>
<td>13.67*</td>
<td>8.45*</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S=8.34 at .05 level of significance

As depicted above, each significant Scheffe score involves the impervious condition. Both the confirming, tangential, and interrupting conditions seemed to have markedly different results on subjects' perceptions of confederates' behaviors, as compared to the impervious condition, especially on the dependent measures of interpersonal attraction and self-disclosure. Contrary to these significant differences, the confirming, tangential, and inter-
rupting conditions revealed interrelationships which were not significant by Scheffé comparison.

Tape Analyses

Eight naive judges were finally employed to analyze the experimental tapes according to types of responses, and overall verbal involvement of the interaction. Also, although they studied and discussed the specific response style assigned to them, they were not aware of the condition which they were listening to at any time. Unfortunately, however, fifteen of the total taped interactions could not be understood when played back. This was due to a warped tape and wearing out of one recorder's batteries.

A total of ten tapes were utilized during the experiment, involving forty-five subject-confederate interactions. Table 7 indicates the specific breakdown according to response conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Condition</th>
<th>Number of Taped Subject-Confederate Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangential</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is obvious, the interactions which were affected most due to tape and recorder malfunctions were the impervious and tangential
Tables 8 through 10 indicate the total assessments of all judges across all response conditions.

**TABLE 8**

**NUMBER OF CONFIRMING RESPONSES IDENTIFIED BY (TWO) JUDGES INSTRUCTED TO ASSESS ONLY CONFIRMING RESPONSES ACROSS ALL RESPONSE CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Interrupting</th>
<th>Impertinent</th>
<th>Tangential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Taped Subject-Confederate Interactions</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Confirming Responses Identified by Judges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Confirming Responses</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Confirming Responses for Each Taped Interaction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings by Judges</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square ($x^2$) between judge’s ratings=1.19 (NS).

A $x^2$ of 7.82 needed at .05 level with 3 df to be statistically significant.
As depicted in Table 8, confirming judges identified the largest number of confirming responses in the confirming condition, even though there were more interrupting interactions taped. Also, the average number of confirming responses for each interaction was highest in the condition involving a confirming confederate.

Given the manner by which judges assessed taped interactions (see previous 'Tape Analyses' section), no correlations could be computed. Therefore, chi square ($x^2$) values were employed to determine whether or not judge's assessments were independent of one another. The chi square ($x^2$) value reported above (1.19 with 3 df) is not statistically significant at the .05 level, suggesting that the confirming judges' ratings were not independent of one another.
**TABLE 9**

**NUMBER OF INTERRUPTING RESPONSES IDENTIFIED BY (TWO) JUDGES INSTRUCTED TO ASSESS ONLY INTERRUPTING RESPONSES ACROSS ALL RESPONSE CONDITIONS**

Experimental Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Interrupting</th>
<th>Impervious</th>
<th>Tangential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Taped Subject-Confederate Interactions</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interrupting Responses Identified by Judges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Interrupting Responses</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Interrupting Responses for each Taped Interaction</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square \((x^2)\) between judge's ratings=3.44 (NS).

A \(x^2\) of 7.82 needed at .05 level with 3 df to be statistically significant.

In comparison to other conditions, interrupting judges perceived the interrupting condition to involve more interrupting responses. Subsequently, this condition also has the highest average of interrupting responses per interaction. The chi square \((x^2)\) value is not significant in this case (3.44 with 3 df).
### TABLE 10
NUMBER OF IMPERVIOUS RESPONSES IDENTIFIED BY (TWO) JUDGES INSTRUCTED TO ASSESS ONLY IMPERVIOUS RESPONSES ACROSS ALL RESPONSE CONDITIONS

**Experimental Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Taped Subject-Confederate Interactions</th>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Interrupting</th>
<th>Impervious</th>
<th>Tangential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Impervious Responses for Each Taped Interaction</th>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Interrupting</th>
<th>Impervious</th>
<th>Tangential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings by Judges</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square (\(x^2\)) between judge's ratings = 4.19 (NS).

A \(x^2\) of 7.82 needed at .05 level with 3 df to be statistically significant.

As with previous two sets of judges discussed, and their assigned response styles, the impervious judges identified the greatest eliciting of impervious responses in the impervious condition. The average number of impervious responses per interaction is largest in its respective condition. There is no reported significance in the chi square (\(x^2\)) value (4.19 with 3 df).
TABLE IX

NUMBER OF TANGENTIAL RESPONSES IDENTIFIED BY (TWO) JUDGES INSTRUCTED TO ASSESS ONLY TANGENTIAL RESPONSES ACROSS ALL RESPONSE CONDITIONS

Experimental Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Interrupting</th>
<th>Impervious</th>
<th>Tangential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Taped Subject-Confederate Interactions</td>
<td>(1l4)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Tangential Responses Identified by Judges:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Tangential Responses</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Tangential Responses for Each Taped Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings by Judges</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square \((x^2)\) between judge's ratings = 2.22 (NS).

A \(x^2\) of 7.82 needed at .05 level with 3 df to be statistically significant.

Unlike the assessments made by judges of other response styles, the tangential judges identified more tangential responses in both the interrupting and confirming conditions, as compared to its own. However, this is largely due to the number of taped subject-confederate interactions in each of those two conditions. As depicted in Table 11, the average of tangential responses per interaction is
higher than in any of the preceding Tables 8-11. The chi square ($x^2$) value reveals no significant difference in judges' ratings (2.22 with 3 df).

The levels of verbal involvement between subjects and confederates was also assessed by judges. Their ratings appear below.

**TABLE 12**

JUDGES' ASSESSMENTS OF LEVELS OF (SUBJECT-CONFEDERATE) VERBAL INVOLVEMENT FOR EACH OF THE FOUR RESPONSE CONDITIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Interrupting</th>
<th>Impervious</th>
<th>Tangential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangential</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Level of Verbal</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All reported scores represent mean ($\bar{x}$) values, computed from judges' assessments of verbal involvement on a one to ten (1-10) scale.

It is interesting to note that the confirming conditions received highest ratings for levels of verbal involvement, whereas the impervious conditions generally received the lowest. This closely
parallels the results of Tables 1-4, in that the confirming and im-
pervious conditions were respectively most confirming and most
disconfirming.

Summary of Judges' Assessments of Taped Interactions

Judging consistency seemed quite high as indicated by: 1) No
statistically significant chi square ($x^2$) values between pairs of
judges' ratings assigned to the four response conditions; 2) All
judges instructed to assess response styles identified with their
respective condition strongly. This is evidenced by the highest
average numbers of responses which were identified by, for example,
confirming judges within the confirming condition.

In general, judges did not assess levels of verbal involvement
to be very high. Although there is no sense of comparison except
among response conditions, one might speculate that this may be a
result of several factors: 1) The interacting dyads were strangers
in an experimental situation; 2) The subject-confederate discussion
questionnaire may have been perceived as being of high risk;
3) Taping procedures may have added to subjects' self-consciousness.

Correlation of Dependent Measures

Although it would have been more desirable to have run a multi-
variate ANOVA on the data within this study, problems associated
with the D.E.C. 10 computer at the University of Montana prevented
it. After several months of frustration, it was decided that
attempts to adapt the BM0vl2 multivariate analysis to the design
of the study were impossible. Basically, that multivariate analysis of variance program will not process data from a one-way design. According to Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973), when a design has multiple dependent measures, it is most appropriate to use a multivariate ANOVA. In lieu of that option, univariate ANOVA's were run and Table 13 summarizes the correlations.

### TABLE 13

CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE FOUR DEPENDENT MEASURES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal Attraction</th>
<th>Self-Disclosure</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Future Reciprocal Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Attraction...</td>
<td>1.00000 (15)</td>
<td>0.25336 (15)</td>
<td>-0.76888 (15)</td>
<td>0.03561 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure...</td>
<td>1.00000 (15)</td>
<td>0.09946 (15)</td>
<td>-0.11956 (15)</td>
<td>0.19811 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy...</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00000 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Reciprocal Exchange...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00000 (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample sizes in parentheses.

Shown to be most highly correlated were the measures of interpersonal attraction and empathy (−.77), and self-disclosure and future reciprocal exchange (.50). This is of some concern since the utilization of one-way analyses of variance assumes that the dependent measures are uncorrelated. Thus, the two high correlations noted above suggest that the F-values reported in Tables 1-5 need to be
interpreted with caution. As explained by Kerlinger (1973), no interrelationships can be formulated between F-values unless a multivariate analysis was performed on the multiple dependent variables. Also, utilizing one-way ANOVAs in this study increased the probability of a Type I error. In this sense, the F-values may be over-stated in their statistical significance.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Each of the three hypotheses was only partially supported. Although one-way analyses of variance results revealed significant F-values for each of the three dependent variables (Tables 1, 2, and 3), as well as for the additional dependent measure (Table 5), Scheffe tests specified only nine of a possible twenty-four comparisons between response conditions as being significant (see Table 6). However, as depicted in Table 6, consistent comparisons were found to exist.

The impervious conditions revealed the most significant effects, as evidenced by its role in each of the nine significant comparisons. Interpersonal attraction and self-disclosure had three identical pairs of significant comparisons. Empathy revealed that confirming v. impervious and impervious v. tangential were significant, as with the two aforementioned variables, yet no significance was found in the interrupting v. impervious condition. And, comparisons associated with reciprocal exchange resulted in one significant pair, confirming v. impervious, which was also significant within the other three measures. Therefore, of the six possible comparisons for each dependent variable, three were significant as specified above.

The significant effect of the impervious condition is also
seen when analyzing the $\bar{X}$ scores for each dependent measure (refer to Table 4). As compared to other conditions, subjects rated confederates as being less willing to disclose information, less empathic, less attractive interpersonally, and the subjects had little interest in interacting with the confederates in the future.

Interestingly enough, the confirming condition—the expression of positive feeling by confederates—had almost opposite effects compared to the impervious condition. Subjects ranked confirming confederates more positively on measures of self-disclosure, empathy, and future reciprocal exchange than other response conditions. And with interpersonal attraction, only the tangential response was viewed more favorably.

Interrupting and tangential response styles, on the other hand, seem to have had quite similar effects on subject's perceptions of confederate's behaviors. Results indicate that of the three disconfirming conditions, only the impervious response style had noticeable disconfirming effects. In this light, if subjects had their statements acknowledged but experienced a change in the direction of the conversation (tangential), or an interruption (interrupting), such response styles did not necessarily affect their views of the confederate.

Other alternative explanations are plausible when interpreting the results. Within the impervious condition, comparatively fewer confirming responses were elicited. It may very well be that the greater frequency of confirming responses within the tangential and interrupting conditions minimized the disconfirming effects which
may have otherwise been present. Also, the instructions revealed to subjects prior to their interactions, i.e., 'to become as involved in the discussion as possible', may have altered their perceptions of tangential and interrupting behaviors. Rather than feeling disconfirmed, subjects may have associated such confederate behaviors as attempts to become involved in discussing the three-item list.

In this light, the impervious response may be a type of disconfirmation unlike the tangential and interrupting responses. Since little conversational involvement is associated with such a response style, it is no wonder that subjects reacted more unfavorably to such behaviors. Not only does this relate to the 'deadliness of silence' discussed in much behavioral research, but suggests that future research could benefit from a more specific taxonomy of levels of interpersonal disconfirmation. In terms of the present study, the operational definitions adapted from Sieburg and Larson (1971) could be redefined according to levels of confirming and disconfirming responses in future experimental attempts.

Also related to the response effects are judges' ratings of levels of verbal involvement across all conditions. Relatively low scores were revealed considering the one-to-ten rating scale (see Tables 8 through 11). The confirming condition received the highest overall ratings, as would seem probable given the confederates' intents to express positive feelings toward the subjects. And, a reciprocal effect seemed to have occurred in the interrupting condition, which received the next highest ratings for verbal involvement. Subjects would often respond to an interrupting response by
interrupting the confederate. Of interest, however, is that subjects did not perceive confederates' interrupting behaviors as being very disconfirming (see Tables 1-U). Their own interrupting involvement may be an underlying factor accounting for this reaction. It may very well be that subjects within this experiment, as well as partners in relationships on a daily basis, only perceive behaviors which they themselves do not engage in as being disconfirming in their effects. This strongly supports the notion that all behaviors are relationally bound, as discussed previously.

The tangential condition received ratings of verbal involvement which were next to the lowest. One interpretation of these results suggests that subjects were unsure as to how or why the confederate was responding in such ways. Subjects did not feel disconfirmed by receiving tangential responses (see Tables 1-U), nor did they seem to reciprocate with similar responses. As the tangential response involved switching the topic in another direction, subjects may have perceived the confederates as not wanting to deal with the topic at hand, but not necessarily uninvolved.

The impervious condition received the lowest ratings for verbal involvement, as would be expected. Listening to the tapes revealed that confederates were consistently impervious to the subjects' intentions, and proved to have the most disconfirming effects of subjects' perceptions. Their experiencing of consistent disconfirming responses is obvious when listening to the tapes and noting overall levels of verbal involvement in Tables 8 through 10.
One major concern relative to the reported results is the accuracy of the judges' ratings of responses. Chi square \( (x^2) \) values reported between judges' assessments in each of the four conditions (see Tables 8 through 11) were not significant. This suggests that judges' ratings were quite similar to one another across the four conditions. However, regardless of their \( x^2 \) values, one may still question the degree of subjectivity involved in such a process of response identification. Although the (two) judges in each of the four conditions revealed fairly consistent results in the numbers of responses they identified, the types of responses identified is still unknown, even though they were trained to listen for one particular kind of response (i.e., confirming, interrupting, tangential, or impervious). In each but the tangential condition, however, judges did identify the eliciting of more responses in the appropriate condition. For example, the confirming judges identified more confirming responses in the confirming condition than the three others, as did the interrupting judges in the interrupting condition. This does suggest that subjects were at least exposed to an abundance of responses inherent within the condition they were assigned to (see Tables 8-11, 'Average Number of Responses'). Consequently, the data suggest reliability (but not necessarily validity) in the judges' categorizations.

The data from the judges also suggests, however, that "spill-over" occurred across conditions. As Tables 8 through 11 specify, each of the four possible responses occurred in each condition. Each condition contained a variety of responses which jointly may
have contributed to subjects' perceptions of the confederates.

In listening to the tapes, it seemed as though there was less reciprocity between subjects and confederates in the impervious condition. The tangential and interrupting responses seemed similar to the confirming response in that subjects would often respond in a reciprocal manner to the confederates' behavior. Thus, again, such exchange may not have promoted the disconfirming results expected. These results differ partially from those suggested by Sieburg and Larson (1971). They note that people find the most disconfirming response to be tangential in nature; yet most do feel an interrupting response to be less disconfirming than those which are impervious in their effects.

Watzlawick et al., (1967) advanced the notion that to disconfirm an individual is the most damaging response because it denies his existence as a person as well. It may be seen as either rejecting or not rejecting what one has to say; it simply is the refusal to engage in interaction. This is definitely what an impervious response style seems to do—since verbal and non-verbal recognition is at such a minimum. Also, Haley (1959) suggests that there are at least two levels to all communication: the direct communication, and the qualification of that communication by tone of voice, gestures, behavior, etc. If both levels are 'disqualified' (Sluzki, 1967), it becomes a prominent form of the well-known double-bind hypothesis (see Bateson, et al., 1956). The effects can be quite damaging. Ruesch (1958) discusses the fact that experiencing such failure in communication can lead one to question his own feelings.
and emotions—possibly accounting for the lack of reciprocity evident when tapes of the impervious condition were played back. And, as mentioned earlier, the fact that subjects ranked confederates employing impervious behaviors in the most negative fashion supports this notion.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Methodologically speaking, several suggestions seem relevant. First of all, if confederates are to be employed in eliciting varying types of confirming and disconfirming responses, their training is essential to the validity of the experiment. Confederates should extensively study the feedback conditions in which they will be involved, listen to their response mannerisms, and, if possible, view their behaviors on videotape. This study revealed that it is by no means an easy task for an individual to consistently engage in either confirming or disconfirming behaviors when interacting with subjects. The difference between a tangential and an impervious response, for example, may be minimal unless confederates are well aware of the intended effects of such communicative styles, and able to apply them adequately in interactive settings. The same rationale can be applied to the training and employment of judges analyzing tape recordings and identifying types of response styles. Using confederates and judges in previously specified ways within this experiment has led to questionable interpretations of the data.

Second, it is suggested that subject-confederate discussion items be non-intimate in content. Due to the experimental setting itself, it is believed that items concerning relevant social issues
or questions with low risk value be employed. Subject-confederate interaction may easily have been constrained within certain situations of this study. When two strangers not only meet for the first time, but are expected to discuss items which may be taken personally, a ten minute discussion period may have caused greater degrees of tension than was conducive to the interactions expected. Also, the selection of discussion topics might have had an impact on the effects found. For example, impervious responses may be distressing when discussing an intimate but not a non-intimate topic.

Also, as discussed in the results section, a multivariate ANOVA is preferrable when multiple dependent measures are utilized.

Future research on relational development is faced with a host of viable alternatives. One such alternative is associated with the tendency for past research to view variables such as self-disclosure in a positive light only. As a result, it has attained what Miller and Steinberg (1975) refer to as "God word status", with disclosure being universally and unconditionally associated with fulfilling social relationships. It is obvious that in so doing, several important factors are overlooked: for example, the negative consequences, both personal and relational in nature, which disclosing behaviors may initiate; the underlying intents held by the participants of disclosing encounters, which may often lead to manipulation of the other for the sake of enhancing one's self at their expense. And, in very realistic terms, the fact that consequences which appear immediately positive, as a result of reciprocal disclosure, may have extended paradoxical results.
Such can also be the case with confirming behaviors as discussed by Sieburg and Larson (1971). Even though one responds in a manner which makes another feel good about himself, the source of the message may be behaving in a manner which increases the likelihood that he will receive what he wishes from the other. Naturally, this is not always damaging. The needs of inclusion, affection, and control, as posited by Schutz (1968), and the normality of behaving in ways which cause others to react in a positive way to our own self-concept (see Wilmot, 1973), leads to the assumption that we all gauge our behaviors accordingly. However, when such behaviors promote relational imbalance, implying consistent demands experienced by dyadic partners to resolve their conflicting feelings, alternative means of relating to one another become alluring—and in some cases a necessity, if relational termination is to be avoided.

Also related is the notion that the eliciting of disconfirming behaviors is undoubtedly a result of one's need fulfillment in any relational context. For example, an individual may feel a need to gain attention which he may not otherwise receive. Or, he may respond in an impervious manner toward others because he does not feel included.

Acknowledging that an individual's intents may be only to accomplish his goals, rather than being concerned with mutuality of influence, has interesting implications when considering the phenomenon of reciprocal exchange. For example, if person A projects himself in a manner which leads person B to reinforce his chosen identity, negative manipulation may become inherent. In this case, reciprocalness
may not be desirable for A. If A becomes accustomed to affecting rather than being affected by B, his 'payoff' may not be associated with a disclosure-begets-disclosure process. Instead, A may become fulfilled by engaging in one way influence, rather than relying upon mutually effective relationships and/or social environments. This sheds particular light upon the need to consider subject's perceptions of confederate's intents in future studies. Supporting the notion adapted from theories of attribution by Lowe and Goldstein (1970), assessments of intent actually become more important in relational development than the actual behaviors which occur.

Focusing upon behaviors which are relationally-bound also seems fruitful for future research. As noted earlier in this analysis, behaviors which may be disconfirming in one's relationship with another may be confirming, i.e., accepted and understood, in yet another relationship. In essence, relational definitions held by participants seem to be of crucial significance. As discussed by Beach and Wilmot (1975), such definitions can be both verbal and non-verbal: revealing one's intentions in either manner represents the relational definition as a major factor in determining the behavioral outcomes of a given exchange. Any message tactic selected in a given relationship, therefore, can be seen as a revelation of how one individual personally reacts to another. Future investigations could focus on the degree to which individuals are sensitive to confirming and disconfirming cues in contexts which differ in degrees of intimacy.
One perspective being discussed thus far, that of viewing elicited behaviors as being strategic in nature, can also have marked effects on the variables of interpersonal attraction and one's empathic ability: Are manipulative behaviors employed more frequently in social, physical, or task oriented environments?; How is this related to one's overall feeling of attraction to another?; Is one more attracted to another whom he can or cannot manipulate?; Why?; Is the more empathic individual in a better position to manipulate others due mainly to his understanding of the reasons for their behaviors?; Does low empathic ability imply minimal or maximum vulnerability to other's disclosing behaviors?; To what degree do 'professional helpers' manipulate their clients in constructive or destructive ways, according to their knowledge of interpersonal processes?

For example, yet other possibilities exist for studying confirming and disconfirming response styles. The study of small group behavior, both from a task and a socio-emotional perspective, might also benefit by employing confirming and disconfirming response identification procedures. Interesting results could be revealed if small group members identified and rank ordered other group members on a confirming-disconfirming continuum. Group processes may change radically over time in terms of the utilization of such behaviors in a wide variety of situations. Also, it would be interesting to discover what types of confirming and disconfirming behaviors are associated with different roles assumed in group contexts, e.g., leader and tension reliever.
And, the effects of verbal-non-verbal behaviors within social settings would seem to have marked effects in reinforcing confirming and disconfirming actions. In this study, for example, a confederate may have unknowingly disconfirmed a display of positive feelings with his non-verbal reactions. And, since an impervious condition involved minimal non-verbal recognition, it would be helpful if different types of non-verbal disconfirmation could be identified, and possibly utilized, in an experimental condition.

It is also believed that this study does have meaningful heuristic value, due to its applicative value to the dynamics of everyday life. People confirm and disconfirm others in a wide variety of fashions, affecting and affected not only by personal and relational development, but by the variables of interpersonal attraction, self-disclosure, and empathy as well. In addition, they must be perceptive enough to choose those who not only wish to feel good about themselves, but who can also reinforce chosen other's views of self. Yet, accomplishing these goals requires more than being socially perceptive: it demands being sensitive to the needs and desires of others, as a means of insuring one's own fulfillment. Surely, the roles which confirming and disconfirming responses play are of major importance within daily interpersonal relationships.

Although the basis of this particular study—the eliciting of types of responses by confederates, and the subsequent identification of these responses by judges—may lead one to carefully interpret results rendered, the conceptual rationale provided is less susceptible to criticism. It seems to be the task of researchers
of human communicative behavior to establish reliable procedures for assessing the process nature of relational development. In so doing, attention must be given to the mutual assignations of meaning which arise between persons as they both elicit and receive confirming and disconfirming responses. As all behaviors and meanings are relationally and contextually bound, even further problems exist when considering the effects of findings generated in experimental settings.

Thus, the more knowledge gained from attempts such as this study, the more obvious it becomes that we too often describe human behavior as it is researched, rather than more accurately describing relational dynamics. The paradox in this statement, however, is that any experimental attempt to describe natural phenomenon is vulnerable to criticism. As noted by Howes (1976), Nofsinger (1976), and Phillipsen (1976), however, naturalistic methodologies may complement understandings of the methods people use to construct and interpret their social realities. One basic assumption suggests that researchers too often believe that their accounts of other's behaviors are more accurate than those made by the people themselves. Thus, the naturalistic perspective focuses on how social actors, acting in normal capacities—rather, social actors acting as social scientists—accomplish their daily lives. This reinforces the orientation that 'doing' social science constitutes a different social world than social actors 'doing' their daily lives. As discussed specifically by Howes (1976), naturalists begin with what social actors do and how they do it. Research problems, then, are
formulated from the perspective of the social actors, and in the
terms they use to account for their actions.

In short, traditional research too often relies upon past theory
building and conceptual schemes to determine what is 'datum'. Nat­
uralistic researchers, on the other hand, are interested in identi­
\[\text{fying the logics of the people being observed. This is not meant to imply that all behavioral research is by any means worthless.}\]
Rather, an integration of research methodologies may serve to
compliment more accurate understandings of human behavior. It is
toward this end that the true value of confirming and disconfirming
responses, and the effects they have on relational maintenance and
progression, can be better foreseen.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

It was the intent of this study to measure the effects of confirming and disconfirming response styles on subjects' perceptions of confederates' behaviors. Underlying conceptualizations suggested that relational (dyadic) development is largely dependent upon the degree to which the participants reinforce (confirm) or negate (disconfirm) one another's views of self. The dependent measures of self-disclosure, empathy, and interpersonal attraction were chosen because of their inherent roles as they affect and are affected by relational partners.

It was assumed that how an individual responds to another predisposes the other to draw inferences about his behavior. In addition, one may question his own view of self as a result of assigning positive and/or negative meanings to specific responses of the other. The purpose of the experimental design employed within this study was to create a situation whereby such meaning assignations would not only arise, but could be assessed by post-test measures. The problems associated with such a procedure are indeed numerous. For example, training confederates to elicit consistent and appropriate responses in an experimental setting is by no means an easy task. In fact, it may be that individuals cannot be trained in such a manner. Given the uniqueness of each subject-confederate interaction, it would seem likely that responses would be altered
accordingly. If this was the case, it is not possible to compare results across response conditions and hope to obtain very reliable results. Not only may confederate responses have changed, but judges' interpretations of these responses may likewise have been affected. Also, training judges to identify types of responses without the use of videotape and/or some other means other than solely listening to tapes, is less than ideal.

In light of the above qualification, the results of this study nevertheless seem to be of heuristic value. Numerous explanations were provided in accounting for: 1) the significant effect of impervious response condition, as it was the only disconfirming response style which had noticeable disconfirming effects; 2) the near opposite effects of the confirming as compared to the impervious response condition; 3) the rather 'neutral' effects of the tangential and interrupting response styles; 4) levels of verbal involvement and reciprocal influences during subject-confederate interactions; and 5) accuracy of the judges' ratings of responses.

The implications of this study for future research seem quite diverse in scope. Both methodological and procedural aspects were discussed. It was suggested that variables such as self-disclosure, as well as types of confirming and disconfirming response styles, be viewed according to participants' needs and intents in relationally-bound contexts. Inherent in such perspectives is the phenomenon of relational manipulation. Finally, the purposes of naturalistic methodologies were described in relation to affecting future behavioral studies.
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FIGURE 1. LEARY INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

FIGURE 1. Classification of Interpersonal Behavior into Sixteen Mechanisms or Reflexes. Each of the sixteen interpersonal variables is illustrated by sample behaviors. The inner circle presents illustrations of adaptive reflexes, e.g., for the variable A, manage. The center ring indicates the type of behavior that this interpersonal reflex tends to "pull" from the other one. Thus we see that the person who uses the reflex A tends to provoke others to ‘obedience’, etc. These findings involve two-way interpersonal phenomena (what the subject does and what the ‘Other’ does back) and are therefore less reliable than the other interpersonal codes presented in this figure. The next circle illustrates extreme or rigid reflexes, e.g., dominates. The perimeter of the circle is divided into eight general categories employed in interpersonal diagnosis. Each category has a moderate (adaptive) and an extreme (pathological) intensity, e.g., Managerial-Autocratic.

APPENDIX 2

RECIPROCITY OF DISCLOSURE AS A FUNCTION OF
TOPICAL INTIMACY AND STAGE OF A SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP
Reciprocity of disclosure as a function of topical intimacy and stage of a social relationship

APPENDIX 3

EXAMPLES OF CONFEDERATE

CONFIRMING–DISCONFIRMING RESPONSE STYLES
Appendix 3

Examples of Confederate Response Styles

**Confirmation:** Behaviors which cause another to value himself more.

A. Positive Feeling: Expression of positive feeling to what an individual has just said.

**Example 1**

Subject: I really have to feel good about a person before I reveal things about myself.

Confederate: Me, too. I believe that's a good attitude for a person to have.

**Example 2**

Subject: I try not to rule out the possibility of getting to know a person I am not attracted to at the moment.

Confederate: It's really good to hear someone say that.

---

**Disconfirmation:** Behaviors which cause another to value himself less.

A. Tangential Response: Acknowledging what a person has said, but quickly shifting the direction of the conversation.

**Example 1**

Subject: I guess people see me as being hesitant and withdrawn when it comes to talking about myself. Are you that way?

Confederate: Sometimes. Do you know what time it is?

**Example 2**

Subject: How others see me bothers me sometimes.

Confederate: Ya... Say, what's the name of that girl I saw you having lunch with today?

B. Impervious Response: Offering the subject no verbal, and minimal nonverbal recognition. This implies that the confederate's behaviors will not be oriented toward the subject's needs.
Example 1

Subject: I find that it really bothers me when a person is not listening to things I say....especially when I feel them to be important.

Confederate: No verbal response. Facial expressions are not aroused by subject's message. Confederate may hesitate, and begin discussing his feelings about the topic being discussed. However, no recognition is given in direct response to the subject's ideas.

C. Interrupting Response: Cuts subject off before he has made his point; subject is not allowed to finish the statements he makes relative to the relationship items being discussed.

Example 1

Subject: I know a person who always...

Confederate: The other night a friend and I were talking about the same thing.

Example 2

Subject: I used to feel that...

Confederate: I don't see myself as being that way anymore either.
APPENDIX 4

COVER PAGE TO

SUBJECT-CONFEDERATE DISCUSSION QUESTIONNAIRE
Daily living, especially in an academic environment, allows an individual to experience many different kinds of people. And, since each of us has certain likes and dislikes, it is natural to frequently associate with those whom we perceive as being similar to us in some way. The similarities may include such things as major areas of study, recreational interests, or even participating in social events, such as going to bars and concerts.

On the other hand, having the same class with another, or even living on the same dorm floor or in the same neighborhood, can also provide situations where people can and do interact with one another—even though it may be more a result of the situation rather than actually being attracted to someone.

It also seems interesting that many people share similar feelings concerning their daily communications with others. The items you are being asked to discuss with another person represent only a few of many characteristics to consider about yourself and those you associate with. Since I am interested in any feelings you may hold about them, I would like you to know that I will be taping your conversation.

Please discuss any or all of the following as they relate to your relationships with other people. It is very important that you do so in as much detail as possible, i.e., become involved in the discussion. Feel free to mention any additional viewpoints which you may have concerning the topics for discussion listed on the following page.
APPENDIX 5

TRUAX-CARKHUFF RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

(ORIGINAL TEST)
Relationship Questionnaire (and Scoring Key)

People feel differently about some people than they do about others. There are a number of statements below that describe a variety of ways that one person may feel about another person, or ways that one person may act toward another person. Consider each statement carefully and decide whether it is true or false when applied to your present relationship with a particular person. If the statement seems to be mostly true, mark it true; if it is mostly not true, then mark it false.

1. He seems to hold things back, rather than tell me what he really thinks.
2. He understands my words but does not know what I feel.
3. He understands me.
4. He understands exactly how I see things.
5. He is often disappointed in me.
6. He seems to like me no matter what I say.
7. He is interested in me.
8. He may understand me but he does not know how I feel.
9. Sometimes he seems interested in me while other times he doesn't seem to care about me.
10. He often misunderstands what I am trying to say.
11. He is almost always very concerned about me.
12. Sometimes I feel that what he says to me is very different from the way he really feels.
13. He is a person you can really trust.
14. Sometimes he will argue with me just to prove he is right.
15. Sometimes he seems to be uncomfortable with me, but we go on and pay no attention to it.
16. Some things I say seem to upset him.
17. He can read me like a book.
18. He is usually not very interested in what I have to say.
19. He feels indifferent about me.
20. He acts too professional.
21. I am just another student to him.
22. I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me.
23. He ignores some of my feelings.
24. He likes to be with me.
25. He knows more about me than I do about myself.

Accurate Empathy
Nonpossession Warmth
Genuineness
Overall Therapeutic Relationship and Intimacy and Intercultural
Conscientious

---

26. Sometimes he is so much "with me" in my feelings, that I am not at all interested by his presence.
27. I can usually count on him to tell me what he really thinks or feels.
28. He appreciates me.
29. He sure makes me think hard about myself.
30. I feel that he is being genuine with me.
31. Even when I cannot say quite what I mean, he knows how I feel.
32. He usually helps me to know how I am feeling by putting my feelings into words for me.
33. He seems like a very cold person.
34. He must understand me, but I often think he is wrong.
35. I feel that he really thinks I am worthwhile.
36. Even if I were to criticize him, he would still like me.
37. He likes me better when I agree with him.
38. He seems to follow almost every feeling I have while I am with him.
39. He usually uses just the right words when he tries to understand how I am feeling.
40. If it were not for him I would probably never be forced to think about some of the things that trouble me.
41. He pretends that he likes me more than he really does.
42. He really listens to everything I say.
43. Sometimes he seems to be putting up a professional front.
44. Sometimes he is so much "with me" that with only the slightest hint he is able to accurately read more of my deepest feelings.
45. I feel safer with him than I do with almost any other person.
46. His voice usually sounds very serious.
47. I often cannot understand what he is trying to tell me.
48. Sometimes he says "pulls back" and sometimes he says, "I am afraid of him.
49. He seems to pressure me to talk about things that are important to me.
He tells me things that he does not mean.
He often does not seem to be genuinely himself.
He is a very sincere person.
With him I feel more free to really be myself then when with almost anyone else I know.
He sometimes pretends to understand me, when he really does not.
He usually says exactly what I mean, sometimes even before I finish saying it.
He keeps me at the way I am even though he wants me to be better.
Whenever I am talking about "good" or "bad" feelings seems to make no real difference in the way he feels toward me.
In many of our talks I feel that he pushes me to talk about things that are upsetting.
He often got me into talking about some of my deepest feelings.
He usually makes me work hard at knowing myself.
Sometimes I feel like going to sleep while I am talking with him.
He is curious about what makes me act like I do, but he is not really interested in me.
He sometimes understands me so that he knows what I am feeling even when I am hiding my feelings.
I sometimes feel safe enough with him to really say how I feel.
I feel that I can trust him more than anyone else I know.
Whenever I talk about it along with him.
He helps me know myself better by sometimes pointing to feelings within me that I had been unaware of.
He seems like a real person, instead of just a teacher.
I can learn a lot about myself from talking with him.
In spite of all he knows about me, he seems to treat my feelings about what is right and wrong very.
Sometimes he is upset when I see him but he tries to hide it.

Central Therapeutic Ingredients: Theoretic Convergence

Relationship Questionnaire (and Scoring Key) (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Nonpossive Warming</th>
<th>Graciousness</th>
<th>Overall Therapeutic Relationship</th>
<th>Intimacy and Intimacy of Interpersonal Contact</th>
<th>Concreteness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70. When he sees me he seems to be &quot;just doing a job.&quot;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. In spite of the bad things that he knows about me, he seems to still like me.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. I sometimes get the feeling that for him the most important thing is that I should really like him.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. There is something about the way he reacts to what I tell him that makes me uncertain whether he can keep my confidence to himself.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. He gives me so much advice I sometimes think he's trying to live my life for me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. He never knows when to stop talking about something which is not very meaningful to me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. He sometimes cuts me off abruptly just when I am leading up to something very important to me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. He frequently acts so restless that I get the feeling he can hardly wait for the day to end.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. There are lots of things I could tell him, but I am not sure how he would react to them, so I keep them to myself.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. He constantly reminds me that we are friends though I have a feeling that he drags this into the conversation.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. He sometimes tries to make a joke out of something I feel really upset about.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. He is sometimes so rude I only accept it because he is supposed to be helping me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Sometimes he seems to be playing &quot;cat and mouse&quot; with me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. He often points out what a lot of help he is giving me even though it doesn't feel like it to me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. It is hard to feel comfortable with him because he sometimes seems to be trying out some new theory on me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. He's got a job to do and does it. That's the only reason he doesn't tell me off.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. If I had a chance to study under a different instructor, I would.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. He is always relaxed, I don't think anything could get him excited.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. I don't think he has ever smiled.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. He is always the same.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship Questionnaire (and Scoring Key) (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accurate Empathy</th>
<th>Nonpaternal Warmth</th>
<th>Overall Therapeutic Relationship</th>
<th>Intimacy and Intimacy of Interpersonal Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Usually I can lie to him and he never knows the difference.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>He says he likes me, but he doesn't like the things I talk about.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>I don't think he really cares if I live or die.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>He doesn't like me as a person, but continues to see me as a student anyway.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>I think he is dumb.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>He is all right, but I really don't trust him.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>If I make mistakes or miss a class, he really gives me trouble about it.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>He lets me talk about anything.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>He probably knows about the things that I have told him.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>I don't think he knows what is the matter with me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>He sometimes looks as worried as I feel.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>He is really a cold fish.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>There are times when I don't dare to speak, he knows how I feel.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>If I am happy or if I am sad, it makes no difference, he is always the same.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>He really wants to understand me, I can tell by the way he acts.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>He knows what it feels like to be ill.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>He must think he is God, the way he talks about things.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>He really wants to understand me, I can tell by the way he asks questions.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>He must think he is God, the way he treats me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>He really makes me talk about anything that would be uncomfortable.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>He indicates it whenever I am talking about something that really means a lot to me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>When I am talking about things that mean a great deal to me, he acts like they don't mean anything.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>I can tell by his expressions sometimes that he says things that he does not mean.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>He really wants me to act a certain way, and says so.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>There are a lot of things that I would like to talk about, but he won't let me.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>He really likes me and shows it.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall**

- **Therapeutic Relationship**
  - **Intensity of Interpersonal Contact**
    - **Overall Therapeutic Relationship**
      - **Nonpaternal Warmth**
        - **Accurate Empathy**
          - **Scoring Key**
            - **F**

**Notes:**

- There are times when he is silent for long periods, and then says things that don't have much to do with what we have been talking about.
- When he is wrong he doesn't try to hide it.
- He acts like he knows it all.
- If he had his way, he wouldn't walk across the street to see me.
- Often he makes me feel stupid the way he uses strange or big words.
- He must think life is easy the way he talks about my problems.
- You can never tell how he feels about things.
- He treats me like a person.
- He seems to be bored by a good deal of what I talk about.
- He will talk to me, but otherwise he seems pretty far away from me.
- Even though he pays attention to me, he seems to be just another person to talk with, an outsider.
- His concern about me is very obvious.
- I get the feeling that he is all wrapped up in what I tell him about myself.
APPENDIX 6

TRUAX-CARKHUFF RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

(SHORTENED VERSION)
People feel differently about some people than they do about others. There are a number of statements below that describe a variety of ways that one person may feel about another person, or ways that one person may act toward another person. Consider each statement carefully and decide whether it is true or false when applied to your discussion. If the statement seems to be mostly true, then mark it true; if it is mostly not true, mark it false.

1. He understands my words but does not know how I feel  
   T F

2. He understands me.  
   T F

3. He understands exactly how I see things.  
   T F

4. He may understand me but he does not know how I feel.  
   T F

5. He almost always seemed very concerned about me.  
   T F

6. Sometimes he argued with me just to prove he is right.  
   T F

7. He ignored some of my feelings.  
   T F

8. Even when I could not quite say what I meant, he knew how I felt.  
   T F

9. He helped me to know how I was feeling by putting my feelings into words for me.  
   T F

10. He must have understood me, but I often thought he was wrong.  
    T F

11. He seemed to follow almost every feeling I had when I was with him.  
    T F

12. He usually used just the right words when he tried to understand how I was feeling.  
    T F

13. Whatever he said usually fit right in with what I was feeling.  
    T F

14. He sometimes seemed more interested in what he himself was saying than in what I was saying.  
    T F

15. He sometimes pretended to understand me, when he really didn't.  
    T F

16. He usually knew exactly what I meant, even before I finished saying it.  
    T F
17. I can learn a lot about myself when talking with him. T F
18. When he saw me he seemed to be "just doing a job". T F
19. He never knew when to stop talking about something which was not very meaningful to me. T F
20. There were lots of things I could have told him, but I wasn't sure how he would have reacted to them, so I kept them to myself. T F
21. If I would have had a chance to talk with someone else, I would have done so. T F
22. He used the same words over and over again, till they had no real meaning for me. T F
23. Usually, I could lie to him, and he would never know the difference. T F
24. I don't think he knew whether anything was the matter with me or not. T F
25. There were times when I didn't have to speak; he knew how I felt. T F
26. He knows what it feels like to be treated impersonally. T F
27. There were times when he was silent for a short period, and then said things that didn't have much to do with what we had been talking about. T F
28. He would talk with me, but other times he felt pretty far away from me. T F
APPENDIX 7

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION SCALES
Reflect upon the discussion you just experienced. Please fill out the following scales, as accurately as possible, as related to the person whom you just interacted with.

1. I think he could be a friend of mine.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

2. It would be difficult to meet and talk with him.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

3. He just wouldn't fit into my circle of friends.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

4. We would never establish a personal relationship with each other.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

5. I would like to have a friendly chat with him.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

6. I think he is quite handsome.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

7. He is very sexy looking.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

8. I find him attractive physically.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

9. I don't like the way he looks.
   Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

10. He is somewhat ugly.
    Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________

11. He is a typical goof-off when assigned a job to do.
    Strongly Agree __________ Strongly Disagree _________
12. I have confidence in his ability to get the job done.
   Strongly Agree ___________ Strongly Disagree ___________

13. If I wanted to get things done, I could probably depend on him.
   Strongly Agree ___________ Strongly Disagree ___________

14. I couldn't get anything accomplished with him.
   Strongly Agree ___________ Strongly Disagree ___________

15. He would be a poor problem solver.
   Strongly Agree ___________ Strongly Disagree ___________