



1983

The Behavioral Display of Power and Intimacy Motivation

Jeffrey Robert Wilbert
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wilbert, Jeffrey Robert, "The Behavioral Display of Power and Intimacy Motivation" (1983). *Master's Theses*. 3288.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3288

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1983 Jeffrey Robert Wilbert

THE BEHAVIORAL DISPLAY OF POWER AND INTIMACY MOTIVATION

by

Jeffrey Robert Wilbert

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

February

1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Dan P. McAdams and Dr. Roderick W. Pugh, for their guidance and support. The encouragement obtained from Dr. Patricia Rupert provided motivation for early completion of the project. Dr. Frank Slaymaker gave me some helpful hints for the data analysis. Finally, many thanks to my data coders, Orianna Raggioli and Mary Kadlec, whose perseverance in the face of several tedious coding tasks was greatly appreciated.

VITA

The author, Jeffrey Robert Wilbert, is the son of Robert Clarence Wilbert and Joyce (Johnson) Wilbert. He was born on March 29, 1958, in Springfield, Ohio.

His elementary education was obtained in the public schools of New Carlisle, Ohio, and his secondary education in the same town at Tecumseh High School. He graduated with honors from there in June, 1976.

He entered Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, in September, 1976. He was supported throughout his undergraduate education by Wright State University Academic Scholarships. He graduated Summa Cum Laude with honors in psychology in June, 1980, and was granted a Bachelor of Science.

In September, 1980, he enrolled in the graduate program in clinical psychology at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. To date, he has completed all coursework for the Master's degree plus two clinical psychology clerkships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.ii
VITA.iii
LIST OF TABLES.vi
Chapter	
I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
Motives and Motive Measurement	1
The Power Motive	5
The Intimacy Motive.	9
Behavioral Manifestations of Motivation.14
Formulation of Hypotheses.16
II. METHOD19
Subjects19
Motivation Assessment.19
Power Motive Scoring20
Intimacy Motive Scoring.21
Subject Selection.23
Procedure.23
Behavioral Assessment.25
Torso Lean25
Discomfort26
Communicative Quality of Interaction27
Coding of Written Reactions.28
III. RESULTS.31
Descriptive Statistics31
Torso Lean33
Discomfort34
Communicative Quality.34
Written Reactions.35
IV. DISCUSSION37

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means of Index of Torso Lean.32
2. Means of Index of Discomfort.32
3. Means of Index of Communicative Quality32

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study seeks to examine the verbal and nonverbal behavior displayed by individuals high in either power or intimacy motivation in an experimentally defined interpersonal interaction. Three primary goals for the undertaking are a) to add to the understanding of how motives measured by thought-content sampling techniques relate to actual interpersonal behavior; b) to provide further evidence for the construct validity for both the power and intimacy motivation assessment methods; and c) to suggest new directions for future research in the area of social motivation and interpersonal behavior.

Motives and Motive Measurement

McClelland (1951, 1981) first proposed a scheme for understanding personality dispositions and behavior in which he differentiated the personality trait, schema, and motive. A trait is basically a stylistic variable referring to how an individual behaves in the interpersonal world. Traits, often formulated as bipolar dimensions, include constructs such as intraversion/extraver-

sion, dominance/submissiveness, and friendly/unfriendly. Second, a schema refers to the cognitive frame imposed by the individual to render the world sensible, meaningful, and predictable. Types of schemata include beliefs, attitudes, and expectancies, all of which contribute to a more generalized world view.

The third aspect of the personality, the motive, is conceptualized as a recurrent thematic constellation in thought that may "energize, direct, and select" behavior in certain situations (McClelland, 1971, p. 19). A motive is characterized by "affectively-toned cognitive clusters" (Winter & Stewart, 1978, p. 396) consisting of cognitive representations of desired goal states which are emotionally arousing and consequently salient to consciousness. McAdams (1982a) has suggested that these cognitive clusters indicate recurrent experiential preferences and, similarly, Atkinson (1981) suggests that motives are instrumental in determining the relative amount of time allocated to experiencing the motive's goal state.

Implicit in formulations of social motives and behavior is a dynamic person by situation interactional view of personality (e.g., Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Mischel, 1981). That is, motivated behavior is a function of the individual's motivation state and the presence of

environmental cues which signal the availability of the preferred experience.

Systematic assessment of fantasy productions has long been employed as a method of studying human social motivation. The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; Morgan & Murray, 1935), in which individuals write imaginative stories in response to ambiguous picture stimuli, was originally developed as a clinical diagnostic instrument. The method brings fantasy productions of individuals under experimental control. This technique was adopted and formalized by McClelland and his associates (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953), following Murray (1943), as a more broad spectrum personality assessment device. It is viewed as a "thought sampling" technique (McClelland, 1971) in which the content of story responses is assumed to reflect some of the dominant themes occurring in an individual's everyday thought. The more often a theme appears in the narrative productions, the higher a person is assumed to be in the corresponding motive disposition. TAT scoring systems for different motives have been developed using what is termed the McClelland-Atkinson research strategy, which originated with studies of the need for Achievement (McClelland, Clark, Roby, & Atkinson, 1949; McClelland, et al., 1953). The basic assumptions of this approach are a) motives can

be experimentally aroused; b) motives are present in differing strengths among different people; and c) the experimentally aroused motive is equivalent in nature to manifestations of the motive across individuals assessed under neutral conditions (Winter, 1973).

The McClelland-Atkinson paradigm involves the use of two groups, one a control and one which is subjected to an experimental situation or experience which is assumed to be an arousal of the motive and its associated fantasy elements. This is an arousal of the motive state which is achieved in order to derive a scoring system that will later be used to measure the motive disposition. Both the arousal and the control groups are then given the TAT, and the story themes which differentiate the two groups are taken to be indicative of the aroused motive, assuming that the arousal manipulation is appropriate. This method allows an operational definition of a motive to be formulated as "the fantasy content (associative imagery, story themes, etc.) that changes under one or more carefully defined types of experimental manipulations" (Winter & Stewart, 1978, p. 397). The scoring system developed from this experimental procedure is then applied to other individuals' TAT responses to identify those who show evidence of the motive in their thought samples under neutral conditions. Once subjects are

identified as high or low in a certain motivation in a neutral setting, individual differences in behavior as a function of type and level of motivation can be assessed.

One important criticism of this strategy has been that the TAT possesses low test-retest reliability (Entwistle, 1972). However, Winter and Stewart (1977) have shown that the reliability of the TAT is a function of the instructions for writing retest stories. The TAT asks for imaginative productions and thus primes subjects for creativity and variability. When subjects are told that they may write the same stories as before or to write whatever comes to mind regardless of what was written before, test-retest correlations rise to acceptable levels. Therefore, traditional conceptions of reliability based on objective mental testing theory may be inappropriate for the open-ended, operant structure of the TAT.

The Power Motive

One type of motivation that has been researched using the TAT is power motivation. The power motive can be defined as a recurrent desire to control, influence, or have impact on another person, group, or the world (Winter, 1973). The affectively-toned cognitive cluster centers around the goal state or preferred experience of "feeling strong." The TAT scoring system for the power

motive was developed by Winter (1973) who revised earlier systems devised by Veroff (1957), Winter (1967), and Uleman (1972).

Individuals scoring high in power motivation are described as having an interpersonal style characterized as controlling, manipulative, persuasive, and dramatic. Power motivation has been shown to be related to holding office in student government; participation in directly competitive sports such as football and basketball; occupational choice of teaching, psychology, or business management; taking part in gambling and vicarious participation in sports; and owning prestige possessions (Winter, 1973). High power individuals also seek to stand out publicly and do so, for example, by taking extreme risks in gambling situations (McClelland & Watson, 1973).

A recent review of the effects of motivation on friendship and interpersonal relations by McAdams (in press) suggests that the high power individual personifies Bakan's (1966) agentic mode of human existence. Such a person seeks to control his/her environment by isolating or distinguishing him/herself from it. The high power person appears to view relationships as arenas for self-assertion and self-display; friendships are viewed as a means to some end. This style apparently contributes to interpersonal relationship difficulties. For

example, Stewart and Rubin (1976) found that power motivation in males was associated with greater expressed dissatisfaction by both partners of a dating couple and greater anticipation of future relationship problems. A longitudinal followup of these couples showed that couples with a high power male had more breakups, whereas those with a low power male had more marriages. These conclusions are consistent with other research which has shown higher divorce rates and greater marital dissatisfaction for high power men (McClelland, Davis, Kalin, & Wanner, 1972; Veroff & Feld, 1970). Surprisingly, high power motivation in females seems related to marital satisfaction (Veroff, 1982), which is perhaps influenced by such women's tendency to marry successful men (Winter, Stewart, & McClelland, 1977).

Further evidence of interpersonal difficulties shows in the high power male's tendency to hold negative, condescending views of women (McClelland, 1975). Such men seem to hold an image of feminine evil as demonstrated in more fantasy themes of females harming, exploiting, or rejecting men (Slavin, 1972) and higher frequencies of production of bizarre, frightening sketches of females (Winter & Stewart, 1978). Perhaps a fear of female domination mediates the high power male's frequent choice of submissive, dependent mates and his

limitation of his wife's career strivings and choices (Winter, Stewart, & McClelland, 1977). Generally, high power males show a marked instability in romantic relationships (Stewart & Rubin, 1976), often manifested by a higher number and increased frequency of sexual partners (Winter, 1973).

In other research, a longitudinal study by McClelland (1979) showed a relationship between power motivation and hypertension in males. The results suggested that individuals with a) strong dispositional need for power and b) a strong tendency to inhibit the overt expression of this need in the form of aggressive actions plus c) strong situational challenges to power motivation (e.g., firing an employee) tended to develop elevated blood pressure.

Steele (1977) demonstrated that arousal of power motivation depends on characteristics of both the individual and the situation. For example, high power subjects showed higher activation levels (as measured by self-report checklists) in response to inspirational, powerful speeches than did low power individuals. In a non-power arousal condition, no differences in activation between motivation groups were found.

In studies of small group interactions, high power individuals in leadership positions seem to foster an

atmosphere detrimental to group decision making by limiting the free expression of ideas and alternatives by group members (Fodor & Smith, 1982). In such situations, persons high in power motivation are perceived by group members as controlling, limiting, and domineering, and tend to respond favorably to ingratiating subordinates regardless of the objective quality of the worker's performance (Fodor & Farrow, 1979). The small group, then, appears to be one arena in which the high power individual can display power strategies, regardless of the ultimate detrimental effect of such behavior.

In summary, an image of the interpersonal style of individuals high in power motivation has emerged. They appear to be controlling, domineering, and manipulative, and in the extreme tend to seek impact on others at the expense of intimate, warm, enduring interpersonal relationships.

The Intimacy Motive

For many years, research on the desire for interpersonal relationships made extensive use of the need for affiliation TAT scoring system (Heyns, Veroff, & Atkinson, 1958). Recent reviews of the need for affiliation literature have concluded that evidence for the construct validity of the measure is lacking (Boyatzis, 1973; McAdams, 1979). The major problem with the scoring system

seems to lie in its focus on the active striving of a story character to obtain, maintain, or restore interpersonal relationships. Consequently, high scoring individuals form a heterogeneous group due to the fact that both approach and avoidance concerns (Boyatzis, 1973) regarding interpersonal relationships are assessed via the scoring categories.

McAdams (1979, 1980) has recently developed a new scoring system for what is termed the intimacy motive. In this system, the interpretive focus is changed from the act of attaining relationships to a focus on a special quality of interpersonal exchange manifested in TAT stories. The intimacy motive can be defined as a recurrent preference or readiness for a particular quality of interpersonal experience characterized by warm, close, communicative exchange with another or others (McAdams & Powers, 1981). The theoretical origins of the intimacy motive lie in the writings of Maslow (1954, 1968) on "Being-love," Bakan (1966) on the communal mode of human existence, Buber (1965, 1970) on the I-Thou relation, and Sullivan (1953) on the need for interpersonal intimacy. McAdams (1979) states that the preferred interpersonal experience for individuals high in intimacy motivation is an egalitarian exchange characterized by seven themes: a) Joy and mutual delight (Maslow); b) reciprocal dia-

logue (Buber, Sullivan); c) openness, contact, union, receptivity (Bakan, Maslow); d) perceived harmony (Buber, Sullivan); e) concern for the well-being of the other (Sullivan); f) surrender of manipulative control and the desire to master in relating to the other (Sullivan); and g) being in an encounter which is perceived as an end in itself rather than doing or striving to attain either a relationship or some extrinsic reward (Bakan, Buber, Maslow, Sullivan).

In comparing the scoring systems for intimacy and affiliation motivation, McAdams (1982b) concludes that a) when the two motives are hypothesized to predict the same results, intimacy generally appears the stronger predictor, and b) when the two motives differ in their correlates, intimacy relates to a "being" and affiliation to a "doing" orientation to interpersonal relationships.

McAdams (in press) states that the intimacy motive scoring system captures the general theme of a communal orientation (Bakan, 1966) to human relationships. Such a mode involves a surrender of manipulative control as relating unfolds spontaneously. Thus, interacting is seen as an end in itself. The research available thus far supports such a conclusion.

For example, individuals scoring high in intimacy motivation are rated very often by peers as being

natural, warm, sincere, likable, appreciative, and loving, but are rarely seen as dominant, outspoken, or self-centered (McAdams, 1980). In a study of interpersonal behavior displayed in a psychodrama, McAdams and Powers (1981) found that high intimacy individuals constructed behavioral scenarios incorporating themes of mutual delight, reciprocity, and surrender of manipulative control in relating to others. In another study in which electronic pagers were carried throughout one week by subjects in order to take random samples of behavior and thought, McAdams and Constantian (in press) found further behavioral confirmation of the intimacy motive. Over the course of one week, high intimacy in comparison to low intimacy subjects revealed more interpersonal thoughts and positive affects in interpersonal situations, more time spent in conversations and letter writing, and more wishes to be interacting when not doing so. High intimacy motivation has also been found to relate to positive psychosocial adjustment in a cohort of middle-aged men (McAdams & Valliant, 1982), sensitivity to facial expressions (McAdams, 1979), and to high frequency of intimate themes in autobiographical memories (McAdams, 1982a).

McAdams (in press) summarizes as yet unpublished research which asked subjects to provide data regarding

recent friendship episodes. It was found that intimacy motivation was significantly related to higher degrees of personal self-disclosure in friendships, more frequent assumption of the role of listener in an exchange, and more frequent engagement in dyadic as opposed to group interaction.

Recent data also suggest that intimacy motivation, in contrast to power motivation, is related to stability and satisfaction in marital relationships (McAdams & Vaillant, 1982). McAdams (1980), in a reanalysis of Stewart and Rubin's (1976) data, showed that intimacy motivation was related to greater intensity of love experienced in an intimate relationship, as measured by Rubin's (1973) "love scale." Finally, McAdams and Vaillant (1982), in reanalysis of longitudinal data on a cohort of men, showed a significant correlation between intimacy motivation and a specific index of marital enjoyment at midlife.

In conclusion, the interpersonal style displayed by high intimacy individuals characterized by warmth, openness, receptivity, and surrender of manipulative control seems antithetical to the interpersonal style of the high power individual.

opposite

Behavioral Manifestations of Motivation

It is the general hypothesis of this study that type of motivation contributes to a certain type of overt behavioral style. Since motivated behavior by definition is an active search for preferred experiences (McAdams, 1982a), in order to render desired goal states available, individuals develop interpersonal behavior which acts to create situations in which the need can be satisfied.

Given that individuals high in power or intimacy motivation have antithetical experiential preferences, it can be hypothesized that differences would exist in their overt behavior. For example, in a communicative interpersonal exchange, a high intimacy person would show warmth and a receptivity to a special quality of intimacy with the partner. However, a high power individual would display behavior which demonstrates his/her superiority, strength, and status vis-a-vis the other. Research relevant to these behavioral differences has been conducted by Mehrabian and his colleagues on the behavioral cues of "immediacy," which is the communication of attraction and openness to interaction (Mehrabian, 1968a, 1968b, 1969b, 1971; Mehrabian & Friar, 1969), and status discrepancy (Mehrabian, 1969a, 1970). These studies have employed three different methodologies: a) Encoding, in which subjects are observed while assuming postures reflecting

experimenter-chosen attitudes; b) decoding, requiring subjects to determine the message being sent by photographed individuals; and c) naturalistic observation of interacting subjects. Summarizing this research program, immediacy cues include forward lean, high level of eye contact, smiling, moderate trunk relaxation, pleasant facial expressions, and decreased interpersonal distance. Conversely, a person communicating a superior status shows backward lean, low level of eye contact, increased interpersonal distance, and loud voice volume. Therefore, in an experimentally defined interpersonal interaction, persons high in either power or intimacy motivation can be expected to show these types of behavioral discrepancies.

Successful searching for motive-consistent goal states results in feelings of satisfaction and comfort as the preferred experience is attained. Thus, in situations congruent to one's motivational disposition there should be a relative absence of discomfort in overt behavior and subjective experience. However, in situations where the preferred goal is absent or a discrepant goal available, anxiety and discomfort should increase (cf., McAdams & Constantian, in press). Continuing the earlier example, in a communicative interpersonal interaction where the emphasis is on egalitarian exchange and

sharing of personal information, the high intimacy individual should experience little overt and subjective discomfort, while the high power person may display more anxiety and less favorableness toward the event.

Formulation of Hypotheses

The present study seeks to examine the behavioral differences of individuals high in power or intimacy motivation as displayed in an experimentally-defined interpersonal interaction. Individuals scoring high in either power or intimacy motivation will be selected to form the following subject pairs: High power - high power, high power - high intimacy, and high intimacy - high intimacy. Each pair of subjects will be videotaped as they interact in a 10-minute unstructured exchange with the defined goal of getting to know each other, as if this were the beginning of a longlasting friendship. After the interaction, subjects' thoughts and feelings regarding the interaction will be assessed through four open-ended questions. Independent judges will code the videotapes for specific behaviors of interest.

This type of expressive exchange is intended to be an arena in which typical behavior patterns of subjects will be manifested. Four basic hypotheses will be tested.

1. High intimacy individuals, due to a high level of readiness for this type of interpersonal exchange, will display more involvement as shown in a higher degree of forward torso lean. High Power individuals, however, will display higher degrees of backward torso lean, indicating both less involvement and the desire for a superior-subordinate relationship.
2. The expressive nature of the exchange will produce less discomfort for high intimacy subjects, as the goal state of interacting with another person is more congruent with intimacy motivation.
3. High intimacy subjects will produce interactions of higher communicative quality, assessed along the dimensions of mutuality of self-disclosure, mutual comfort, mutual positive affect, lack of rigidity, and lack of awkwardness. Thus, high intimacy - high intimacy exchanges will have the highest and high power - high power exchanges the lowest level of communicative quality.
4. Finally, high intimacy subjects' written reactions to the interaction will show higher degrees of positive affect regarding meeting

and interacting with another person and lower levels of negative affect regarding anxiety and discomfort.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 48 Loyola University students (24 males, 24 females) who participated for course credit in introductory and developmental psychology classes.

Motivation Assessment

A large pool of introductory and developmental psychology students were administered the TAT in the standard group format (Atkinson, 1958). Subjects were given five minutes to write an imaginative story to each of the following six picture stimuli, in sequence: a) A male and female sitting on a park bench by a river; b) a man sitting at a desk upon which is a photograph of a family; c) a ship captain talking to a man on a boat; d) a male and female trapeze artist in midair; e) two women working in a chemical laboratory; and f) an older man and a younger woman walking through a field with a dog and two horses. Pictures a and b can be found in McClelland and Steele (1972). Pictures c, d, and e are from McClelland (1975).

All stories were then scored for both power and intimacy motivation by different trained scorers. Each scorer had demonstrated an acceptable level of agreement with expert scoring. Category agreements for power and intimacy imagery were all well above 85%, and rank order correlations with expert scoring of practice stories were all greater than .85. These scoring criteria are detailed in Winter (1973).

Power Motive Scoring

The power motive scoring system (Winter, 1973) first examines each story for power imagery, i.e., some person or group in the story is concerned with establishing, maintaining, or restoring his/her power, influence, or control over others. The presence of power imagery receives one point and is a prerequisite for scoring for the presence of the following subcategories:

1. Prestige of the actor: Characters concerned about the power goal are described in ways that either increase (one point) or lower (one point) their prestige. Two points are awarded if both effects are present.
2. Stated need for power: Explicit statement of a desire to obtain some power goal.
3. Instrumental activity: The actor is actually doing something covertly or overtly to obtain a

power goal.

4. Block in the world: An explicit obstacle or disruption to obtaining a power goal is overcome.
5. Goal anticipation: Positive (one point) or negative (one point) anticipation of experiencing the power goal. Two points are awarded if both are present.
6. Goal states: Positive (one point) or negative (one point) feeling states associated with attaining or not attaining the power goal. Two points are awarded if both are present.
7. Effect: Some distinct response occurs by someone in the story to the power actions of a character.

The maximum score using this system is 11; if no power imagery is present, the story scores 0.

Intimacy Motive Scoring

The intimacy motive scoring system (McAdams, 1979) consists of 10 thematic categories, the first two of which are "prime tests of intimacy imagery." At least one of these prime categories must be present in order to score for other subcategories. The categories are:

1. Relationship produces positive affect (Prime test #1): An interpersonal interaction leads

- to loving, liking, peacefulness, happiness, or tender behavior for characters.
2. Dialogue (Prime test #2): Characters engage in reciprocal and noninstrumental communication.
 3. Psychological growth and coping: An interpersonal interaction leads to psychological growth, fulfillment, or problem solving for one of the characters.
 4. Commitment or concern: A character commits him/herself to another, helps another, or expresses humanitarian concern.
 5. Time-space: A relationship transcends spatial and/or temporal limitations.
 6. Union: Characters come together after being apart.
 7. Harmony: Characters feel that they are in synchrony or that they truly understand each other.
 8. Surrender of control: A character relinquishes manipulative control of an interaction.
 9. Escape to intimacy: Characters leave a nonintimate environment or state and proceed to an intimate one.
 10. Connection with the outside world: Characters open up to the outside world and exist in com-

munion with it.

The presence of each category receives one point, with the maximum score being 10.

Subject Selection

Subjects were considered high in either power or intimacy motivation if one motive score was in the top quartile of the distribution for the entire sample and the opposing motive score fell in the lowest quartile. After classification according to dominant motivation, subjects unknown to each other were selected to form the following interaction pairs: High power - high power (six pairs), high power - high intimacy (twelve pairs), and high intimacy - high intimacy (six pairs). Only same sex pairs were formed, with equal numbers of male and female pairs in each group.

Procedure

Appointments for the experiment, which lasted approximately thirty minutes, were arranged by telephone. Subjects were seated in padded, straight-back chairs squarely facing each other, with the front legs of the chairs being 45 inches apart. In the same room, approximately 15 feet away and equidistant from each subject, was Sony Betamax videotape equipment. The recorded image was a profile view of the two subjects facing each other.

After subjects signed consent forms, the experimenter (a male) spent several minutes in conversation with subjects in an attempt to allay initial anxiety. The presence of the videotape equipment was discussed, as was the nature of the task ahead.

Subjects were then told,

We are interested in how people get acquainted. In this ten minute interaction, your purpose is to get to know one another. Consider this a situation in which you have just met your partner, and you anticipate having numerous future interactions with him (her). You want to find out more about who your partner is. Try to imagine that this is the type of interaction you would undertake in the real world, and that this may be the beginning of a longlasting friendship. There are no set guidelines for accomplishing this task. In other words, how you go about doing this is entirely up to you both. Remember, you will have ten minutes. Are there any questions?...Remember, the purpose of this interaction is for you to get to know one another.

These instructions were designed to maximize the intimate, self-disclosing nature of the exchange. It was intended as an exchange more congruent to intimacy motivation due to the emphasis on establishing a friendship and the sharing of personal information. Thus, the assumption was that this type of exchange would be more incongruent to power motivation. The experimenter left the room after starting the recorder, and re-entered after 10 minutes. Then, each subject wrote responses to the following four questions: a) What did you like about this interaction? b) What did you dislike about the

interaction? c) What positive thoughts and feelings did you have during the interaction? and d) What negative thoughts and feelings did you have during the interaction?

Subjects were then debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Behavioral Assessment

Torso Lean

Each minute of the 10 minute tape, an estimate of the degree of forward or backward torso lean for each subject was made by two coders. With the tape paused, the angle of torso lean was constructed on the monitor screen with a water soluble marker. The vertex of this angle was defined as the point at which the back of the subject's buttocks met the chair. The sides of the angle were the straight line of the chair cushion and the line between the vertex and the middle top of the subject's visible shoulder. The angle was then transferred to tracing paper and measured with a protractor. Pearson correlation showed that the degree of agreement for coders' individual torso lean estimates was .86. Each one minute interval estimate was averaged across coders. Each subject's index of torso lean for the interaction was then obtained by averaging these 10 mean estimates.

Discomfort

Interpersonal discomfort was defined in this study by the presence of the following five categories of behavior, based on research summarized in Harper, Wiens, & Matarazzo (1978):

1. Non-communicative gestures: Movements of hands and arms which have no communicative value.
2. Fidgeting: Behaviors which seem to indicate discomfort, such as frequent posture shifts, tapping of feet or fingers, and frequent repositioning of arms and legs.
3. Speech disruptions: Disruptions in the form of speech, including sentence corrections, stuttering, slips of the tongue, omission of words or word parts, filled pauses, and excessively high rate.
4. Gaze aversion: Deviations from the appropriate eye contact pattern of looking more while listening and less while speaking.
5. Closed posture: Excessive rigidity in positioning of arms and legs.

For each subject, a 30 second sample of behavior was observed by two coders every minute of the interaction. The order of subject observation was alternated across the duration of the tape, with the unobserved sub-

ject being covered and hidden from view. After each 30 second observation period, coders indicated on a checklist which categories of behaviors had been observed. Then an overall rating of discomfort for the observation period was made using a five point scale ranging from 1 (No discomfort) through 5 (Extreme discomfort; intermediate values labelled). It was emphasized that each observation period was an independent event. The result of this process was a set of 10 ratings of discomfort for each subject by each coder. The interrater agreement for each discomfort rating was $\underline{r} = .84$. A mean of each of the 10 ratings across coders was obtained. For each subject, the index of discomfort for the interaction was the mean of these 10 mean ratings.

Communicative Quality of Interaction

Each interaction was observed by two coders for level of communicative quality. A high quality interaction was judged by the author to have the following attributes:

1. Mutuality of self-disclosure: Each partner freely discloses aspects of his/her life and self.
2. Little structure: There is an easy give-and-take of conversation, with no need for a rigid question and answer format.

3. Mutual comfort: Both partners appear reasonably comfortable, with little anxiety present.
4. Little awkwardness: There are no embarrassing deviations from comfortable conversation; silences are absent or tolerated.
5. Mutual positive affect: Both partners appear to be enjoying the interaction.

After one-minute observation periods, coders indicated on a checklist which of the above attributes were judged present during the preceding one minute. Then a rating of communicative quality was made using a five point scale ranging from 1 (Very low quality) through 5 (Very high quality; intermediate values labelled). Interrater agreement for each rating was $r = .87$. Each 10 minute observation rating was averaged across coders. The index of communicative quality was the mean of these 10 ratings, resulting in one rating per interaction rather than per subject.

Coding of Written Reactions

Two coders read the written responses of each subject to the four questions assessing reactions to the experience. Coders assessed the intensity of affect expressed by subjects regarding the following five themes:

1. Positive affect regarding self-disclosure by self; e.g., "It was fun talking about myself to someone else."
2. Positive affect regarding making contact with another person, including meeting someone new and/or finding out about someone else; e.g., "I made a new friend" and "I liked it that we had so much in common."
3. Positive affect regarding relief from anxiety about the interaction, including reporting of aspects of the interaction that made it easier to tolerate; e.g., "It wasn't as bad as I expected" "He easily initiated topics" and "Sitting at eye level made it easier."
4. Negative affect associated with anxiety or uneasiness; e.g., "I was too self-conscious."
5. Negative affect regarding the structure of the interaction; e.g., "It was too forced."

Coders judged the intensity of expressed affect by assessing two variables: a) Intensity of descriptive phrases (e.g., "It was really wonderful" vs. "It was OK"); and b) length of the response (More words equals more affect). For each of the five categories, coders rated the intensity of expressed affect using a four-point scale ranging from 1 (No affect) through 4 (Extreme

affect; intermediate values labelled). The interrater agreement (using Pearson correlation coefficients) for the category ratings were #1, .63; #2, .73; #3, .71; #4, .58; and #5, .62. For each category, coders' ratings were averaged, resulting in five separate estimates for each subject.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

For the purpose of data analysis, the experiment was construed as a 2 x 2 x 2 between subjects factorial design with the factors Subject Motivation (power or intimacy), Composition of Exchange (heterogeneous or homogeneous motives), and Subject Gender. Unless otherwise specified, all ANOVAs reported follow this format.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the major dependent variables were as follows. For the Index of Torso Lean, the overall mean was 89.3, with a standard deviation of 10.5. Scores ranged from 61.3 to 110.7. For the discomfort measure, the grand mean was 2.32, and the standard deviation was 0.52. The range of scores was 1.25 to 3.65. Finally, for the Index of Communicative Quality, the overall mean was 3.02, with a standard deviation of 0.69. Scores ranged from a minimum of 1.45 to a maximum of 4.55 per interaction pair. The cell means for these three measures are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

TABLE 1

Means of Index of Torso Lean

	Power		Intimacy	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Hetero- geneous	89.1	87.9	84.3	89.3
Homo- geneous	89.9	86.4	93.7	94.2

TABLE 2

Means of Index of Discomfort

	Power		Intimacy	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Hetero- geneous	2.60	2.18	2.32	2.24
Homo- geneous	2.72	2.16	2.29	2.05

TABLE 3

Means of Index of Communicative Quality

	Power- Power	Power- Intimacy	Intimacy- Intimacy
Male pairs	2.53	3.09	3.38
Female pairs	2.95	2.83	3.47

Torso Lean

Hypothesis #1 stated that intimacy subjects would show more immediacy cues manifested by a smaller angle of torso lean, while power subjects would display the status cue of more backward lean. The ANOVA using the index of torso lean for each subject showed no significant results. The only trend toward significance was in a Subject Motivation by Composition of Exchange interaction, which showed that intimacy subjects tended to manifest more variability in torso lean across conditions ($F(1, 40) = 1.42; p = .24$). With a power partner, torso lean was less (mean = 86.8) than with an intimacy partner (mean = 93.9). Power subjects, on the other hand, showed little difference between conditions (mean with power partner = 88.1, mean with intimacy partner = 88.5). This suggests that intimacy subjects may be more attuned to the level of intimacy in the exchange and may make adjustments in torso lean to achieve equilibrium and comfort.



Discomfort

Hypothesis #2 predicted that intimacy subjects would show the least and power subjects the most discomfort in the interaction. Using the index of discomfort for each subject, the ANOVA showed only a significant main effect for Gender ($F(1, 40) = 4.74$; $p < .05$), in that, overall, males (mean = 2.48) showed more discomfort than females (mean = 2.16). There was a trend toward significance for Subject Motivation ($F(1, 40) = 1.65$; $p = .21$) in which power subjects (mean = 2.42) showed more discomfort than intimacy subjects (mean = 2.22).

Communicative Quality

Hypothesis #3 stated that power-power exchanges would manifest the lowest and intimacy-intimacy exchanges the highest degree of communicative quality. The index of communicative quality for each interaction pair was subjected to a 3 (Composition of Exchange: Power-power, power-intimacy, and intimacy-intimacy) by 2 (Gender of subject pair) between groups ANOVA. Overall, no significant results were obtained. The planned contrast between the power-power and intimacy-intimacy means was marginally significant ($t(21) = -1.77$; $p < .10$). Inspection of means showed some support for the hypothesis, in that the highest communicative quality was manifested by intimacy-intimacy exchanges (mean = 3.42) and the lowest qual-

ity in the power-power exchanges (mean = 2.74). The mean for the power-intimacy exchanges fell in between (2.96).

Written Reactions

Each of the five category indices was subjected to a separate between groups ANOVA. No significant results were obtained for reported positive affect regarding self-disclosure. A marginally significant main effect for Composition of Exchange using the category 2 index ($F(1, 40) = 3.24$; $p < .10$) showed that more positive affect regarding making contact with another person was reported in the heterogeneous (mean = 3.19) than in the homogeneous (mean = 2.79) exchanges. For both category 3 and 4, a significant main effect for Composition of Exchange was demonstrated ($F(1, 40) = 7.10$, $p < .05$; $F(1, 40) = 4.74$, $p < .05$, respectively). These measures both reflect reported discomfort in the interaction, and were highly correlated ($r = .59$; $p < .001$). The means for these categories show a higher level of reported discomfort for the homogeneous exchanges (category 3 mean = 3.0; category 4 mean = 2.15) as compared to the heterogeneous exchanges (category 3 mean = 2.29; category 4 mean = 1.63). Finally, a trend toward significance for category 5 showed that the intimacy subjects tended to report more negative affect regarding the forced nature of the interaction (mean = 2.23) than did power subjects (mean =

1.94; $F(1, 40) = 1.78$, $\underline{p} = .19$).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

In general, this study provides only marginal support for the general hypothesis that motivation disposition contributes to a particular style of overt interpersonal behavior. Although none of the major hypotheses were strongly supported, the results are nonetheless interesting and worthy of further empirical testing.

It was found that the intimacy-intimacy exchanges tended to manifest the higher degree of communicative quality, defined by the dimensions of mutuality of self-disclosure, mutual comfort, mutual positive affect, and little structure or awkwardness. Such a measure was intended to assess a type of interaction which is similar to the preferred experience of the high intimacy individual. The measure seems to reflect the type of interpersonal style that intimacy individuals were hypothesized to bring to the interaction: Non-controlling, open, warm, and friendly. The combination of these similar styles in the intimacy-intimacy exchanges resulted in a higher quality interaction, as defined in the present

study.

However, the results from the objective measure of communicative quality are somewhat inconsistent with the affects expressed in subjects' written reactions. Regardless of the objective quality of the interaction, the most subjectively satisfying and comfortable interaction was the mixed motive pair. In this interaction, more positive affect was expressed regarding making contact with another person. In addition, there was less reporting of anxiety and less reporting of aspects of the interaction which made it more tolerable. The most logical variable producing these results is the complementary nature of subjects' motive dispositions. In this mixed exchange, the intimacy individual finds it easy to relinquish manipulative control to one who relishes control and dominance of an interaction. Thus, both the power and the intimacy subject find the complementary exchange more satisfying because each finds it easier to obtain his/her preferred interpersonal experience. The intimacy-intimacy exchanges, although judged objectively to be of higher quality, were not as comfortable for the participants. Perhaps, due to a higher willingness to self-disclose on the part of the intimacy subjects, these exchanges produced a high level of intimacy which resulted in discomfort. The power-power exchanges were

also less comfortable, and were judged of low quality. One possible explanation for this is that a struggle for control occurred and the result was more awkwardness, less intimacy, and ultimately less satisfaction. Finally, although the mixed motive pairs were found to be more comfortable, they were rated only of intermediate quality. This may be an artifact of the definition of communicative quality which emphasized the mutuality of, for example, self-disclosure and comfort. Anecdotal reports from coders suggests that in some interactions, one subject would be freely self-disclosing and would seem comfortable, while the partner seemed to limit his/her mutual participation. Thus, the communicative quality of these exchanges would be lower than those in which there was mutuality throughout. An alternative to the measure of communicative quality of the interaction would be assessment of social skills of individual subjects, which might prove fruitful. It is expected that intimacy individuals would show higher degrees of Rogerian listening and communication skills, as these would more likely facilitate the preferred intimacy experience.

The significantly higher level of overt anxiety for male subjects was an unexpected finding. It is important to point out that both data coders were female. The effects of this factor on ratings is at present unclear.

Two general aspects of the experiment may have contributed to the few number of significant findings. First, the general hypothesis of the study was that motive disposition would contribute to a particular overt interpersonal style. While this hypothesis seems tenable, as McClelland (1951, 1981) points out, motivational and stylistic variables are separate aspects of the personality. The relationship between motivation and interpersonal style might have been more solidly demonstrated had there been some stylistic assessment rather than a sole dependence on the TAT. For example, some intimacy subjects may be extroverts, and some may be introverts. Both individuals would desire a warm, egalitarian exchange with others, but each would facilitate such an experience in different ways. These stylistic effects were probably present but unidentified in the present study. Second, the structure of the interaction was not the best setting for natural, spontaneous communication. As one subject wrote, "We were thrown into a room and were forced to interact." Such an interaction probably increased anxiety, decreased natural flow of conversation, and ultimately masked to some degree the expression of the characteristic interpersonal style of subjects. Any replication of this research should include stylistic assessment and a restructuring of the interaction to ren-

der it less artificial.

In summary, this study is a first step toward understanding the motivational variables influencing dyadic interpersonal interaction. No studies to date have paired subjects of varying motive dispositions in experimentally defined exchanges. Future research in this area will provide a wealth of data on the relationship between what people want and what people do on an interpersonal level.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J.W. (Ed.). Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Atkinson, J.W. Studying personality in the context of an advanced motivational psychology. American Psychologist, 1981, 36, 117-128.
- Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- Boyatzis, R.E. Affiliation motivation. In D.C. McClelland & R.S. Steele (Eds.), Human motivation: A book of readings. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1973.
- Buber, M. Between man and man. New York: MacMillan, 1965.
- Buber, M. I and thou. New York: Scribner's, 1970.
- Endler, N.S., & Magnusson, D. (Eds.). Interactional psychology and personality. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Entwistle, D.E. To dispel fantasies about fantasy-based measures of achievement motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 77, 377-391.
- Fodor, E.M., & Farrow, D.L. The power motive as an influence on use of power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 2091-2097.
- Fodor, E.M., & Smith, T. The power motive as an influence on group decision making. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 42, 178-185.
- Harper, R.G., Wiens, A.N., & Matarazzo, J.D. Nonverbal communication: The state of the art. New York: Wiley, 1978.

- Heyns, R.W., Veroff, J., & Atkinson, J.W. A scoring manual for the affiliation motive. In J.W. Atkinson (Ed.), Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Maslow, A. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Maslow, A. Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand, 1968.
- McAdams, D.P. Validation of a thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1979.
- McAdams, D.P. A thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. Journal of Research in Personality, 1980, 14, 413-432.
- McAdams, D.P. Experiences of intimacy and power: Relationships between social motives and autobiographical memory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 42, 292-302 (a).
- McAdams, D.P. Intimacy motivation. In A. Stewart (Ed.), Motivation and society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982 (b).
- McAdams, D.P. Human motives and personal relationships. In V. Derlega (Ed.), Communication, intimacy, and close relationships, in press.
- McAdams, D.P., & Constantian, C.A. Intimacy and affiliation motives in daily living: An experience sampling analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, in press.
- McAdams, D.P., & Powers, J. Themes of intimacy in behavior and thought. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 40, 573-587.
- McAdams, D.P., & Vaillant, G.E. Intimacy motivation and psychosocial adjustment: A longitudinal study. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1982, 46, 586-593.
- McClelland, D.C. Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1951.

- McClelland, D.C. Assessing human motivation.
Morristown, N.J.: General Learning, 1971.
- McClelland, D.C. Power: The inner experience. New
York: Irvington, 1975.
- McClelland, D.C. Inhibited power motivation and high
blood pressure in men. Journal of Abnormal
Psychology, 1979, 88, 182-190.
- McClelland, D.C. Is personality consistent? In A.I.
Rabin, J. Aronoff, A.M. Barclay, & R.A. Zucker
(Eds.), Further explorations in personality. New
York: Wiley, 1981.
- McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., & Lowell,
E.L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-
Century-Crofts, 1953.
- McClelland, D.C., Clark, R.A., Roby, T.B., & Atkinson,
J.W. The projective expression of needs, IV: The
effect of need for achievement on thematic
apperception. Journal of Experimental Psychology,
1949, 37, 242-255.
- McClelland, D.C., Davis, W.N., Kalin, R., & Wanner, E.
The drinking man. New York: The Free Press, 1972.
- McClelland, D.C., & Steele, R. Motivation workshops.
Morristown, N.J.: General Learning, 1972.
- McClelland, D.C., & Watson, R.I. Power motivation and
risk taking behavior. Journal of Personality, 1973,
41, 121-139.
- Mehrabian, A. Inference of attitudes from the posture,
orientation, and distance of a communicator.
Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968,
32, 296-308 (a).
- Mehrabian, A. Relationship of attitude to seated
posture, orientation, and distance. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 26-30
(b).
- Mehrabian, A. Significance of posture and position in
the communication of attitude and status
relationships. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71,
359-372 (a).

- Mehrabian, A. Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. Behavior research methods and instrumentation, 1969, 1, 203-207 (b).
- Mehrabian, A. A semantic space for nonverbal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 248-257.
- Mehrabian, A. Verbal and nonverbal interaction of strangers in a waiting situation. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1971, 5, 127-138.
- Mehrabian, A., & Friar, J.T. Encoding of attitude by a seated communicator via posture and position cues. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 330-336.
- Mischel, W. Personality and cognition: Something borrowed, something new? In N. Cantor & J.F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), Personality, cognition, and social interaction. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1981.
- Morgan, C.D., & Murray, H.A. A method for examining fantasies: The thematic apperception test. Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 1935, 34, 289-306.
- Murray, H.A. Thematic apperception test: Manual. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1943.
- Rubin, Z. Liking and loving. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.
- Slavin, M. The theme of feminine evil: The image of women in male fantasy and its effect on attitudes and behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1972.
- Steele, R.S. Power motivation, activation, and inspirational speeches. Journal of Personality, 1977, 45, 53-64.
- Stewart, A.J., & Rubin, Z. The power motive in the dating couple. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 305-309.
- Stewart, A.J., & Winter, D.G. Arousal of the power motive in women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 495-496.

- Sullivan, H.S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry.
New York: Norton, 1953.
- Uleman, J.S. The need for influence: Development and validation of a measure, and comparison with the need for power. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1972, 85, 157-214.
- Veroff, J. Development and validation of a projective measure of power motivation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 1-8.
- Veroff, J. Assertive motivations: Achievement vs. power. In A.J. Stewart (Ed.), Motivation and society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Veroff, J., & Feld, S.C. Marriage and work in America. New York: Van Nostrand, 1970.
- Winter, D.G. Power motivation in thought and action. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1967.
- Winter, D.G. The power motive. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Winter, D.G., & Stewart, A.J. Power motive reliability as a function of retest instructions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 436-440.
- Winter, D.G., & Stewart, A.J. The power motive. In H. London & J.E. Exner, Jr. (Eds.), Dimensions of personality. New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Winter, D.G., Stewart, A.J., & McClelland, D.C. Husband's motives and wife's career level. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 159-166.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Jeffrey Robert Wilbert has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Dan P. McAdams, Director
Assistant Professor, Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Roderick W. Pugh
Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

2/21/83

Date

Dan P. McAdams

Dan P. McAdams, PhD

Director