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ABSTRACT

Little critical attention has been paid to the assumptive framework underlying the dialectical perspective on close relationships. Review of communication and social psychology research suggests that: 1) individuals differ on the extent to which they desire dialectical needs, and 2) that dialectical needs and tension are communicated nonverbally. I hypothesized that in response to a confederate-manipulated interaction, people would differentially exhibit dialectical tension and needs. Statistical analyses of coded interactions and participants' self-reports of dialectical needs did not support the hypotheses. The findings indicate that people do differ on dialectical needs and behave differently in line with such differences, but not significantly so. This research provides a start to research investigating the experiential nature of dialectical tension, differences in dialectical needs, and communication.
Chapter 1

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Several models have been proposed to explain individuals’ behavior in relationships, generally, and interaction, specifically (e.g., Berger & Bradac, 1982; Brown & Levinson, 1978; Knapp, 1984; Pearce, 1976). Many of these perspectives, however, fail to recognize the dynamic, processual nature of relationships. Undoubtedly, partners vary in their needs and behavior within and between interactions, yet some theories of relationship development treat relational change as the exception, not the rule (e.g., Knapp, 1984; Levinger, 1983).

In contrast to such static relationship theories, the dialectical perspective considers change and process as fundamental to relating. Considerable evidence may be cited in support of dialectic tenets. Baxter (1994) argues frequent relational change is the product of dialectics, conceptualized as contradictory, interrelated relationship needs such as autonomy/connection, predictability/novelty, and openness/closedness that are inseparable from relationship interaction (Baxter, 1988). Scholars have found dialectics to be fundamental to relationships of varying kinds, including work associates, friends, daters, marital partners, and divorcees (Bridge & Baxter, 1992; Cupach & Metts, 1988; Graham, 1996; Hoppe & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Rawlins, 1989).

Research from the dialectical perspective has produced both a refinement in the conceptualization of dialectics, and a rich database of qualitative descriptions of dialectic tensions. Unfortunately, much less critical attention has been paid to the assumptive framework underlying this research. Careful examination of the dialectical perspective suggests that current conceptualizations of dialectical tension may not adequately capture the essence of dyads’ experience of these tensions. For example, fundamental to current dialectical theory is the notion that all individuals have constant, simultaneous needs for autonomy and connection. This proposition suggests that any individual engaged in a relationship should be experiencing constant internal confusion, tension, and frustration. However, this would not be the case for individuals who differed in need for autonomy and connection. Thus, one purpose of the current study is to determine whether dialectical tension varies in line with differences in autonomy and connection needs.

An alteration in the conceptualization of dialectical tension would revise predictions regarding individuals’ communication, as well. Nonverbal research supports
the presence of autonomy and connection needs in interaction (Burgoon & Hale, 1984, 1987; Burgoon & Newton, 1991; Coker & Burgoon, 1987). Put simply, if individuals’ current needs for autonomy and connection differ, their communication with others should differ. The communication of those with a high need for autonomy or with a high need for connection is proposed to be distinct from communication transacted by individuals who are being pulled between autonomy and connection. The latter individuals should enact communicative behavior that reveals ambivalence about wanting either connection or autonomy.

Since dialectically conceived relationships intrinsically entail partners’ management of dialectical tension, communication is particularly germane to relating (Baxter, 1994). Dialectical scholars examine participants’ communicative descriptions of their relationship for evidence of dialectics and their management. To that end, compelling evidence of dialectical tension in relationships now exists. It is clear that people are aware of the relationship between autonomy and connection and they can articulate their experiences of managing these needs (e.g., Baxter, 1990; Goldsmith, 1990; Graham, 1996; Hoppe & Ting-Toomey, 1994). Despite the evidence of dialectical tension these type of data provides, there is a relative paucity of quantitative research that attempts to discover partners’ subjective experience of dialectic tension in their interaction. Thus, a second purpose of the present investigation is to elucidate relationships between individuals’ interaction and their autonomy and connection needs.

In sum, the goals of this investigation are: 1) to propose an alternative conception of dialectical tension, and 2) to elucidate the intersection between
communication and dialectical needs during conversational interaction. In order to understand where and how dialectic research is being extended in this investigation, a thorough review of dialectic literature is necessary.

Dialectical Assumptions

The dialectic perspective is based upon several core, interrelated assumptions. Foremost of these is contradiction, as it is proposed to be fundamental to relating with others. Relationship participants require contradicting needs from relationships. Examples of these competing needs include autonomy and connection, predictability and novelty, openness and closedness, and instrumentality and affection (Baxter, 1988; Rawlins, 1989). Despite being contradictory, these “dialectics” are unified by definition (Altman et. al, 1981; Baxter, 1994). For example, from a dialectical perspective, one cannot understand “autonomy” without an understanding of “connection,” and vice versa (Montgomery, 1993). As relational partners need, by definition, both autonomy and connection, these needs coexist in relationships. The proposed result is a constant “dialectical tension” present in the relationship. For the dialectical scholar, this tension is inseparable from the relationship itself. To have a relationship is to manage the tension between dialectics.

In partners’ attempts to satisfy both contradicting needs, the poles of the dialectic fluctuate from subordination to domination (Baxter & Simon, 1993). This assumption of change in relationships is fundamental to a dialectical perspective. To the dialectical theorist, relationships necessitate change to continue (Altman et. al, 1981). Should the dialectics stop fluctuating, regardless of the position on the dialectic
continua (e.g., openness over closedness), the relationship begins to deteriorate (Baxter, 1990). Indeed, stagnation or the cessation of change is associated with relationship disengagement (Baxter, 1988; Cupach, 1992).

Baxter and Simon (1993) provide evidence of a fluctuating dialectic between autonomy and connection. Their research showed “connection behaviors” (e.g., affection displays, initiating and seeking communication, and making plans to spend time together) to be better received by partners who were experiencing autonomy than those experiencing connection. The authors argued that the positive receivers of the connection behaviors were moving from autonomy to connection, hence the positive response to connection-enhancement. These findings suggest that individuals do indeed fluctuate between the twin needs for autonomy and connection.

Since the assumed natural order of relationships is change (Montgomery, 1993), relating is proposed to be processual in nature. That relationships involve process is the third assumption undergirding dialectical research. In the dialectical view, fluctuating contradictory needs are present in all relationships at all times (Baxter, 1988). Thus, there is no goal state to which relationships strive towards or attempt to maintain. Traditional notions of “stability” and “maintenance” in relationships are momentary. That is, dialectic fluctuation in relationships is not confined to “growth” or “deterioration” phases of relationships, but is instead the defining dynamic of relating, characterizing all interaction over time.

Because relationships are processual, and are defined in terms of unified contradictions, finding or maintaining an ideal steady state is not part of relating.
(Baxter, 1994). Instead, relationships are constantly "becoming." Throughout their existence, all relationships fluctuate between constant dialectic tensions. In support of this proposition, Hoppe and Ting-Toomey (1994) observed the same dialectics present in marital relationships as those present in daters (Cupach & Metts, 1988). Rawlins (1989) documents similar fluctuation in friendships, noting that these relationships lack formal institutionalization by many societies, and thus may be especially prone to fluctuation and a process organization. Goldsmith (1990) provides additional support for the process orientation, finding that dialectics are not only constantly recurring throughout relationship progression, but also that dialectics qualitatively change with time.

Overall, relationships are considered to be interpersonal processes of change produced by the fluctuation of opposing contradictions inherent to relating (Baxter, 1988). Thus far, dialectics have been discussed as if they all have equal weight in the process of relating. Dialectic scholars have proposed that some tensions are more centrally tied to what is fundamentally involved in "being in a relationship."

**The central dialectic**

Scholars have argued that "autonomy/connection" is the main dialectic of relationships, around which the others are organized (Baxter, 1988; Cupach, 1992; Cupach & Metts, 1988; Goldsmith, 1990; Rawlins, 1983). To sustain a relationship, one can never be wholly autonomous, or the relationship ceases to exist. Conversely, too much connection inhibits the individuality required for two people to relate with one another (Baxter, 1990).
Both autonomy and connection have been put forth as fundamental needs and motivations for individuals. Connection needs have received much support in relational literature. Indeed, undergirding relational research is the assumption that partners want connection and relationships are important providers of it (Buss, 1990; Peplau & Perlman, 1982; Rudich & Vallacher, 1999). Baumeister and Leary (1995) examined the findings regarding a fundamental necessity for connection with others and people’s motivation to seek it. Their review suggests that people form relationships “readily,” and that these relationships are associated with positive emotional states (e.g., joy, happiness, contentment). Relationship participants devote much cognition to actual or potential relationship partners and, moreover, reserve more favorable and specific information processing for those with whom they share relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Fisher, 1994; Honeycutt, 1991, 1995; McDonald, & Ross, 1999). A litany of other studies can be cited to support the idea that individuals desire connection (e.g., Buss, 1990; McDonald & Ross, 1999; Peplau & Perlman, 1982, Rudich & Vallacher, 1999). Among the more impressive findings are those indicating that people who are not in close relationships have higher incidences of psychological and physical health problems (e.g., clinical depression, eating disorders, immunodeficiency, suicide) (For review, see Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Baumeister & Tice, 1990).

Although individuals clearly seek connection, evidence also exists in support of the notion that individuals seek autonomy, a need that includes concepts such as independence, self-actualization, and ego-identity (Peplau, Cochran, Rook, & Padesky, 1978). Ryan and Solky (1996) define the need for autonomy as the “fundamental
human propensity to have one’s behavior emanate from the self,” including agency, self-expression, and spontaneity. Related to self-esteem and self-efficacy, autonomy occupies a primary status in individuals’ healthy functioning (Cunningham & Antill, 1994; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; Visher & Visher, 1990). Deci and Ryan (1991) argue that autonomous behavior has negative psychological consequences if the actor does not perceive his/her own behavior as emanating from the self.

Conceived of as “privacy” or psychological separation from another, autonomy is also associated with individual mental health and appears to be a necessary component of relationship success (Altman et al., 1981; Petronio, 1991). Dialectical scholars assume that these needs are related to one another, and coexist in relationships as a dialectic tension. Individuals pursue both connection with and separation from their partners (Montgomery, 1993). Bakan (1966) described a dialectical tension between “agency” and “communion” (i.e., autonomy and connection), and argued that both are fundamental to close relationships. Cantor (1991) found evidence of needs for both autonomy and connection. Assuming that needs and goals are intimately related, she asked participants to list current personal goals in their intimate relationships. Respondents indicated that both autonomy and connection goals comprise relational “intimacy.” Indeed, Ryan and Solky (1996) contend that relationships that support one’s autonomy enhance the quality of connectedness in the relationship. Using a similar proposition, Blais, Sabourin, Boucher and Vallerand (1990) examined individuals’ perceived autonomy in relationships as a predictor of relationship satisfaction. As they predicted, perceptions of relational quality and connection are
related to self-reports of autonomy. Similarly, Hui and Villareal (1989) observed that unified yet oppositional (i.e., dialectical) needs of "self-reliance" and "interdependence" are related to affiliative, nurturant, and succorant needs, suggesting that there are dimensions of both autonomy and connection in intimate relationships.

Askham (1976) provides further evidence for individuals' twin needs for autonomy and connection. He examined how marital partners maintain an individual identity while sustaining a relational one. Despite entering relationships for connection, and realizing that the relationship provides strong social support, individuals still indicate a need to separate themselves from the relationship at times. Baxter (1990) found tensions between autonomy and connection present in 75% of partners' self-identified relationship stages. Furthermore, Hoppe and Ting-Toomey (1994) observed that couples describe this central dialectic tension using sophisticated analogies (e.g., a "taffy-pull" and a "rubber band"). Together, such findings suggest that the autonomy/connection tension is present in relationships, and that participants view it as central to relationship functioning. As further testament to the centrality of autonomy/connection, relationship participants decipher subtle mutations in dialectical tension throughout the process of relating (Goldsmith, 1990).

Partners recognize the dialectic between autonomy and connection in multiple ways within their relationships. For instance, Goldsmith (1990) identified qualitative differences in couples' expression of the autonomy/connection dialectic based on salient relationship issues. Participants discussed four significantly different variations of the autonomy/connection dialectic. For example, the fundamental decision to "get
involved” with a person was focused on the pull between autonomy and connection. Goldsmith (1990) also found that the same dialectic surfaced in partners’ desires for exclusivity in the relationship, in their negotiation of time spent together, and in decisions regarding long-term commitment. Issues of relationship development, namely increasing interdependence and exclusivity, are central to partners’ definition of the relationship and, thus, their behavior. Supporting the significance of the autonomy-connection dialectic, research outside the perspective widely recognizes the above dialectical “moments” as crucial to a relationship’s status, stage or future (e.g., Baxter, 1988; Knapp, 1984; Levinger, 1983).

Goldsmith’s (1990) study provides strong support not only for the importance of the autonomy/connection dialectic, but also for the propositions that dialectics: 1) are present throughout a relationship’s existence, and 2) drive relationship change. If autonomy/connection is a main dialectic and theme in relationships, then couples’ attempts to manage this tension should be manifest in their communication. Indeed, this notion is one of the dialectical perspective’s main tenets.

**The exigency of communication**

Bakhtin (1981), one of the foremost dialectical philosophers, proposed that the processes of combining with and separating from another (i.e., autonomy and connection) are fundamental to social interaction. These conflicting forces intersect in spoken dialogue. The “dialogue” (i.e., dyadic communication) allows the simultaneous unity of two voices, yet each of the contributors to the dialogue maintains a unique identity. Baxter (1988) stated that communication is required to manage the dialectics
that are inherent to relating with others. The coordination and management of relationship dialectics is carried out in partners’ communication with one another. As such, dialectical scholars propose that communicative interaction is where dialectic tension and fluctuations will be revealed (Altman et al., 1981; Baxter, 1994). Considerable evidence may be cited to support this proposition. Baxter and Wilmot (1983), Rawlins (1983), and VanLear (1991) all found that partners’ communication reflects fluctuations in dialectic needs.

Baxter and Wilmot (1983) had participants record interactions in a diary for a two-week period. They found that openness and closedness and autonomy and connection were related. Specifically, frequent fluctuations in openness and closedness are related to changes from connection to autonomy in developed relationships. Rawlins (1983) also observed that individuals use communication to manage their autonomy/connection dialectic. In his study, participants indicated that the use of openness to manage autonomy/connection was dependent upon the topic that was being discussed. Individuals reported some topics are to be “too sensitive” to warrant complete openness. Finally, VanLear (1991) evidenced that conversational partners exhibit cycles of “openness/closedness” in initial interactions. This communicative cycling or dialectic fluctuation occurs both within and between conversations, suggesting that fluctuation is a complex phenomenon and integral to both short and long term relationship sustenance. In other words, partners’ short-term communication is indicative of long-range dialectic movement between autonomy and connection in the relationship. Concurrently, the specific communication enacted may influence central
dialectic movement.

An investigation by Hoppe and Ting-Toomey (1994) lends further support to this notion. These researchers interviewed marital partners regarding their management of the autonomy/connection dialectic. Partners verbalized their views on the essential pull between autonomy and connection, the ways the couple managed the dialectic, and how they felt about the contradiction and its management. Specifically, respondents reported that one of the ways they managed relational autonomy and connection is through communication with their partner. Communication strategies ranged from "we always tell each other how we feel," to "constant redefinition of the relationship" through communication with each other. Couples also reported using communication to increase the level of connection in the relationship. This finding is not surprising given the popularly accepted "ideology of intimacy" (Parks, 1982) that defines "close relationships" as those with open, honest, sincere self-disclosure. As evidenced by the results of these investigations, relationship participants strategically communicate in order to manage their dialectics.

Based upon the assumption that relating is a process of managing inherent contradictions (Baxter, 1988, 1994; Rawlins, 1983, 1989), dialectical research has found that issues of autonomy and connection are important to relational growth and maintenance (Baxter, 1988; Goldsmith, 1990), satisfaction (Baxter, 1990; Cupach & Metts, 1988), and communication (Hoppe & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Rawlins, 1983).

Despite these findings, there has been very little test of the assumptions undergirding the dialectical perspective. Specifically, limited evidence can be cited in
support of the notion that there is constant tension between autonomy and connection in relationships. Dialectical scholars assume that within relationships, people have constant needs for both autonomy and connection (Baxter, 1988). Individuals in relationships, therefore, have omnipresent “dialectical tension” between contradicting, unified needs. Accepting these dialectical assumptions, all individuals experience tension between autonomy and connection at all times.

Rather than assume, as dialectical scholars do, that individuals always have a need for both autonomy and connection (e.g., Baxter, 1988; Cupach, 1992; Goldsmith, 1990; Montgomery, 1993), other scholars argue that individuals fall on a continuum of these needs (e.g., Bartholomew, 1990; Cantor & Malley, 1991; Fitzpatrick, 1977; McAdams, and Constantian, 1983). Some individuals have high needs for autonomy (and little need for connection), some have high needs for connection (with little need for autonomy), and others fall in the middle of this continuum, with needs for both autonomy and connection.

If autonomy and connection needs do vary, then the degree of dialectical tension varies as well. Moreover, the predictions from the perspective of variable dialectical needs would differ markedly from those of the dialectical perspective. For example, consider a typical scenario in which an individual decides to go out with his/her friends one Friday evening rather than spending time with a significant relationship partner. The traditional dialectical perspective expects all individuals to have needs for, and tension between, autonomy and connection in choosing one of the two options. The alternate perspective predicts that individuals who indeed have needs
for both autonomy and connection would have the greatest dialectical tension, but that those who highly needed either autonomy or connection would experience less dialectical tension than the aforementioned group. In support of this latter perspective, a number of scholars' research evidences both longitudinal and variable individual differences in autonomy and connection needs.

**Individual Differences in Autonomy and Connection Needs**

The dialectical perspective proposes that dialectical needs are intrinsically related to one another, indeed inseparable. Other scholars contend, however, that these needs are unrelated to one another. Peplau and Cochran (1982) observed that individuals' need for autonomy was not significantly related to any measure of their desired need for or current connection with relationship partners. If autonomy and connection needs differ from one another, it is possible that not all individuals experience constant dialectical tension. Research from various areas supports this notion.

For example, in an investigation of the connection between individualism-collectivism and autonomy and connection needs, Hui and Villareal (1989) found that despite regional culture (i.e., North American versus Asian), those high on collectivism have high needs for affiliation, nurturance and succorance (i.e., connection) and low need for autonomy. They conclude that individualists and collectivists are clearly distinguishable in their individual and relationship needs. Similar researchers' investigations of relationship values support the argument that people differ in their needs for autonomy and connection. Peplau and her colleagues (Peplau & Cochran,
1982, Peplau et. al., 1978; Peplau, Rubin & Hill, 1977) studied autonomy and connection values in heterosexual, gay and lesbian relationships. Importantly, this research suggests there is considerable commonality in the internal dynamics of relationships, regardless of sexual orientation. In a study of lesbian relationships, Peplau et al., (1978) revealed strong evidence of individual differences in the importance given to autonomy and connection. Their results showed that half of the participants gave great importance to one need and tended to devalue the other, and that the other half equally endorsed both. This research supports the notion of a continuum of autonomy and connection needs, where some individuals have high need for autonomy, others high need for connection, and some equally need both.

Research in the area of relationship attachment also indicates there are individual differences in autonomy and connection needs. According to the theory, individuals' experience of attachment with others influences their relationship needs and behavior (Bowlby, 1973; Collins & Read, 1994). The more positive one's experience of attachment is, the more important both autonomy and connection needs are. Individuals having various types of negative attachments require either excessive connection or autonomy in their relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Thus, individuals fall on a continuum of needs for autonomy and connection. Bartholomew (1990) proposed four attachment styles that exemplify a range of individuals' autonomy/connection needs. Some individuals highly need connection (Preoccupieds), some have high needs for autonomy (Dismissives and Fearful Avoidants), while others need degrees of both (Secures). Considerable research reveals support for these
distinctions between individuals and their relationships (e.g., Bartholomew, 1993; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Pistole, 1989). Together, these findings provide evidence of individual differences in autonomy/connection needs within relationships.

Studies also indicate that individuals seek autonomy and connection not only in previously established relationships, but in initial interactions as well. Larson and Bell (1988) predicted that people who wanted closedness—conceptually related to autonomy (Baxter & Wilmot, 1983; Hoppe & Ting-Toomey, 1994)—would be less friendly and attracted (i.e., indicating a lack of desire for connection) to their conversational partner. Indeed, observers were able to differentiate high closedness from high openness individuals based on participants’ verbal reinforcements and nonverbal tension. Additionally, individuals who behaviorally indicated a preference for closedness were as satisfied in their interactions with others as were those who indicated a preference for openness.

Other researchers indicate that individuals’ goals reflect their varying needs for connection or autonomy. By linking needs to goal-oriented behavior, Cantor and Malley (1991) propose that individuals who need autonomy should not necessarily simultaneously need connection. In support of this proposition, the authors presented data indicating that women’s connection and autonomy needs do not always coexist (Cantor & Malley, 1991). Absent from women’s self-reports of autonomy-oriented goals (e.g., career development, publishing a book), were goals that fulfilled connection needs (e.g., maintaining a fulfilling marriage, raising children). Conversely, women who reported connection goals did not indicate need for autonomous pursuits.
McAdams and Constantian (1983) found similar results. They reported individuals' need for connection was negatively associated with desires for autonomy when interacting with others.

Whether trait-like individual differences, motivations, or variable needs, the above evidence suggests that autonomy and connection needs are independent entities and that individuals do vary in their needs for autonomy and connection. This research is important because it questions the traditional conception of dialectical tension. That is, current dialectical theory maintains that all individuals have constant simultaneous needs for autonomy and connection and hence have constant dialectic tension. As seen above, however, there is evidence that individuals differ in their autonomy and connection needs.

A status change in dialectical needs (i.e., from constant to variable) results in individual differences in dialectical tension; People who have high needs for both autonomy and connection experience greater tension between the competing needs than individuals who highly need only one end of a dialectic continuum, or individuals who desire neither autonomy nor connection. This alternative notion of dialectical tension, where internal conflict between needs causes dialectical tension, is not unique. Indeed, some dialectical research suggests such a view of dialectical tension (Goldsmith, 1990). Researchers in the area of goal conflict and decision-making employ a similar notion of conflict, providing support for the logic suggested above. Relevant findings from these areas are reviewed below.
Goal Conflict and Dialectical Tension

Austin and Vancouver (1996) define goals as “internal representations of desired states” (p. 338). In a recent review of the goals literature, Austin and Vancouver draw several general conclusions that are pertinent to the discussion of dialectic needs and tension. One conclusion is that autonomy (Ryan & Solky, 1996) and connection (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) are stable motivators or goals. A second conclusion drawn by Austin and Vancouver (1996) is that goals are organized in a hierarchical or linear fashion. Austin and Vancouver’s (1996) evidence, that (a) goals are cognitions regarding desired internal needs, and (b) that these cognitions are organized hierarchically, provides the foundation for the definition of goal conflict. Because goals are hierarchical, goal conflict presides when pursuit of one goal blocks the pursuit of another (Kernan & Lord, 1990). Sanders (1987) presented a similar definition of conflict that originates from “formal opposition.” He and others theorize that goals are in conflict (i.e., formally opposed) when striving towards one goal interferes with accomplishing the other (Epstein, 1982; Pervin, 1982; Wilensky, 1983). In effect, dialectical or competing goals temporarily disable the cognitive chain of command that composes human action. Research investigating individuals’ goal conflict supports the tenet that desiring dually opposing needs results in internal conflict for individuals.

For example, Pennebaker (1985, 1990) and his colleagues (Pennebaker, Kiecolt-Glaser, & Glaser, 1988) have shown that conflict between openness and closedness results in increased autonomic arousal and psychological distress. Similar results have been obtained by King and Emmons (1990, 1991), who reported that conflict over
openness and closedness with others is related to depression, anxiety, guilt and other measures of psychological distress, even while controlling for self-reported expressiveness. Thus, whether individuals are expressive or not, if they have needs for both openness and closedness, they will experience tension produced by these competing goals. Given the established connection between openness/closedness and autonomy/connection dialectics (Baxter, 1994; Baxter and Wilmot, 1983; Hoppe and Ting-Toomey, 1992; Rawlins, 1983), these results provide compelling evidence that the juxtaposition of need for autonomy and need for connection in individuals results in conflict or tension between the desired states. In fact, Goldsmith (1990) reported that people “overwhelmingly view autonomy/connection tension as a negative and unpleasant experience” (p. 553). Moreover, Zedlow, Daugherty, and McAdams, (1988) observed that high levels of autonomy and connection motivations are associated with high levels of depression and low levels of self-esteem in individuals. Other research links individuals who have conflicting autonomy and connection needs with physiological outcomes such as obesity, cancer, and cardiovascular disease (Dixon, Heppner, & Anderson, 1991; Kreitler & Kreitler, 1990).

In contrast, individuals who only need one end of a dialectic pole may experience less tension than those who need both ends. This suggests that individuals who have a singular motivation attempt to prevent conflicting motivations from interfering with their initial goal. Scholars in the area of social cognition reveal that this is an accurate account of goal striving. In a series of studies, Kuhl (1986, 1984) and Gollwitzer (1987) found that individuals use several strategies to prevent competing
goals from interfering with one another. These strategies include adding more information to the intended goal, adding positive valence to the current intention, and ignoring any positive consequences of the opposing goal. Thus, people attempt to push their needs to one end of a dialectic pole, in order to reduce conflict. Interestingly, decision-making is founded upon this very reasoning. Investigators from this field offer additional support to the argued version of dialectical tension presented in the current study.

**Decision-making and dialectical tension**

Most decision-making literature defines "conflict" in terms of dialectical forces (e.g., Festinger, 1957, 1964; Janis & Mann, 1977; Lewin, 1948a). For example, Lewin (1948a) argued that internal conflict exists when differing forces of equal strength affect a person simultaneously. Individuals in this "approach/approach" conflict are proposed to be midway between two forces that are equally attractive, yet opposite (Lewin, 1948b). Similarly, Festinger (1957) describes conflict as being pulled in two opposite directions at once.

Students of Lewin extended this notion of conflict to decision-making behavior. Most notable are Janis and Mann (1977), who proposed a conflict model of decision-making. They argue that the relationship between decisional conflict and psychological stress is a function of unfulfilled needs. Decisional conflict is defined as simultaneous opposing tendencies within an individual to accept and reject a given course of action. According to Janis and Mann (1977), the more important the unfulfilled needs are to the decision maker, the more conflict (i.e., tension) the person experiences in making
his/her decision. As argued by the dialectical perspective, autonomy and connection needs are the most important to relationship functioning (Baxter, 1988). Thus, tension elicited from simultaneously wanting these contradictory needs is potentially high.

Strong evidence can be cited in support of tension between two equally attractive options that is subsequently reduced with acceptance of a singular alternative. This research is important to the test of simultaneous needs for autonomy and connection. If all individuals have concurrent needs for autonomy and connection, finding both alternatives equally attractive, then the traditional notion of constant dialectic tension and simultaneous needs is supported. If, however, as some evidence suggests, needs for autonomy and connection vary, then those individuals who do not find both autonomy and connection equally attractive experience less dialectical tension when deciding between options.

In support of this argument, research reveals that individuals who must choose between alternatives that are equally important but opposite take longer to decide, tend to vacillate back and forth before deciding, attempt to make one alternative more attractive than the other, and ignore information that doesn't reduce tension towards one alternative (Walster, 1964; Cohen, 1962; Janis & Mann, 1977). This is a response, scholars argue, to the tension that comes from desiring both alternatives.

Providing additional support for Janis and Mann's argument, Festinger and Walster (1964) found that 62% of individuals fluctuated between two attractive alternatives multiple times before deciding on one. Relatedly, Davidson and Kiesler (1964) reported that individuals experiencing tension prior to decision making
reevaluated their choice multiple times prior to settling upon one alternative. Finally, Jecker (1964) observed that individuals in conflict prior to a decision significantly reduced their tension with the occurrence of deciding between alternatives. Such evidence of decisional conflict provides further support for the notion that holding simultaneous conflicting needs is associated with tension, while striving towards a particular need is not. Thus, those individuals who hold each alternative as equally important and attractive should experience more tension in deciding between the options than those who highly seek only one option (Festinger, 1957, 1964; Janis & Mann, 1977).

**Differences in Dialectical Needs and Nonverbal Tension**

Examination of peoples' differing values, relationship experiences and self-actualizing goals suggests that autonomy is important to some, connection to others. Those who are in need of both autonomy and connection experience greater tension than others who need only one pole of the dialectic. This idea stands in contrast to the prediction that would be made from a traditional dialectical perspective, as individuals are proposed to have concurrent needs for, and thus constant tension between, autonomy and connection.

Work by Emmons and colleagues (Emmons, 1986; Emmons & King, 1988, 1989; Epstein, 1982) suggests that conflict between opposing needs like autonomy and connection leads to increased “rumination” or thought about alternatives. Ambivalence that is experienced when individuals have competing goals is exhibited in their communication. Specifically, because of the increased rumination required to
select satisfaction of only one need, those who have both autonomy and connection needs express more speech nonfluencies and nonverbal tension than those who currently need one end of a dialectic continuum. Individuals presented with an opportunity to enhance a dialectical need will differ in nonverbal tension due to their autonomy and connection needs. Much research supports the notion that excessive cognitive load interferes with encoding processes in the form of decreased fluency and increased nonverbal tension (e.g., Berger, Karol, & Jordan, 1989; Greene, 1984; Siegman & Feldstein, 1979).

If a scenario were presented to individuals that offered them an opportunity to enhance one end of a dialectical continuum, differences in peoples’ dialectical needs should be empirically evident in their rates of nonfluencies. Individuals who need both autonomy and connection experience the greatest dialectical tension (as evidenced by nonverbal tension and speech nonfluencies) when presented with satisfaction of only one need. To test this logic, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H1: Individuals who need both autonomy and connection (High autonomy/High connection) experience a greater increase in dialectical tension when making a relational decision to enhance connection, than individuals high on autonomy/low on connection, individuals high on connection/low on autonomy, or individuals low on both autonomy and connection.

Communication is the place where dialectical tension is revealed and managed.
According to traditional dialectical theory, communication should always evidence competing needs for autonomy and connection (Baxter, 1994; Hoppe & Ting-Toomey, 1994). Individuals’ accounts of their strategies to manage autonomy and connection support this proposition. It is clear that people are aware of the contradictory relationship between autonomy and connection and they can articulate their experiences of managing these needs (Baxter, 1990; Goldsmith, 1990; Graham, 1996). Very few studies however, have examined how competing needs are manifested in actual interaction. Typically, dialectical scholars interview relationship partners regarding their fundamental management of dialectics such as autonomy and connection. In so doing, they focus on reports of communication and, particularly, on overall strategies for handling dialectical tensions. Examining people’s competing needs as expressed in interaction, then, would add to the accumulated knowledge in extant dialectical literature.

**Differences in Dialectical Needs and Nonverbal Involvement**

As noted earlier, Hoppe and Ting-Toomey (1994) found that relationship partners report they initiate verbal communication in order to increase connection. Their data also indicated that partners express autonomy and connection needs nonverbally (e.g., signals that the other should be left alone for now). Examination of existing research reveals that individuals’ motivations toward autonomy and connection are communicated to others via nonverbal immediacy behavior. Burgoon and Hale (1984; 1987) provide strong support for the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and connection needs. In their review and analysis of nonverbal literature, they
establish that intimacy or connection is a predominant message theme found in people's nonverbal communication. In other words, people rely upon nonverbal channels to convey connection and autonomy needs.

Argyle and Dean (1965) propose that connection needs are directly related to nonverbal immediacy. Specifically, if peoples' need for affiliation is high (i.e., need for connection), then they will attempt to increase immediacy with others. If, conversely, current involvement exceeds individuals' affiliative needs, decreased involvement will be attempted. In a similar vein, Patterson (1983) argues that increased connection is manifested through increased nonverbal immediacy, and decreased connection (i.e., autonomy) manifests through decreased immediacy. People who are high on psychological distance (i.e., low on connection) have been found to send fewer nonverbal immediacy messages than those higher on immediacy (Burgoon, Pfau, Birk, & Manusov, 1987).

Despite the subtlety of nonverbal communication, people are proficient at deciphering someone who desires increased connection from one who does not. Extensive research indicates that individuals encode and decode nonverbal immediacy and nonimmediacy differently (Coker & Burgoon, 1987; Burgoon, Newton, Walther, and Baesler, 1989). For example, Coker and Burgoon (1987) showed that five nonverbal dimensions (immediacy, expressiveness, smooth interaction management, altercentrism and absence of anxiety) were associated with only high levels of nonverbal involvement. Burgoon and Hale (1988) studied individuals' perceptions of encoder immediacy. They found that high immediacy behaviors (i.e., high eye gaze,
mirrored body orientation, forward lean, and facial pleasantness) communicated high
closeness to decoders. Hale, Lundy, and Mongeau (1989) observed that as relational
intimacy increased, so too did nonverbal immediacy between partners. Additionally,
participants and observers appear to assign the same meanings to immediate and
nonimmediate behavior (Burgoon & Newton, 1991).

Clearly, encoders and decoders know the difference between immediacy and a
lack of it. Communicators also recognize relational meanings within nonverbal
immediacy. For example, highly immediate behavior from encoders means that they
desire connection with decoders. McAdams (McAdams, 1980; McAdams & Powers,
1981) argues that affiliation (i.e., connection) is a motive that individuals manifest in an
attempt to initiate and/or maintain relationships with others. McAdams' research
reveals that social actors are aware of their autonomy and connection needs, and they
alter autonomy and connection levels in line with their current needs. O'Connor and
Rosenblood (1996) provide support for this view. They found that individuals select
activities and situations that correlate with their needs for connection or autonomy. The
empirical link between autonomy and connection needs and social behavior is important
because it allows for predictions of communication based upon peoples' autonomy and
connection needs.

Scholarly research suggests that autonomy and connection needs are manifested
in nonverbal communication. Specifically, the need for autonomy is indicated by a lack
of nonverbal immediacy, whereas the need for connection is indicated by high
immediacy. Because individuals desiring both autonomy and connection are in the
middle of a continuum of needs, they should exhibit some nonverbal behaviors indicating a need for connection and others indicating a need for autonomy. This proposition differs from traditional dialectical theory in two important ways. First, it examines microscopic behaviors that occur in actual interactions as opposed to reports and descriptions of dialectics and dialectical management strategies. Second, the traditional perspective would predict that all individuals would exhibit a mixture of autonomy and connection in their communication with others. In the present study, however, it is hypothesized that:

H2: When offered an opportunity to enhance connection, individuals high on need for connection (Low autonomy/High connection) exhibit greater increase in nonverbal immediacy behaviors than all other groups (High autonomy/High connection, High autonomy/Low connection, Low autonomy/Low connection).
Chapter 2

METHOD

Overview of Procedure

Upon arrival at a designated time, I ushered participants into the laboratory where the confederate, posing as another participant in the study, was already seated and waiting. Next, I obtained voluntary consent from the participant and confederate. Then I gave both a survey containing thirty items assessing individual autonomy and connection needs and asked to rate the current importance of each need and the extent to which they were currently satisfied with each need. I explained that I would be in and out of the laboratory to ensure that they had no questions or problems with the survey, but that if they should finish while I was out, to wait there until my return whereupon the second and final survey would be administered.

At completion of the survey, the confederate initiated a scripted conversation revolving around academics, specifically regarding a class the confederate and participant reportedly had in common. At the center of this interaction was an opportunity for participants to meet connection needs. The confederate offered assistance on an upcoming project for the communication course in which the participants were currently enrolled. During this scenario, I observed the communicative behaviors of participants. The interaction between the confederate and the participant was viewed behind a one-way glass in an adjoining video recording.
room and coded “live” for nonverbal involvement and tension by trained assistants. From these observations, we tested the hypotheses that the communication of participants (i.e., communicative involvement and tension) having 1 of 4 autonomy/connection need configurations would differ in the ways and directions predicted. At a set point, I interrupted the conversation, and the participant and confederate completed several post-interaction measures. To ease the positive face threat of deliberate deception, the confederate always finished this set of measures before the participant, allowing him/her to leave before the debriefing. During debriefing, the researcher explained the specific nature of the investigation both verbally and via a written form. A second verification of voluntary informed consent was administered to participants who were then given the opportunity to obtain a copy of the results when they became available. Appendices A and B contain copies of the consent forms administered before and after the experimental interaction; all other instruments used in the current study, as well as the confederate script for the experiment, appear in Appendices C through J.

**Participants**

Undergraduate students from two communication courses at the University of Delaware were offered extra course credit for participation in this study. Life-span development research suggests that needs for autonomy and connection are particularly relevant to young adults this age (Cantor and Langston, 1989; Cantor and Zirkel, 1990). A total of 36 (32 women, 4 men) participated. Because only four men were represented in the sample, their data were removed prior to analyses. One participant knew the
confederate prior to the experiment; consequently her data was also removed from the sample. Thus, the final sample size was 31. Ages ranged from 19 to 23 years (mean=21.3). The sample was not accurately representative of ethnicity; the majority of participants classified themselves as White/Caucasian with only three falling into the Asian/Pacific and Black/African-American categories.

**Independent Variables: Need for Autonomy and Connection**

**Plano inventory of need satisfaction**

Prager and Buhrmester's Plano Inventory of Need Satisfaction (PINS) was used to obtain participants' current autonomy and connection needs (Prager & Buhrmester, 1992). Thirty items that assess autonomy and connection needs were selected from the fifty-item PINS to measure participants' autonomy and connection ratings, the independent variables in this study. Participants were instructed to make two ratings of all thirty needs: current importance of the need to them, and current satisfaction in meeting each need. Participants used a seven point Likert-type scale when making these ratings; a 1 signified not at all important (or satisfying), and a 7 signified extremely important (or satisfying). Only importance ratings were analyzed in the present study. Examples of items representing autonomy needs are, “The need to come and go as you want to,” “The need to do things on your own,” and “The need for a sense of control over your life.” Items representing connection needs include, “The need to do things with others when you want companionship,” “The need to receive affection,” and “The need to feel needed by others.”
connection were obtained by computing a mean score on the eight items comprising the autonomy variable and twelve items comprising the connection variable. Table 1 contains a list of the retained items comprising each variable.

Participants were separated into four groups based on their configurations of current needs. The groups constructed were: high autonomy, low connection (HALC); high autonomy, high connection (HAHC); low autonomy, high connection (LAHC); and low autonomy, low connection (LALC). Using the midpoint of the seven-point scale (4), cross-tabulations were computed for the four groups. This proved unproductive, as the entire sample fell into the HCHA group. Cross-tabulations were recalculated using the median of the two variables as criteria to divide the groups (6.28 for autonomy, 5.75 for connection). In order to retain as much of the sample as possible, and to ensure a maximally even distribution, cases equivalent to the median were included in the high groups of each variable before cross-tabulations were computed. The resulting groups broke down as follows: HALC n=7, HAHC n=9, LAHC n=9, LALC n=6. T-tests were run as a check of the conceptual differences between these groups. Results indicated that there was a significant difference between high and low groups for both autonomy (t = 7.36, df = 2, p< .001) and connection (t = 5.47, df = 2, p< .001).
Table 1. Autonomy and connection scale items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items composing autonomy scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The need to come and go as you want to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The need to be growing and creating a richer life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The need for a sense of control over your life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The need to feel free to make your own choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The need to do things on your own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The need to be a unique individual with a place in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The need to be independent and free.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items composing connection scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The need for emotional support when you’re feeling down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The need to participate in social functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The need to receive affection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The need to feel needed by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The need to do things with others when you want companionship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The need for tenderness and warmth from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The need for encouragement and sympathy when you’re upset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The need to have people do routine activities with you, like eating, shopping, watching TV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The need to share your meaningful experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The need to provide comfort and attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The need for advice and guidance when you’re stuck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The need to share common activities with others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Covariates

Several variables were assessed in conjunction with autonomy and connection needs in order to examine what, if any, effect they had on the relationships predicted. These variables were chosen based on their ability to offer alternative explanations for individual differences in nonverbal involvement and tension. They include Extraversion/Introversion (Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985), Interpersonal Attraction.
(McCroskey and McCain, 1974), Unwillingness to Communicate (Burgoon, 1976), and participants' current grade point average. These variables are discussed below.

**Eysenck personality questionnaire-revised**

Past research studying the personality trait of extraversion/introversion suggests that this individual difference variable is associated with nonverbal immediacy behavior. For example, extraverts display all signs of positive affect more often than introverts, including smiles, laughter, and vocal pitch changes (Ruch et al., 1991). Indeed, Ruch and colleagues have found a positive linear relationship between level of extroversion and average level of positive affect intensity. Moreover, extraversion/introversion has been found to predict personal attitudes and values, including the need for autonomy and/or connection. Specifically, Heaven (1996) and Furnham (1986) suggest extraversion/introversion is important in distinguishing those who endorse the importance of connection; they found that introverts clearly do not value connection as important, whereas extraverts do. Because extraversion/introversion has been associated with individual differences in nonverbal involvement and has been shown to distinguish those who value connection from those who value autonomy, it was included as a covariate in the present study.

Extraversion/introversion was assessed using Eysenck and Eysenck’s (1985) revised Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R). This standard self-report measure asks participants to indicate whether they agree (by circling “yes”) or disagree (by circling “no”) with adjectives and descriptions that are associated with seeking out (a) the
company of others and novel stimulation (extraversion) or (b) solitude and minimal stimulation (introversion). Sample items from the scale include, "Do you enjoy meeting new people," "Are you a talkative person," "Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions," and "Do other people think of you as rather lively?" All 23 items were used in this investigation. Participants with a high extraversion score (extraverts) would agree with items describing themselves as sociable, impulsive, carefree, active, and adaptive. Those scoring low on this personality trait (introverts) would be self-described as quiet, retiring, introspective, serious, and controlled.

Much evidence exists in support of the EPQ-R's reliability. Alphas reported by researchers in this country are consistently greater than .80, with similar results obtained by scholars in Germany, England, and Canada (Heaven, 1993; Ruch et al., 1991). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha was .81 after one item was removed ("Have people said that you sometimes act too rashly?"). Individuals' scores on this variable were computed by summing across the remaining 22 items. Appendix D contains a copy of the EPQ-R (1985).

**Interpersonal attraction**

Interpersonal attraction refers to the evaluative judgments individuals make early in relationships, especially initial interactions (Tardy, 1988). Research emphasizes the importance of attraction to the likelihood of repeated interaction (Sunnafrank, 1990). Additionally, perceptions of attraction have been associated with conversational involvement (Burgoon, Newton, Walther, & Baesler, 1989) and immediacy (Burgoon and Hale, 1989). Because the connection-enhancement
opportunity offered during the experiment was based upon a hypothetical future meeting, the possibility of attraction influencing participants' behavior seemed plausible. This, combined with findings suggesting that perceptions of attraction affect ratings of nonverbal involvement in interaction, resulted in the inclusion of interpersonal attraction as a covariate in subsequent analyses.

A modified version of McCroskey and McCain's (1974) Interpersonal Attraction Scale (IAS) was used in this investigation. The authors conceptualize attraction as multidimensional, including social attraction (liking), task attraction (dependability), and physical attraction (appearance). Because the experimental interaction took place between two females, physical attraction was thought to be less relevant. Hence, no physical attraction items were included in the current version of the IAS. Three task attraction and five social attraction items (eight in total) were combined to create the modified social attraction scale. Participants used a seven-point scale to indicate the extent to which they strongly agreed ("7") or strongly disagreed ("1") with statements about their conversational partner. Items such as, "I would recommend him/her as a work partner," and "This person would be an asset in any task situation," assessed task attraction. "He/she is easy to get along with," and "I would like to have a friendly chat with him/her" were items used to assess social attraction.

McCroskey and McCain's scale was chosen because it is generally considered appropriate for indexing general ratings of attraction that are typical of individuals in initial interactions (Tardy, 1988). Additionally, because the experimental connection opportunity involves cooperative completion of a salient task, it was important to
examine any effect task attraction had on the predicted relationship between need for connection and communicative involvement. Finally, the IAS is a reliable assessment of the dimensions it measures (previous internal reliabilities are .84 for social attraction, and .81 for task attraction). Because the scale was significantly shortened (eight items taken from the original fifteen) all items were included in the reliability assessment. This is consistent with past research (Hill and Courtright, 1981). The internal consistency of the scale, as assessed by Cronbach's alpha, was .91. The version of the IAS used in this investigation can be found in Appendix E.

**Communication reticence**

Reticence to communicate has been linked to both nonverbal tension leakage and communicative noninvolvement. Research indicates that when compared to nonreticent individuals, reticent people tend to produce more verbal nonfluencies (Daly, 1978; Freimuth, 1976; McCrosky, 1976) and display less nonverbal involvement behavior, including gaze aversion, indirect body orientation, and backward lean (Burgoon & Koper, 1984; Burgoon, Pfau, Birk & Manusov, 1987). Given such findings, it was important to include communication apprehension in the current study to determine whether it influenced any of the hypothesized relationships.

Reticence was assessed by the Unwillingness to Communicate scale (UCS) (Burgoon, 1976). This measure consists of an approach-avoidance dimension and a reward dimension. The former reflects a person's inclination to participate or avoid interaction with others, while the latter reflects the extent to which an individual finds communication to be manipulative and deceptive. The reward dimension was not
included in this investigation as it was peripheral to the principle interest, namely individuals’ approach-avoidance behavior (i.e., connection enhancement). Five items were selected from the twenty in Burgoon’s (1976) scale. Participants were asked to use a seven-point scale to rate the extent to which they agreed with statements such as, “During conversation, I prefer to talk rather than listen,” and “I talk a lot because I am not shy.” A “7” indicated strong agreement with the item whereas a “1” indicated strong disagreement.

The UCS was chosen for two reasons. First, it focuses on communication apprehension within the context of interaction instead of the more common measure of speech anxiety or fear of public speaking. Second, while communication reticence has been associated with introversion (Kelly, 1982), inclusion of a separate assessment allowed for finer distinctions between these covariates and their possible confounding effects. Alphas for the approach-avoidance dimension reported in the literature are more than sufficient, ranging from .85 to .98 (Buller & Burgoon, 1986; Burgoon & Hale, 1984). Using Cronbach’s alpha, the reliability of the scale employed in this investigation was .81. The items comprising the UCS as it was used here can be found in Appendix F.

**Participants’ grade point average (GPA)**

Students’ GPAs were also included as covariates based upon the reasonable expectation that it may influence connection behavior in the experimental task. It seemed possible that participants may have chosen to work with another, more experienced student on a class project not because they sought increased connection,
but rather because they wanted to bring up their grades in the course or their overall GPA. Students' unofficial GPAs were acquired from school records; the mean for the group was 2.79 (SD = .61).

Experimental Interaction

Confederate interaction script

Several decisions were necessary prior to construction of the interaction script. First, the type of interaction was chosen. Scholars have had success capturing dialectic needs in initial interactions (Larson and Bell, 1988; VanLear, 1991). Confederate-stranger interaction was thus selected because it offered the most control over the conversation, especially with respect to the connection-enhancement opportunity. In addition, female-female interaction was decided upon in an attempt to control for the dynamics surrounding the connection-enhancement question that might have been present between male-female interactants (i.e., implied physical attraction).

Second, the conversational topic was chosen. Because the interaction took place between two unacquainted students, academic topics were selected. Finally, the nature of the connection-enhancement opportunity had to be decided. A cooperative task (e.g., help researching a topic at the library) provided a realistic context for connection enhancement regardless of participants' current relational status (i.e., single, dating), while minimizing face threat to both confederate and participant.

The script was based upon discussion of a research paper required for completion of the course in which participants were enrolled. The premise of the conversation was that the confederate had taken the course with the current professor in
the past. The script contained approximately fifteen moves with contingencies where necessary to aid confederates when participants did not respond or needed further prompting. Five moves opened the conversation and directed the conversation toward academics, five moves focused the interaction to the constructed connection enhancement opportunity, and five composed a “closing,” with gradual changes of subject. At the beginning of the section of moves concerning the experimental connection offer, confederates disclosed that they had done well on the assignment required for the specific communication course in which participants were enrolled, but had struggled with the research aspect particularly. After solicitation of the participants’ topic and/or problems, confederates offered to help participants with the library research as they “had to go over [to the library] anyway” for another assignment.

Apparently, participants believed this interaction to be relatively “normal.” Following the interaction, participants completed a conversational typicality measure, located in Appendix G (alpha .71). Responses to these questions indicate that participants perceived the conversation as typical of interactions, in general (mean = 5.83; SD = .91). Interactions typically lasted approximately twenty minutes. The script on which the interactions were modeled is located in Appendix H.

Confederate training

To ensure naturalistic conversations, every effort was made to acquire confederates who had actually taken the course with the current professor; however, a sufficient number of confederates were needed to cover the reserved fifty hours of laboratory time. Of the four confederates, only two had taken a course with the given
professor, a third had attended lectures with the professor that covered similar course material and had a compatible major (sociology), and a fourth was enrolled in a basic communication course. All four volunteered to participate in the current research study and indicated interest in communication research.

Confederates attended a total of six hours of training: an hour long introductory session, a second session, in which mock conversations were conducted, and a final trial run where their interaction was coded live by trained assistants. In the initial session, the confederates were told the nature of the investigation but not the specific hypotheses. Topics they felt were appropriate for small talk were generated. Each confederate was given a script of the interaction, and after studying it, was given portions of the script to enact with another confederate. This concurrently gave the confederates a chance to see how the interaction would flow and introduced them to the script experientially. Discussion followed the performance of each portion of the script. Confederates were asked to memorize the interaction for the next session.

The second session began with a troubleshooting discussion, including hypothetical and realistic problems the confederates could run into (e.g., an uncooperative participant, specific information requests regarding the class, paper, or teacher, issues of academic honesty and the possibility that the participants would not have a topic for the paper yet). Confederates were then paired and asked to alternate role-playing both the participant and confederate at varying levels of participant responsiveness and difficulty. They were told not to force the connection enhancement opportunity or to appear coercive, as such behavior would nullify predictions if
participants did not freely choose to accept their offer of help. During this time, the experimenter advised confederates on their performance and answered questions. Confederates were encouraged to be as consistent as possible in their interactions with participants, always pulling tangential conversation back to the script. It was stressed that the conversational moves took priority over specific word choices.

The experimental trial run included additional practice enacting the scripted conversation in the laboratory with other uninformed research assistants acting as participants. Coaching continued throughout data gathering to ensure consistency across confederates. When necessary, confederates were asked to reexamine the script and suggestions were made on how they could improve their performance. Despite intensive training, individual differences in the confederates’ behavior may bias the relationships hypothesized. To examine a possible confederate effect, ANOVAs were conducted on the two dependent variables. A four-level (“confederate effect”) independent variable was created by dummy-coding each of the confederates as one “level” of this new variable. No significant effects due to confederates were found (tension: $F(3,22) = 2.39, p > .05$; involvement: $F(3,22) = 2.36, p > .05$).

**Dependent Variables: Nonverbal Tension and Involvement**

**Nonverbal coder training**

Seven (n=7) coders were recruited from upper level communication courses. They were randomly assigned to code for involvement or tension. Each of the two sets of coders received six hours of comprehensive training. This included (a) reviewing definitions of items designed to assess nonverbal involvement and nonverbal tension,
(b) discussing how to discern the various levels of nonverbal involvement and nonverbal tension; and (c) practicing coding on interaction videotapes unrelated to the current study.

After all coders were clear on definitions of items and their levels of distinction, a practice code was taken. Observations were compared and discussion was held regarding why ratings were coded at certain levels. This continued until a consensus could be reached regarding how that type of behavior would be rated in the future. Finally, in the trial run of the experiment, coders rated live interactions without any discussion among themselves or the principle researcher. Coder reliabilities were assessed using a series of ten (n=10) thirty-second clips of videotaped interactions. Additional training sessions were to be attended if either of the two sets of coders proved to be unreliable. This was unnecessary as resulting reliabilities (assessed by Cronbach’s alpha) were .97 for involvement raters, and .91 for tension raters.

Coding of nonfluencies and tension

Tension was assessed using the composure/arousal theme of the RCS constructed by Burgoon and Hale (1987). Two global measures of tension were combined with four specific behaviors of speech nonfluency to create the six-item scale used in the study. This was done to allow coders to make judgments of the general composure and ease of participants’ communication with the confederate, in addition to cataloguing specific nonfluency behaviors. Specific behavioral indices of tension were chosen based on past evidence regarding decoding of the relational theme of tension and past research on cognitive processing (Berger, Karol, and Jordan, 1989, Burgoon
and Newton, 1991; Burgoon, Pfau, Birk, and Manusov, 1987). They included: (a) vocal fillers (i.e., uh, urn, and, you know), (b) false starts (beginning one sentence or phrasing a sentence one way and changing the sentence or phrasing within the same speaking turn), (c) halting (silence indicating difficulty composing thoughts or words), and (d) silence (reticence; awkward silence between participant speaking turns). Global measures of participant tension included a “choppy/fluent” continuum and an “awkward/smooth” continuum (see Appendix I).

Coders of nonfluencies and tension used a Likert-type scale to assess how much tension was present, where a “1” represented very high tension for all global and specific items, and a “7” represented very low tension for all six items. Coders of nonfluencies and tension coded participants’ interaction at the same four approximate points in the interaction (see Appendix H for approximate code locations), and for the same lengths of time as indicated in the involvement coding section (all codes 30 seconds except experimental connection enhancement offer). The six items were averaged for each rating time made during the interaction.

Burgoon and Hale’s RCS (1987) was used because it examines an individual’s relational tension in the context of dyadic interaction. Past reliabilities for the composure/arousal theme range from .68 to .89. Reliability for the tension measure was computed by averaging ratings of the six tension items, creating a tension “item” scale (composed of the six summary tension ratings). Reliability, assessed by Cronbach’s alpha, was .90.
Coding of nonverbal involvement

Burgoon and Hale's (1984, 1987) Relational Communication Scale (RCS) was used to assess nonverbal involvement. Because a composite relational message theme like conversational involvement is encoded and decoded in multiple ways, both global indices and specific nonverbal behaviors were selected for rating participants' level of involvement (Burgoon, Walther, & Baesler, 1992; Burgoon and Newton, 1991; Coker and Burgoon, 1987). Two global items (involvement/uninvolvement, respondent/despondent) and three specific behaviors (eye gaze, body lean, and body orientation) were combined for a total of five items assessing nonverbal involvement (see Appendix J), this is in accordance with the RCS (Burgoon and Hale, 1987). The five items used to assess involvement were averaged to create one involvement score each time it was coded.

Participants' communication of nonverbal involvement was rated using a 7-point Likert format, with a “1” signifying low involvement for all items and a “7” signifying high involvement for all items. Ratings were made at four approximate points in the interaction script in order to maximize the chance of capturing participants actually engaging in involvement behavior, and to examine changes in involvement behavior over time (see Appendix H for code times). Coder assessments were made in short intervals (i.e., thirty seconds) to prevent excessive change within coding intervals and to ensure that the participants' past behavior did not confound current involvement estimates. An exception to this was the rating taken at the experimental connection-
enhancement opportunity. A ten-second interval was decided upon in order to get participants' initial reactions to the offer.

The RCS was chosen based upon its ability to distinguish immediate from nonimmediate behaviors, which is considered isomorphic with involvement (Burgoon and Hale, 1987; Burgoon and Newton, 1991). Previous reliabilities for the RCS composite theme of involvement range from .81 to .97 for specific behaviors and from .81 to .99 for global intimacy/involvement indices. Inter-item reliabilities were computed by averaging ratings on each of the five involvement measures. The five summary ratings were then used to create an involvement "item" scale that could be assessed for internal reliability. Cronbach's alpha showed this scale to be sufficiently reliable (alpha = .86).

**Summary**

This investigation used Prager & Buhrmester's (1992) Plano Inventory of Need Satisfaction to assess female college students' configurations of current autonomy and connection needs. Trained raters assessed women's nonverbal involvement and tension (participants' communicative indications of dialectical needs) during an initial interaction with a confederate. Measures of extraversion/introversion, social attraction, communication apprehension, and participants' grade-point average were taken to examine their effect upon predictions regarding involvement and tension. The complete list of variables included in this study--along with their means and standard deviations--appears in Table 2 found on the following page. The next chapter presents the results of the analyses performed to examine the study's hypotheses.
Table 2. Variable means and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for autonomy</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for connection</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion/introversion</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication apprehension</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ GPA</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal involvement</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal tension</td>
<td>(-).08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

RESULTS

The current project was designed to examine whether individual differences in autonomy and connection needs relate to indices of nonverbal tension and involvement. This chapter presents the results of initial analyses examining potentially confounding covariate effects, and subsequent tests of the two hypotheses posed in the study.

Analysis of Covariance

In order to examine whether any of the covariates produced confounding effects, two analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were conducted. In these analyses, each of the covariates served as independent variables (i.e., extroversion/introversion, interpersonal attraction, communication apprehension, and participants' GPA); the dependent variable in the first ANCOVA was nonverbal tension, while the dependent variable in the second ANCOVA was nonverbal involvement. No effects for any of the covariates were found in either analysis. In the ANCOVA for nonverbal tension, the following $F$ values were observed: $F(1,25)=1.50, p>.05$ for extroversion/introversion; $F(1,25)=1.37, p>.05$ for interpersonal attraction; $F(1,25)=.88, p>.05$ for communication apprehension; and $F(1,25)=.67, p>.05$ for participants' GPAs. $F$ values detected in the ANCOVA for nonverbal involvement were: $F(1,25)=2.16, p>.05$ for extroversion/introversion; $F(1,25)=.02, p>.05$ for interpersonal attraction; $F(1,25)=.45,$
p>.05 for communication apprehension; and F(1,25)=.90, p>.05 for participants’ GPAs. Given these findings, none of the covariates were included in further tests.

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that participants who had high needs for both autonomy and connection (HAHC) would exhibit the greatest increase in nonverbal tension when in a position to enhance only one need, followed by all other configurations (LALC, HALC, LAHC). Examination of the tension means showed that, as a group, individuals who had high needs for both autonomy and connection (HAHC) experienced the most nonverbal tension overall, followed by individuals who had low need for autonomy and connection (LALC), individuals who had low autonomy needs and high connection needs (LAHC) and finally, individuals who had high autonomy needs and low connection needs (HALC) (See Table 3 below).

**Table 3. Autonomy/Connection Group Global Tension Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Tension</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAHC</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>(2.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALC</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>(.42 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHC</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LALC</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>(.49 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the predicted hypothesis, a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed, with time as a within-subjects factor (code rating time 1-4),
dialectical needs configuration as a between-subjects factor (HAHC, HALC, LAHC, LALC), and nonverbal dialectical tension as the dependent variable. In contrast to the predication, the Tension x Dialectical Needs Group analysis was not significant \[ F(9, 81) = .57, p = .81 \]. Thus, the data do not support Hypothesis 1.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 investigated the relationship between nonverbal communication and individuals' needs for autonomy and connection. It was expected that individuals who had low need for autonomy and high need for connection (LAHC) would express the most nonverbal immediacy to another when presented with a connection enhancement opportunity. Individuals who had high autonomy needs and high connection needs (HAHC) will exhibit the second-highest levels, followed by individuals who had either low autonomy needs and low connection needs (LALC), or individuals who had high autonomy needs and low connection needs (HALC).

**Table 4. Autonomy/Connection Group Involvement Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Involvement</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAHC</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAHC</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LALC</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALC</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the involvement means revealed that, overall, individuals low on autonomy needs and high on connection needs (LAHC) expressed the most nonverbal involvement, followed by HAHC individuals, LALC individuals and HALC individuals involvement, respectively (See Table 4). To test the hypothesized prediction, a repeated measures ANOVA was used. Specifically, the within-subjects factor was time (code rating times 1-4), the between-subjects factor was dialectical needs configuration (HAHC, HALC, LAHC, LALC), and the dependent variable was nonverbal involvement. Contrary to the proposed hypothesis, the Involvement by Dialectical Needs Group analysis was not significant \[ F (9, 81) = 1.15, p = .33 \]. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Overall, the data reveal that (a) dialectical needs are not associated with nonverbal tension increase in a connection enhancement opportunity, and (b) that autonomy and connection needs do not alter individuals' conversational immediacy responses to a connection-enhancement opportunity. These findings require more detailed discussion. The next chapter provides additional explanation of the results and examines some of their implications. In addition, limitations of the current investigation will be discussed and directions for future research suggested.
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate dialectical tension between individuals' autonomy and connection needs and differences in their communication. To that end, the current investigation compared college students' self-reported needs for autonomy and connection with their nonverbal tension and immediacy in initial interactions. Both hypotheses were unsupported. Below is a discussion of the methodology, hypotheses and results, and some possible implications to extant research.

Methodological Explanations

This study was methodologically unique in several ways. First, it used a self-report survey assessment of individual autonomy and connection needs. This procedure allowed participants themselves to indicate how important or unimportant autonomy and connection are to them. Variability in people’s autonomy and connection needs was revealed that until now, has remained hidden in past research. The main contribution this self-assessment survey method makes to existing dialectical literature lies in its ability to associate individuals’ autonomy and connection needs with specific communication behaviors in interactions. It is hoped that future revision and replication of this project will yield data that allows scholars to make predictions regarding individuals' communication and relational outcomes.
A second difference of this study from existing literature is the examination of conversational interaction between participants, specifically their nonverbal communication, for evidence of autonomy and connection needs. The findings of the study indicate that assessments of individuals' nonverbal communication may capture needs for autonomy and connection and tension between them, given further study. This will be important as dialectics are intricately linked with communication (Baxter, 1988; Rawlins, 1989). Currently, strong evidence supports that individuals have sophisticated conceptualizations of dialectical tension (Baxter, 1990; Goldsmith, 1990; Hoppe & Ting-Toomey, 1991), however limited evidence of communicative dialectical needs and tension can be found.

**Variance in Autonomy-Connection Needs**

A core assumption of the dialectical perspective is that all individuals have constant needs for both autonomy and connection. Seminal dialectical authors propose that dialectical needs, like autonomy and connection, are conceptually inseparable and inherent to relationships (Baxter, 1988, 1994). Individuals in this study however, did vary in their levels of autonomy and connection needs, with participants falling in each of four dialectical need configurations (HAHC = 9, HALC = 7, LAHC = 9, LALC = 6). Although not a formally proposed hypothesis, this finding alone is important. By proposing that autonomy and connection needs are equally important for all individuals, traditional dialectical theory has no means to account for why there are differences between relationships or within relationships. The dialectical perspective does suggest that differing tension management strategies exist (Baxter, 1990; Hoppe & Ting-
Toomey, 1994), but these are relationally negotiated. The dialectical assumption undergirding these strategies is that there is cooperation between relational participants regarding how, when, why, and to what extent dialectics like autonomy and connection will fluctuate. Studying autonomy and connection as a solely relational concept is limiting.

By studying individuals' autonomy and connection needs and variations, scholars might examine: the effect that one partners' needs has on the others needs; the relational outcomes of partners' ill-timed needs, the role that social relationships (i.e., work colleagues, friends, family) play in meeting autonomy and connection needs; and the effect that time or stage of life has on individuals and partners' autonomy and connection. This is by no means an exhaustive list. However, it is indicative of the rich, yet divergent data that an individual approach to studying autonomy and connection needs offers in complement to a relational approach. Several examples illustrate this idea.

Evidence suggesting that all individuals do not equally value and seek both autonomy and connection offers insight into why relationships and relational outcomes differ with respect to the handling of these needs. For example, individual differences in autonomy and connection needs may account for why some partners feel jealous, while others in the same circumstance do not. Indeed, examination of both individual and relational factors that contribute to feelings of jealousy shows that when individuals are higher on connection than their partner or when individuals perceive their partners aren't connected enough (i.e., they are high on autonomy) "high" connection
individuals are more likely to experience jealousy than those who are high on autonomy (Berscheid, 1983; White, 1981). These high connection individuals may perceive more threat from competing external sources if they are not meeting their desired level of connection with their partner. In at least one instance then, individual autonomy and connection need differences may contribute to differences in relational outcomes. It is more likely than not however, these contradictory needs impact more than just this one domain of relationships.

Another promising contribution that the study of individual differences in autonomy and connection needs can make is in the area of relationship development. Irwin, Altman and Brown (1981) proposed that partners’ individual differences influence the development of relationships, yet little research examines which individual differences are important or how they affect developing relationships. Research reveals that some relationships’ developmental paths “skip” stages, encounter stages “out of order” and “cycle back” to earlier stages (Goldsmith, 1990; Surra & Houston, 1987). These inconsistencies may actually result from lack of recognition given to the effect individual partners’ needs for autonomy and connection have on relationship development.

If phases of relationships are structured around negotiating issues of individuals’ autonomy and connection needs, relationship development will likely differ qualitatively. For instance, relationships where both individuals highly need connection may develop especially quickly and skip stages entirely. Thus, one result of considering partners’ individual autonomy and connection needs in relationship development would
be stylized trajectories based upon specific dyad members rather than paths based upon a generalized conglomeration of individuals in relationships. Research into specific relational trajectories would allow for more specific theories of relationship development than are currently available. While examination of peoples' differing autonomy and connection needs and their effects show promise for relational communication, capturing dialectical needs and tensions in conversation proves more challenging.

**The Communication of Dialectical Tension and Needs**

Little evidence can be cited in support of dialectic needs or tension being manifested in conversation between people. Given the exigent status of communication in dialectical views of relating, this lack of research is surprising. Dialectical philosophy proposes that all individuals have constant needs for autonomy and connection. Given that individuals' autonomy and connection needs appear to vary, dialectical tension should alter respective to those needs. Hypothesis 1 proposed that individuals torn between autonomy and connection (high autonomy/high connection) would experience a greater increase in dialectical tension than all other groups (i.e., high autonomy/low connection, high connection/low autonomy, low autonomy/low connection) when given the opportunity to enhance only connection. This hypothesis was not supported.

A second hypothesis examined autonomy and connection changes in communication. Nonverbal research suggested that peoples' intentions are carried nonverbally, and has linked nonverbal immediacy behavior with intent or desire for
intimacy (i.e., connection). It was proposed that, in comparison with other groups, individuals with low autonomy and high connection needs would exhibit the greatest increase in nonverbal immediacy when offered a connection-enhancement opportunity. This prediction was not supported.

Globally, people with different autonomy and connection needs did behave differently. Overall group means indicated that individuals with various dialectical need configurations differed in predicted ways on nonverbal tension and involvement (See Tables 3 and 4). These results should be interpreted with caution, however, since these communicative differences were not significant. Nonetheless, they provide some evidence that the line of reasoning behind the hypothesized predictions may hold merit for future investigations. Several limitations likely contributed to the disconfirmation of Hypothesis 1 and 2. Future work should seek reparation of these limitations.

Limitations

While the present investigation did find significant differences between people based upon their reports of autonomy and connection needs, the overall sample was high in need for both autonomy and connection. Thus, the median score for autonomy and connection was used to distinguish those “high” on both dialectic needs. In addition, because some respondents fell at the median, they were included in the analysis as part of the high groups in order to prevent loss of any data. Although the above would seem to support that individuals’ autonomy and connection needs are constantly high as argued in traditional Dialectic literature, it is believed that this result, along with the disconfirmations of Hypotheses 1 and 2 are consequences of the sample
from which data was gathered. It is critically important for future replications to use a larger, more representative sample of the population.

The decision to use an initial interaction scenario was bolstered by the success of past scholars' success evidencing autonomy and connection needs there (Larson & Bell, 1988; VanLear, 1991), nonetheless, use of a feigned initial interaction was another limitation of this investigation. Relatedly, the semi-scripted topic of conversation limits the study's generalizability. Academic matters pertaining to a particular course in which participants were enrolled were selected for a conversational topic because the topic area presented an opportunity for connection-enhancement that did not violate cultural expectations of an initial interaction (e.g., the confederate asking participants out for a "date"). The use of pre-existing relationships and/or naturally occurring conversational content will improve internal and external validity in future replications.

**Summary**

The current study proposed that: 1) individuals differ in their needs for autonomy and connection, 2) dialectic tension varies according to where one falls on autonomy and connection need levels, and 3) individuals' autonomy and connection needs contribute to differences in nonverbal communication in initial interactions. The findings of this study, though limited, are heuristically fertile, potentially extending dialectical research and contributing to relationship development literature. Future research examining the essential nature of dialectical tension, individual differences in dialectical needs, and the intersection of dialectical needs/tension in interaction is needed.
APPENDIX A

Individual Needs Study (97F) – Participant Consent Form

Thank you for participating in this project. We are interested in studying individuals' needs in their relationships and the association between these needs and communication. With this in mind, we will ask you to fill out several surveys designed to assess your needs. Your responses will help us further understand needs and how people meet them. There are no "right" or wrong answers in any of these questionnaires; we are simply trying to learn more about peoples' needs. During this time, your behavior will be videotaped. Any video recordings will be viewed only by authorized members of the research team. Your confidentiality is insured, and the assistants have signed sworn statements not to discuss the contents of any videotape with others outside the research team. Names do not appear on any videotapes and the content of the tapes are held in the strictest confidence. Nevertheless, it is your prerogative to ask that any video segment including you be destroyed and that we not use the film in our study. Although we greatly appreciate your willingness to help us with this research, please keep in mind that it is your right to (a) not participate in this study, or (b) to withdraw from the study at any time, for any reason with no penalty for withdrawal.

It is very important to us that you know that there is NO information on your surveys, or elsewhere, that can connect you in any way to your answers on surveys. If you have questions regarding the study, or would like more specific information regarding its purpose or results, you can contact Wendy Wade McGuire at ______________. Should you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact Costel Denson, Vice Provost for Research, at 302-831-2136. Thank you for participating in our research. Do NOT write your name anywhere on the surveys.

We must get your signature as evidence that you are aware of your rights as a participant and that you are aware of the voluntary nature of your participation.

There are two identical copies of this form. Please sign both forms; Turn one into the experimenter and keep the other for your benefit.

"I understand the purpose of the study; I understand there is no information on the surveys that could identify me as a participant; I understand that I will be videotaped during a portion of the study; I am voluntarily participating in this study; and I provide consent for the use of the answers on the surveys in the analysis of this study."

Signature ___________________________ Date ____________________
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APPENDIX B

Individual Needs Study (97F) – Participant Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in our study. As has been verbally explained to you, the primary purpose of this investigation was to examine two needs that individuals have (freedom and intimacy) and the relationships between those needs and individuals’ communication with others. To do this, we had to create a false conversational scenario with another individual. In order to learn whether you would increase your intimacy with another, we had a research team member ask if you desired their assistance on the upcoming project in your communication course. The individual you interacted with was told to behave the way that they did and ask you the questions they asked. Their instructions were based on behavior we have observed in similar situations, however. That concluded the experimental deception; there is no further deception involved in this study; all information you have received following the completion of the surveys is true. We sincerely hope that you understand that the conversation in which you participated was designed only assess your needs for freedom and intimacy and how they relate to your communication with others.

Your interaction with the research team member was videotaped. These videotapes have been analyzed by research assistants for information that may help us further understand the individuals’ needs through their communication with others. Your confidentiality is insured, and the assistants have signed sworn statements to not discuss the conversation you had with others outside the research team. We recognize that the nature of the conversation included discussion of your current professor. No professor that was discussed will have access to the videotaped interactions. In addition, no information will be given to them regarding anything you may have said. The videotapes will be stored in a secured location and will be kept for use in training future assistants to analyze conversational behavior. Some interactions may be used as classroom instructional aides, exemplifying how individuals’ needs are represented in communication. As a participant, it is your right to specify how much or how little of your videotaped conversation will be used. Please indicate below the extent to which you give us permission to use your recorded conversations.

 Specify below the conditions under which you want your videotaped interaction used.

Check ALL the conditions that pertain to our use of conversation.

I do NOT give my permission for use of my videotaped conversation, under any condition. Destroy my tape in my presence.
I permit my videotaped conversation to be used:
   _____ In the analysis of this study
   _____ As a training tool for future research assistants.
   _____ As a classroom instructional aid.

I give my permission for my videotape to be used only under the following conditions:
   _____ Use the picture only
   _____ Use the sound only
   _____ Do NOT use the videotape at the UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Since the success of the study depends upon participants not knowing the purpose of the study before the completion of the surveys and interaction, we ask you not to discuss the specifics of the investigation or the general purpose with others. Obviously, it is crucial to the success of the study that participants not know the nature of the investigation before they participate. We once again thank you for your willingness not to discuss the study with others.

If you have any questions about the nature of your participation in this study or your rights as a participant, you can contact Costel Denson, Vice Provost for Research, at 302-831-2136. If you any question or comments about this particular investigation, please do not hesitate to contact Wendy Wade McGuire. Sometimes participants are interested in receiving a summary of the results once they become available. If you would like a copy sent to you, you can call the above phone number or e-mail the experimenter at _____ to request a copy of the results. The results can then be e-mailed to you or you can specify a postal address in your request. Remember that it may be the winter session before results are available, so consider that in any address you specify.

We must get your signature as evidence that you understand the true nature of the study and your participant rights regarding the videotaped conversations.

   "I understand the purpose of the study; I provide consent for the use of my videotaped interaction only as indicated above; I understand that I can request my videotaped interaction be destroyed upon request without penalty to me; I voluntarily participated in this study."

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

You will find two identical copies of this form. Please sign both forms and turn in only one. Keep the other for your benefit.
APPENDIX C

Autonomy and Connection Need Assessment

Instructions: People have a number of needs in their lives. Many of these are listed below. We are interested in your individual needs, specifically how important they are to you and how satisfied you are with meeting your needs.

First, indicate how important the need currently is to you. Important needs are those that you care about or those that would cause distress if they were unfulfilled.

Using the scale described below, indicate the extent to which you feel each need is important to you.

7 = Extremely important – I really care about this
6 = Very important – I really care about this quite a bit
5 = Somewhat important – I care about this somewhat
4 = Neither important nor unimportant
3 = Somewhat unimportant
2 = Not very important – I care a little about this
1 = Not at all important – I don’t care about this at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at All Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The need for a personal identity.
2. The need for a predictable pattern in your day-to-day life.
3. The need to comfortably share feelings and thoughts.
4. The need for emotional support when you’re feeling down.
5. The need to participate in social functions.
6. The need to receive affection.
7. The need to come and go as you want.
8. The need to be growing and creating a richer life. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. The need to know yourself. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. The need for a sense of control over your life. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. The need for your private thoughts to be listened to and really understood. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. The need to feel needed by others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. The need for people to spend free time with. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. The need to feel free to make your own choices. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. The need to let down your defenses and express how you really feel. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. The need for a sense of certainty, of knowing what to do. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. The need to do things with others when you want companionship. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. The need for tenderness and warmth from others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. The need to do things on your own. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. The need to be a unique individual with a place in the world. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. The need for encouragement and sympathy when you're upset. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. The need to have people do routine activities with you, like eating, shopping, watching television. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. The need to avoid feeling confined or restrained. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. The need to know where you going with your life. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25. The need for an orderly structure in your life.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. The need to share your meaningful experiences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. The need to provide comfort and attention.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. The need for advice and guidance when you're stuck.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. The need to share common activities with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. The need to be independent and free.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, rate your current level of satisfaction with the need. A need is satisfied if your current life circumstances meet your expectations or you are happy with this aspect of your life right now.

Using the scale described below, indicate the extent to which you are currently satisfied with each need.

7 = Perfectly Satisfied
6 = Very Satisfied
5 = Mildly Satisfied
4 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
3 = Mildly Dissatisfied
2 = Dissatisfied
1 = Very Dissatisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Perfectly Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The need for a personal identity.
2. The need for a predictable pattern in your day-to-day life.
3. The need to comfortably share feelings and thoughts.
4. The need for emotional support when you’re feeling down.
5. The need to participate in social functions.
6. The need to receive affection.
7. The need to come and go as you want.
8. The need to be growing and creating a richer life.
9. The need to know yourself.
10. The need for a sense of control over your life.
11. The need for your private thoughts to be listened to and really understood.
12. The need to feel needed by others.
13. The need for people to spend free time with.
14. The need to feel free to make your own choices.
15. The need to let down your defenses and express how you really feel.
16. The need for a sense of certainty, of knowing what to do.
17. The need to do things with others when you want companionship.
18. The need for tenderness and warmth from others.
19. The need to do things on your own.
20. The need to be a unique individual with a place in the world.
21. The need for encouragement and sympathy when you’re upset.
22. The need to have people do routine activities with you, like eating, shopping, watching television.
23. The need to avoid feeling confined or restrained.
24. The need to know where you going with your life.
25. The need for an orderly structure in your life.
26. The need to share your meaningful experiences.
27. The need to provide comfort and attention.
28. The need for advice and guidance when you’re stuck.
29. The need to share common activities with others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. The need to be independent and free. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX D

Extroversion Measure

**Instructions:** We are interested in what sort of person you describe yourself as. Please answer each question by indicating “yes” or “no” to the following descriptions. There are no right or wrong answers and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too long about the exact meaning of the question.

1. Do you have many different hobbies? Yes No
2. Are you a talkative person? Yes No
3. Are you rather lively? Yes No
4. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a party? Yes No
5. Do you enjoy meeting new people? Yes No
6. Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions? Yes No
7. Do you like going out a lot? Yes No
8. Do you prefer staying home to meeting people? Yes No
9. Do you have many friends? Yes No
10. Would you call yourself “happy-go-lucky”? Yes No
11. Do you usually take the initiative in meeting new friends? Yes No
12. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people? Yes No
13. Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party? Yes No
14. Do you like telling jokes and funny stories to your friends? Yes No
15. Do you like mixing with other people? Yes No
16. Have people said that you sometimes act to rashly? Yes No
17. Do you nearly always have a “ready answer” when people talk to you? Yes No
18. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly? Yes No
19. Do you often make decisions on the spur of the moment? Yes No
20. Do you often take on more activities than you have time for? Yes No
21. Can you get a party going? Yes No
22. Do you like plenty of bustle and excitement around you? Yes No
23. Do other people think of you as being very lively? Yes No
APPENDIX E

Interpersonal Attraction Scale

**Instructions:** Complete the following items about the person with whom you just had a conversation. Use the seven-point scale to indicate your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would enjoy working on a task with him/her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He/She is pleasant to be with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would recommend him/her as a work partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would <strong>not</strong> like to spend time socializing with him/her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This person would be an asset in any task situation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. He/She is easy to get along with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would like to have a friendly chat with him/her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Unwillingness to Communicate

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which these statements describe you overall, using the scale described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am afraid to speak up in conversations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk less because I am shy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. During conversation, I prefer to talk rather than listen.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I talk a lot because I am not shy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find it easy to make conversation with strangers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Conversational Appropriateness Scale

**Instructions**: Complete the following items about the person with whom you just had a conversation. Use the seven-point scale to indicate your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My partner behaved the way I expect most people to behave.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My partner’s behavior was unusual.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have had conversations very similar to this one.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My partner engaged in normal conversational behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I was comfortable throughout the conversation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The nonverbal body language my partner exhibited was typical of other peoples’.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Confederate Interaction Script

Approximately 10 minutes after the experimenter's absence:

1. Confederate: “Well, that wasn’t too bad…”
   (Participant response)

2. Confederate: “I’ve participated in other studies where you have to do… write out you know essay style, your answers like, ‘touchy-feely’ questions and stuff… that makes this look like a walk in the park…”

3. Confederate: (prompt) “Have you ever done anything like this before?”
   A. (If not) “So, I guess you don’t know how long she’s going to be gone?”
      (Participant response)
   B. (If yes) “So, do you know how long she’s going to be gone?”
      (Participant response)

4. Confederate: “Are you doing this for extra credit?”
   (Participant response)

5. Confederate: “Yeah, I figured it couldn’t hurt to get in good with my professor come grade time, you know…”

   SMALL TALK- weather, summer break, weekend

6. Confederate: “I’m a communication major, what about you?”
   A. (If no) i. “I’ve taken a lot of the courses from the department.”
      ii. “Who do you have right now… what are you taking?”
   (Participant response)
B. Confederate: (prompt- if needed)
   iii. “Is that with (Professor) Afifi?”

7. Confederate: “Yeah, I hand for that course last year. He’s pretty good, but he grades really hard. I ended up with a B+ though.”

   (Participant response)

8. Confederate: “Has he started talking about that big research paper yet?”

   (Participant response)

9. Confederate: “I did pretty good on mine, which was good because it helped my last exam grade, but I waited until the last minute to do mine, so I couldn’t really go ask for help or, you know, he would know I hadn’t started on it! But, if I were you, I would get help because I was pretty clueless myself.”

   (Participant response)

10. Confederate: “Yeah, because just knowing how to search the library for my topic took a long time and it’s actually like, the easier part, you know, finding the information, because he grades the paper so hard.”

   (Participant response)

11. Confederate: “What are you, well what do you think you’ll do yours on?”

   A. If they specify topic(s): “That could be pretty cool.”

      (Participant response)

   B. If they don’t specify topic(s): “Well, what are the lectures you liked the most... that’s how I chose my topic... ya know.”

      (Participant response)

12. Confederate: “Have you been able to find stuff in the library (on that)?”

    (Participant response)

13. Confederate: “(I know,) I hate the library. Every time I searched one of the databases I came up with different stuff, even though I was using the same
search terms and stuff. And then, you go to find the articles and they're not on the shelf?"

(Participant response)

14. **Confederate:** "Well, since I have to go over to the library anyway for another class, do you want me to help you search the library for your topic?

(Participant response)

A. (If yes) Confederate: "Well, that'll be cool. I can actually say I learned something from one of my classes!"

(1) Confederate: "So, what else are you taking this semester?"

(Participant response)

(2) Confederate: "Are you almost done with school, or?"

(Participant response)

***Approximate experimenter return – end of interaction***

B. (If no) Confederate: "Are you sure, 'cause I know that last year when I was doing mine I didn't know anyone who could help me; we were all pretty much in the same boat, you know?"

(Participant response)

(1) (If still no) Confederate: "Oh, well that sounds good."

(Participant response)

*Go to 14A 1 & 2*
APPENDIX I

Coder Form: Nonverbal Involvement/Immediacy

Date __________

Dyad # __________

Observer Name __________

Sex of Participant: M -- 1
F -- 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
<th>Very involved</th>
<th>Very little gaze</th>
<th>Very extended gaze</th>
<th>All backward lean</th>
<th>All forward lean</th>
<th>Very indirect body orientation</th>
<th>Very direct body orientation</th>
<th>Very despondent</th>
<th>Very respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
<th>Very involved</th>
<th>Very little gaze</th>
<th>Very extended gaze</th>
<th>All backward lean</th>
<th>All forward lean</th>
<th>Very indirect body orientation</th>
<th>Very direct body orientation</th>
<th>Very despondent</th>
<th>Very respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Not at all involved</th>
<th>Very involved</th>
<th>Very little gaze</th>
<th>Very extended gaze</th>
<th>All backward lean</th>
<th>All forward lean</th>
<th>Very indirect body orientation</th>
<th>Very direct body orientation</th>
<th>Very despondent</th>
<th>Very respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Time 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little gaze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All backward lean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very indirect body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very despondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very extended gaze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All forward lean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very direct body orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX J

### Coder Form: Nonverbal Tension/Nonfluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dyad #</th>
<th>Observer Name</th>
<th>Sex of Participant: M -- 1</th>
<th>F -- 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very choppy</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Much use of vocal fillers</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very few vocal fillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many false starts</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very few false starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halting</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many silences</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Few silences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very awkward</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very smooth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very choppy</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Much use of vocal fillers</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very few vocal fillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many false starts</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very few false starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halting</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many silences</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Few silences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very awkward</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very smooth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very choppy</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Much use of vocal fillers</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very few vocal fillers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many false starts</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very few false starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halting</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many silences</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Few silences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very awkward</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very smooth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Time 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very choppy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much use of vocal fillers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many false starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many silences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very awkward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very fluent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very few vocal fillers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very few false starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very articulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few silences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very smooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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