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ABSTRACT

Clinical psychologist Albert Mehrabian of the University of California at Los Angeles has developed a theory of non-immediacy in language. It holds that the more linguistic qualifying devices, or non-immediacy features, with which a communicator refers to himself and to that about which he communicates, the referent, the greater the metaphorical distance between the two. For example, the communicator may refer to himself as belonging to a class rather than as an individual, or he may qualify the referent by naming only a part or characteristic of the referent. Mehrabian's research partially confirms that the greater the non-immediacy of a communicator's statements, the more negative are the communicator's attitudes toward the referent, toward the receiver of his communication, or toward the act of communicating.

Mehrabian has further developed a method of analyzing a discourse for non-immediacy. It consists of dividing a discourse into clauses and counting the number of non-immediacy features in each clause. A discourse yields a non-immediacy score, which is the ratio of total non-immediacy features to the total number of clauses.
Mehrabian's non-immediacy hypothesis was tested in the public speaking situation. Students in leadership positions on the Baton Rouge campus of Louisiana State University were asked to participate as speakers in a series of symposium meetings concerned with problems of campus communication. The symposia were presented to Speech 1 classes. Speakers were covertaly video taped and audio taped while speaking under three audience conditions: peers (Treatment One), peers plus a superior of whose presence they had been warned in advance (Treatment Two), and peers plus a superior of whose presence they had not been warned in advance (Treatment Three). Manuscripts from the audio tapes were analyzed for non-immediacy. It was hypothesized that speeches given under Treatment Two would yield greater non-immediacy scores than speeches given under Treatment One, and that speeches given under Treatment Three would yield greater non-immediacy scores than speeches given under Treatment Two. These data were analyzed by analysis of variance in a Lucas Switchback Design. No differences in non-immediacy scores were observed due to audience condition. Rather, non-immediacy scores were found to differ as a function of personality. Positive correlations were found between non-immediacy scores and two scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory, Theoretical
Orientation (TO) and Personal Integration (PI), regardless of speaker sex or audience condition.

It was further hypothesized that speakers who performed under Treatment Two would be perceived as having more negative attitudes than speakers who performed under Treatment One, and that speakers who performed under Treatment Three would be perceived as having more negative attitudes than speakers who performed under Treatment Two. Speakers' attitudes toward their subject, toward their audience, and toward their role as a communicator were assessed on four evaluative semantic differential scales. Speech 1 classes which had not attended a live symposium made the speaker attitude assessments on the basis of video tapes they viewed. These data were also analyzed by analysis of variance in a Lucas Switchback Design. The hypothesis was partially confirmed. Treatment Three speakers were perceived to have more negative attitudes than Treatment Two speakers. Since no differences in non-immediacy scores had been previously observed due to audience condition, this finding was assumed to be due to paralinguistic phenomena or speakers' personalities. Audiences viewing the tapes also indicated that when high non-immediacy scores co-occurred with high TO and PI scores, those speakers were judged to have a relatively more negative attitude toward their role as a
communicator than other speakers. Audiences perceived no differences in speaker attitudes due to speaker sex.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Clinical psychologist Albert Mehrabian of the University of California at Los Angeles has developed a theory of non-immediacy\(^1\) in language. It holds that the more linguistic qualifying devices with which a communicator refers to himself or to that about which he communicates, the referent, the greater the metaphorical distance between the two. For example, the communicator may refer to himself as belonging to a class rather than as an individual, or he may qualify the referent by naming only a part or characteristic of the referent. Mehrabian's research partially confirms that the greater the non-immediacy of a communicator's statements, the more negative are the communicator's attitudes toward the referent, toward the receiver of his communication, or toward the act of communicating.

Mehrabian has further developed a method of analyzing a discourse for non-immediacy. It consists of dividing a discourse into clauses and counting the number

\(^1\)Although throughout his published research, there is some variation in terminology, Mehrabian has most often used "non-immediacy" to denote the characteristics of language with which he is concerned. He has also expressed preference for "non-immediacy" in a letter (July 25, 1969) to the writer.
of linguistic qualifying devices, or non-immediacy features, in each clause. A discourse yields a non-immediacy score, which is the ratio of total non-immediacy features to the total number of clauses.

For the researcher in the field of speech communication, Albert Mehrabian's research holds out the possibility of quantifying a set of linguistic features indicative of speaker attitudes toward the receiver of communication. The present study is primarily designed to investigate Mehrabian's non-immediacy hypothesis as it operates in the public speaking situation.

I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the history of rhetorical theory as well as in the current field of speech communication, problems of language occupy a central place. The guiding assumption of this investigation is that language and communication are inextricably tied.

Language in Speech Communication

Two contrasting points of view toward language dominate the field of speech communication. One is normative, the other is descriptive. In the former tradition are such works as Book III of Aristotle's Rhetoric (1:185-219) and the fourth chapter of Wayne C. Minnicks The Art of Persuasion (18). They instruct the
speaker in how to perform a set of social conventions or communicate more effectively with an audience. The present investigation is in the latter tradition. It is descriptive, that is its immediate purpose is not to provide speakers with directions on how to use language, though it may provide the basis for such directives, but to describe how speakers actually do use language in the public speaking situation.

As for intellectual predecessors, the present study may be viewed as an enactment of the middle two steps of George Campbell's four step program for arriving at a systematic rhetoric.

The first step is introspection.

The next step is to observe and discriminate by proper appellations, the different attempts, whether modes of arguing, or forms of speech, that have been employed for the purposes of explaining, convincing, pleasing, moving, and persuading.

The third step is to compare, with diligence, the various effects, favourable or unfavourable, of those attempts, carefully taking into consideration every attendant circumstance by which the success appears to have been influenced, and by which one may be enabled to discover to what particular purpose each attempt is adapted, and in what circumstances only to be used (5:1).

The fourth step is to account for communication successes and failures by the principles of human nature. Thus the present investigation is concerned with the encoding or production of linguistic non-immediacy (step two) and the decoding or perception of linguistic non-immediacy (step three).
Communication Behaviors

In modern parlance, what Campbell was asking researchers to study are communication behaviors. As used here, communication behaviors refer to linguistic and para-linguistic behaviors with which human beings cope with their surroundings and to which percipients ascribe significance. The point of view of the present study is both influenced by and echoed by Frederick Williams when he deplores the fact that psycholinguists have concentrated on the acquisition of forms, phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, to the exclusion of "a child's communication development, which would include not only his capabilities in recognizing and creating linguistic forms, but knowing when and how to use them in a functional sense" (22:100). In a polemical response to one such formally oriented paper, Williams asked the heuristic question guiding the present investigation: "Certainly, one goal of a speech-communication theory is to describe the functional role of language. This concern can be phrased broadly in this question: How do the details of language enter into the details of communication?" (22:110).

The present study treats linguistic non-immediacy as a detail of language and asks how it functions in communication, specifically in the public speaking situation. The encoding and decoding of linguistic non-immediacy are therefore taken as communication behaviors.
It may be useful at this point to present, as a hypothesis, a model for the production of communication behaviors. Such a model would consist of two components: a repertoire of communication behaviors and a set of principles of selection. The repertoire would consist of all linguistic and paralinguistic capabilities of the speaker. The principles of selection would consist of the rules guiding the speaker's responses in communication situations, that is, the rules by which he chooses the appropriate communication behaviors. The two-component system constitutes the speaker's communication competence and is analogous to Noam Chomsky's concept of linguistic competence: "tacit knowledge . . . that underlies actual performance" (6:140).

**FIGURE 1**

A Model for the Production of Human Communication Behaviors
That such a model is an accurate representation of human communication behavior is attested to in the communication literature. A number of studies indicate the existence of (1) an array of options available to the speaker as adaptations to differing communication situations, and (2) a system of rules governing the speaker's choice among these options.

L. S. Vygotsky has explored differences between speech intended only for ourselves, the speech of thought, and speech intended for others (19). He argues that the egocentric speech of children, for example the "collective monologue" of children at play, is the prototype of adults' inner speech and results from children's insufficient differentiation between speech for others and speech for oneself (19:136). His research showed that from age three to age seven, the language of children's thinking out loud (egocentric speech) became more clearly differentiated from the language of their speech as communication with others. He also found that children's egocentric speech gradually disappeared from ages three to seven. Simultaneous with this differentiation and disappearance of egocentric speech, Vygotsky observed the development of children's thinking ability. He reasoned that children's egocentric speech was being used more for thought, or inner speech, than for thinking out loud as a child developed from three to
seven. By age seven what had been egocentric speech was used entirely for thought (19:133-134).

Therefore, Vygotsky's conclusions about adults' inner speech are based on observations of children's egocentric speech. What is important to the theoretical framework of this experiment is that he found great differences between inner speech and external speech. The quantity of egocentric speech produced by the children in the three experiments reported was observed to be dependent on the type of communication situation in which they found themselves. In each experiment, the children's speech behavior in normal play situations was compared to their speech behavior in relative isolation from their playmates, isolation by language barrier, by the intrusion of external noise, or by physical separation. In each of the isolated conditions, egocentric speech either disappeared all together or was greatly reduced (19:136-139).

The observation that the children's speech behavior altered quantitatively depending on whether they thought they were understood would not carry the weight it does except for the fact that Vygotsky also discovered that the children's egocentric speech was quite different qualitatively from adults' external speech. First, he found a tendency toward abbreviation and predication in inner speech, "namely, omitting the subject of a sentence and all words connected with it, while preserving the
predicate" (19:139). Second, Vygotsky held that in inner speech, there is greater dependence on sense and less dependence on meaning than in external speech. "Sense" he designated as "the sum of all the psychological events aroused in our consciousness by the word" (19:146). A word acquires its sense from context, whereas the meaning of a word, for example that which is codified in a dictionary, is comparatively stable across contexts and over time (19:146). A third characteristic of inner speech elaborated by Vygotsky is that the senses of words used in inner speech have a tendency to "combine and unite" until a word is so pregnant with meaning that it requires many words in external speech to exhaust the store (19:147-148). Fourth, Vygotsky observed that the egocentric speech of children tends to combine words to deal with complex ideas, an activity similar to the process of nominalization in German (19:147).

Vygotsky's *Thought and Language* indicates that even preschool children apparently possess a repertoire of communication behaviors and a set of rules which they use to determine choices among the options. His research further indicates that as children's socialization progresses their communication behavior with regard to egocentric speech takes a different form.

Another area of theorizing and research which lends validity to the two-component model for the
production of communication behaviors is the work of Basil Bernstein. He has hypothesized:

the form the social relationship takes regulates the options which speakers select at both the structural and vocabulary levels. . . . then it may establish for the speakers specific principles of choice: coding principles. . . . [which] entail from the point of view of the speakers and listeners planning procedures which guide the speakers in the preparation of their speech and which guide the listeners in the reception of speech (2:56).

Bernstein has differentiated two types of social relationships and their attendant languages. The first is a public language or "restricted code" (2, 3) "which contains a high proportion of short commands, simple statements and questions where the symbolism is descriptive, tangible, concrete, visual and of a low order of generality, where the emphasis is on the emotive rather than the logical implications" (4:164). The second is a formal language or "elaborated code" (2, 3): "The language use of the middle-class is rich in personal, individual qualifications, and its form implies sets of advanced logical operations; volume and tone and other non-verbal means of expression although important take second place" (4:164). The restricted code is the language of lower socio-economic levels, and the elaborated code is the language of middle class and upper socio-economic levels. It is the middle class child who has learned a set of communication behaviors, for he "is capable of manipulating the two languages--the
language between social equals (peer groups) which approximates to a public language and a formal language which permits sensitivity to role and status. This leads to appropriateness of behaviour in a wide range of social circumstances" (4:166). If Bernstein's theory is correct, the middle class and upper class child has a repertoire of at least two languages and a set of rules for their use.

A part of Bernstein's hypothesis has been confirmed experimentally. He holds that children at lower socio-economic levels have a restricted code due to the style of family decision-making. Decisions are justified on the basis of status and authority, and the limits for children's individualization are very narrow. The elaborated code characteristic of upper socio-economic levels is due, on the other hand, to a style of family decision-making in which justifications are based on individual needs and future consequences. In the former, the child as learner is passive, and learning is rote. In the latter, the child as learner is forced to consider his behavior as it affects others and to make decisions himself (9:190).

Robert D. Hess and Virginia C. Shipman have found that mothers of four year olds ranked by socio-economic level rank themselves in the same order by the manner in which they regulate the behavior of their children. That is, the upper middle-class mothers spoke with their
children in an instructive and person-oriented manner and the lower socio-economic level mothers spoke with their children in an imperative and status-oriented manner (10:876-878). The revealing thing is that the children performed in the manner predicted by Bernstein's hypothesis. Specifically, the middle-class children, in explaining their behavior on the sorting tasks performed for the experiment, made finer distinctions and qualifications than did the other children. They displayed an elaborated as opposed to a restricted code. They made more "descriptive: part-whole" statements, which indicated sorting objects on the basis of some specific physical characteristic which is a part of the whole object. They made more "relational-contextual" statements, which indicated that one item was given meaning from its relation to another item in the context. Finally, they made more "categorical-inferential" statements, which indicated objects were sorted on the basis of some unobservable characteristic which qualified it as a member of a certain class (10:878-880). Hess and Shipman's work indicates that communication behaviors are learned, and that, across social classes, children possess a repertoire of communication behaviors and employ them
according to the communication circumstance in which they must function.

This brief examination of the work of Vygotsky, Bernstein, and Hess and Shipman has been presented to lend credibility to the two-component model for the production of communication behaviors. Their work also suggests that communication behaviors exist _sui generis_ and therefore may be investigated in their own right.

II. STUDIES IN NON-IMMEDIACY:

ALBERT MEHRABIAN

Albert Mehrabian's research indicates that under certain conditions language users employ a set of linguistic features which reflect their attitude toward the thing about which they are talking, toward the receiver of the communication, or toward the act of communicating. To the extent that these alterations of language are encoded in response to the receivers of the communication, they are communication behaviors. To the extent that they are decoded by receivers as denoting differences in speaker attitudes, they are communication behaviors. In order to discuss the implications of Mehrabian's research for the speech communication researcher, it is first necessary to understand the method by which discourse is analyzed for non-immediacy, then to review and assess that research.
The Language of Non-immediacy

In order to analyze it for non-immediacy, the researcher must first divide the communication into units. Then within each communication unit non-immediacy features are counted. The resulting score assigned to the communication is the ratio of non-immediacy features to communication units (15:90).

Communication Unit. The communication unit used by Mehrabian is essentially a clause, whether a simple sentence, a dependent clause, or an independent clause (20:97). The object of separating a communication into communication units is to isolate each unique communicator-referent relationship. A communicator-referent relationship is the interaction of the speaker with the thing spoken about, mediated by an intervening verb. In almost every utterance produced by a speaker, he establishes some relationship between himself and the "event, person, or object which is the ostensible reason for the communication" (15:83). Take for example the utterance, "We thought people like that were a thing of the past." The communicator places himself in a group—"we"—and

2In some publications, Mehrabian used "subject" as synonymous with "communicator" and "object" as synonymous with "referent." This investigator has avoided the use of "subject" and "object" in order to avoid confusion with grammatical subjects and objects.
makes a unilateral action—thinking—toward the referent, whom he also places in a group—"people like that."

Mehrabian's non-immediacy hypothesis is based on the fact that most native speakers of English would say that the utterance, "We thought people like that were a thing of the past" denotes an entirely different relationship between speaker and spoken about than does the utterance, "Bob is an anachronism."

The major problems with the definition of a communication unit are sentences with subordinate clauses or multiple verbs. With both however, the solution is the same. A sentence is divided into as many communication units as there are unique communicator-referent relationships (15:87-88; 20:97-98). If such a sentence displays no communicator-referent relationships, each clause is a communication unit and is assigned zero non-immediacy features.

**Non-immediacy Features.** The most recent explication of non-immediacy was used for the analyses in the present investigation. It is found in the recently published book by Morton Wiener and Albert Mehrabian, *Language Within Language: Immediacy, a Channel in Verbal Communication* (20). The nine non-immediacy features are divided into three classes: spatio-temporal features, denotative specificity features, and agent-action-object features. The presence of each
one in a communication unit denotes some attenuation of the communicator-referent relationship.

The first class contains the two features indicated by its name. The Spatial feature (symbolized "S") is present in a communication unit under any of the following conditions: (1) when "that or "those" are used in lieu of the alternative "the," "this," or "these;" (2) if an adverb clause begins with "where;" or (3) if the communication unit in any other way indicates spatial distance between the communicator and the referent, e.g., the use of "not here" (20:87).

I like those chairs (20:87). S

Second under the spatio-temporal class is the Temporal feature (symbolized "T"). The Temporal feature is present in a communication unit under any of the following conditions: (1) if the verb is not in the present tense grammatically; (2) if adverb clauses introduced by "when," "while," or "during" are used in the communication unit; or (3) if modifiers such as "before," "after," "later," or "first" are used in the communication unit (20:88).

When I begin to work on it (the problem) (20:88) T

In the denotative specificity class are the features called Part, Class, and Implicit. The Part feature is assigned to a communication unit under any one of these conditions: (1) if only "a part, characteristic,
attribute, or aspect" of the communicator is designated in the communication unit ("P_c"); (2) if only "a part, characteristic, attribute, or aspect" of the referent is designated ("P_r"); or (3) if a negative statement is used under conditions equally allowing a positive statement ("P_n") (20:89-90).

  X likes my car (20:90). P_c
  I hate X's guts (20:90). P_r
  I am not skinny (20:90). P_n

The Class feature is assigned to a communication unit (1) if the communicator is designated as belonging to a class of persons which includes the communicator ("C_c"); or (2) if the referent is designated as belonging to a class which includes the referent ("C_r") (20:90-91).

  X has some habits and ways which are annoying to everybody (including myself) (20:91). C_c
  Those high school girls (X is a high school girl) really get on my nerves (20:91). C_r

The Implicit feature is present in a communication unit if either the communicator ("I_c"), the referent ("I_r"), or both are not explicitly designated (20:91-92).

  The experimenter gave hints (to me) (20:91). I_c
  I didn't do well (in the experiment) (20:91). I_r

The agent-action-object class includes the features of Unilaterality, Passivity, Modified, and Intensity-extensity. The Unilaterality feature is present in a communication unit (1) when the communicator acts
toward the referent and the action is not reciprocated ("Ur"); (2) when the referent acts toward the communicator and the action is not reciprocated ("Uc"); or (3) when it is ambiguous which, the communicator or the referent, is acting toward the other, but it is clear implicitly that one is acting ("U") (20:92).

I am looking at X (20:92). \( \text{Ur} \)

X drove me to school (20:92). \( \text{Uc} \)

X and I are walking (20:92). \( \text{U} \)

The Passivity feature is present in a communication unit under any of these conditions: (1) if either the communicator or the referent are related in a "have to" or a "forced to" situation; (2) if the communication unit is in the passive voice grammatically; or (3) if such words as "because" are used to designate external causation affecting either the communicator or the referent. "Pa_c" is the symbol for the communicator being passively related to the referent; "Pa_r" is the symbol if the referent is passively related to the communicator (20:93).

I had to read Passage X (20:93). \( \text{Pa}_c \)

The blocks had to be divided the way I did it (20:93). \( \text{Pa}_r \)

The Modified feature is present in a communication unit if "an objectification or qualification of the communication is introduced in the verbalization." Cues
for the assignment of the "M" feature are the presence of such phrases and words as "I feel . . . ," "Supposedly," "perhaps," and "just" (20:94).

I feel (think, believe, etc.) X hates me (20:94).

The Intensity-extensity feature ("X") is assigned to a communication unit if cues such as the following are present: "some," "hardly," "mostly," or "enormously" (20:95).

I talked to her a great deal (20:95)

Analysis of two communication units which Wiener and Mehrabian present for illustration will help to clarify the application of the non-immediacy features to discourse.

That illness of X's is affecting my ability to concentrate (20:95).

This communication is assigned four non-immediacy features: P_c (the communicator's ability); P_r (the referent's illness); U_c (unilateral action from referent to communicator); and S ("That" illness) (20:95).

Maybe X and I will be friends again sometime (20:95).

Two features of non-immediacy are assigned to this communication unit: T (the tense is not present); and M (for "maybe") (20:95).

The non-immediacy score for the first communication unit is four and for the second, two. It is, in each case,
the number of features assigned. Mehrabian's system of non-immediacy analysis does not take into account possible differences in intensity among the non-immediacy features. Therefore, the inference to be drawn from these two communication units is that the producer of the first one had, at the time of production, a more negative attitude toward his referent X, toward the receiver of the communication, or toward the act of producing it than did the producer of the second communication unit (20:49). Further explanation of non-immediacy analysis appears below in a consideration of the analytical treatment of the data involved in this experiment.

**Mehrabian's Research in Non-immediacy**

Albert Mehrabian's research in non-immediacy may be conveniently divided into two areas, encoding and decoding. That is, some of his work has dealt with the question of whether people produce language in accord with the non-immediacy hypothesis, and some of his work has dealt with the question of whether people understand language in accord with the non-immediacy hypothesis.

**Encoding.** In his dissertation Mehrabian instructed two groups of subjects, twenty-four male college freshmen and thirty-two female nursing students, to perform four tasks:
1. Write a positive statement about someone you like very much.

2. Write a positive statement about someone you dislike very much.

3. Write a negative statement about someone you like very much.

4. Write a negative statement about someone you dislike very much (16:22-24).

Mehrabian hypothesized that non-immediacy scores would discriminate between statements about liked as opposed to disliked persons regardless of the positive or negative nature of the statements (16:21). The hypothesis was confirmed with both male and female subjects. Non-immediacy scores were significantly greater for the communications about negatively experienced events (disliked persons) than about positively experienced events (liked persons) regardless of whether the communication was explicitly positive or negative (i.e., "irrespective of the affective or evaluative contents [my italics] of the communications") (16:21).

Since this is the only study of Mehrabian's which deals with male-female differences and since the present investigator plans to use both male and female subjects, his findings on this point are important. The non-immediacy scores of the communications written by the female subjects were significantly lower for the tasks which designated "Write a positive statement" than for the tasks designating negative statements. This
difference was not significant in the male subjects' communications (16:47). Most of this difference was accounted for by the females' task one score (positive statement-liked person) being significantly lower than their task three score (negative statement-liked person) (16:54). Recalling from above that a lower non-immediacy score is indicative of positive affect and that a higher score indicates a negative affect, Mehrabian explained the females' unique scores by hypothesizing that the nursing students were better able "to express their experience of closeness to affectively positively experienced people" than were the male college freshmen (16:54). Also, the nurses' generally lower scores (than the males') on both "negative statement" tasks were consistent, according to Mehrabian, with current knowledge of sex differences, specifically, that females are "more interpersonally oriented than males" (16:54).

One other point of concern to the present investigator is the reliability with which a communication may be analyzed for non-immediacy. In the dissertation it was reported that two independent judges were in complete agreement on eighty-five per cent of the 356 scorable units in the male data and eighty-four per cent of the 422 scorable units in the female data (16:40-41). In an unpublished study with Morton Wiener, eighty-one per cent agreement was obtained (16:50).
Finally, regarding the strength of the conclusions to be drawn from this research are two points bearing on the demand characteristics of the experiment. First, subjects knew they were part of an experiment. The extent to which this factor distorted normal communication behaviors is not known. Second, subjects were told to vary their style as they wrote (16:25), an admonition which may easily have caused the subjects to exaggerate normal differences among the four writing tasks.

Mehrabian's second research report on the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy dealt with oral rather than written communication. He hypothesized:

Explicitly positive communications about disliked people have greater non-immediacy than explicitly positive communications about liked people.

Explicitly negative communications about disliked people have greater non-immediacy than explicitly negative communications about liked people (15:89).

A male experimenter administered the test singly to each of twenty-four male and twenty-four female UCLA.

Demand characteristics are features of the experimental situation from which subjects infer the intent of the experiment. With this knowledge, subjects' tendency is to react to aid or to hinder the outcome. In either case, subjects are not passive, but active participants in the experiment. See Martin Orne, "On the Social Psychology of the Psychological Experiment," American Psychologist, XVII (November, 1962), 776-783.
undergraduates. After securing the names of someone the subject liked very much and someone the subject disliked very much, the experimenter gave the subject four tasks -- an oral version of the dissertation experiment. The subject was asked to say something "positive, pleasant, or good" about himself and the liked other, then about himself and the disliked other; something "negative, unpleasant, or bad" about himself and the liked other, then about himself and the disliked other (15:89). Responses were covertly tape recorded.

Both the hypotheses were confirmed (15:91). That is, explicitly positive communications about disliked people did have greater non-immediacy scores than explicitly positive communications about liked people; and explicitly negative communications about disliked people did have greater non-immediacy scores than explicitly negative communications about liked people.

However, as before, the application of the findings is limited by the demand characteristics of the experiment. Specifically, each subject was told:

We are studying variations in styles of speaking; that is, the different expressions or wordings which people use to say essentially the same things. It will therefore be important that you vary your style as you go along (15:89).

So the subjects, knowing they were in an experiment and knowing differences in wording were desired, were in an
abnormal situation and one in which they were likely to comply with the experimenter's wishes beyond the normal. Whether the observed linguistic non-immediacy would have been encoded by the subjects under normal conditions is open to question.

Mehrabian's third study of the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy was designed to investigate the hypothesis that, in a written communication, greater non-immediacy scores correspond, in positive linear fashion, to more negative attitudes of the communicator toward the referent of his communication. One hundred seventy-three UCLA undergraduates were given one of four writing tasks. Each subject was asked to mark on a twelve centimeter scale (labeled "dislike very much" and "like very much" at the poles) his attitude toward someone he (1) liked very much, or (2) liked, or (3) neither liked nor disliked, or (4) disliked very much. Then the subject was asked to write "one or two sentences" about the person so evaluated (14:294).

The hypothesis was generally supported. That is, there was a positive linear relation between degree of dislike as indicated on the evaluation scale and the non-immediacy scores of the statements about the person assessed.\footnote{With no mention of the distribution of males and females.}
evaluated on the scale. Non-immediacy scores steadily increased as the scores on the like-dislike scale increased from three to twelve centimeters, i.e., toward "dislike very much." However, on the "like very much" extreme of the scale (from zero to three centimeters), non-immediacy scores steadily decreased (14:295). The relatively high non-immediacy scores found to correspond to the "like very much" end of the evaluation scale were unexpected. Mehrabian accounted for the phenomenon by hypothesizing that when subjects are restrained from saying something explicitly negative about a person they are committed to as liking very much, negative attitudes are nevertheless expressed implicitly through linguistic non-immediacy (14:295).

In this article also was another report of scoring reliability. Two independent judges achieved 0.92 reliability in dividing the statements into communication units and 0.74 reliability in assigning non-immediacy scores to the units, thus yielding 0.68 reliability on complete agreement. Testing reliability another way, an 0.83 product-moment correlation coefficient was obtained "between the pairs of mean non-immediacy scale scores assigned by the two judges" (14:295).

Except for the fact that the subjects apparently knew they were in an experiment, demand characteristics were at a minimum in this experiment.
The fourth research report by Albert Mehrabian (with Morton Wiener) on the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy differed from those preceding it in that (1) the experimenter induced negative affect rather than relying on the long-standing experience of his subjects, and (2) he distinguished between subjects' attitudes toward persons and toward objects. Three experiments were reported. In the first one, twelve male and twelve female Clark University undergraduates were randomly given passing scores on one passage of a reading comprehension test and failing scores on another. Afterward, each subject was asked to write a sentence using "I" or "they" and "Passage 1," then a sentence using "I" or "they" and "Passage 2" (12:422). As was hypothesized, the non-immediacy score for failure-associated sentences was significantly greater than the non-immediacy score for success-associated sentences (12:423).

The second experiment, rather than dealing with subjects' attitudes toward objects (the passages), dealt with subjects' attitudes toward people. Thirty-five female nursing students were asked to think of someone they liked very much and to write something about themselves and that person. Then they were asked to think of someone they disliked very much and to write something about themselves and that person. It was
hypothesized that communications about disliked persons would have higher non-immediacy scores than communications about liked persons. The hypothesis was confirmed (12:424).

Experiment three differed from experiment two in that each subject wrote only one statement: a statement about himself and someone he liked or a statement about himself and someone he disliked. In this manner a between subjects measurement was obtained comparing task-groups instead of a within subjects measurement comparing all subjects' performance on one task to all subjects' performance on the other task. In accord with the hypothesis, the non-immediacy score of statements about disliked persons was significantly greater than the non-immediacy score of statements about liked persons (12:424).

Other figures on scoring reliability were also reported in this article. Based on data from all three experiments, agreement between two independent judges on division of the statements into scorable units was 0.82. Where there was agreement on the division, there was 0.75 agreement on non-immediacy scores. Therefore, there was 0.62 probability of complete agreement of two judges (12:424). Another indicator of scoring reliability was derived by taking the coefficient of linear correlation
between the pairs of scores assigned by the two judges to the subjects' communications. This figure was 0.80 (12:424).

Concerning the strength of the findings of this study, it may be noted that the pass-fail differentiation of passages one and two in experiment one and the like-dislike differentiation in experiment two probably accounted for some of the observed differences reported. That is, the extremes of the conditioning stimulus and the extremes of feeling asked for are hardly comparable to the subjects' normal communication tasks. However, this factor of variance was probably held to a minimum in experiment three by taking only between subjects measurements, though it was, like the first two, an overtly experimental situation.

The last study of Mehrabian's (et al.) on the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy deals with variations in non-immediacy scores as a function of the receiver of communication. Two hypotheses were tested: first, that there are greater non-immediacy scores in the communications about negative as opposed to positive experiences; and second, that there are higher non-immediacy scores in communications to an authority than to a peer (7:267). It was assumed in relation to the authority-peer factor, "that authorities are most often seen as more evaluative and more stressful [than peers, and that] subjects are
expected to experience more negative affect towards or preference for these addressees than peers" (7:267).

Subjects were sixteen male and sixteen female paid undergraduate volunteers, ostensibly for two experiments. In the "first experiment" they were randomly passed or failed on a psychological test to induce success or failure experiences (7:268). Then, as part of the "second experiment (a study of rumor)," subjects were asked to write a message about the "first experiment" either to a professor (a well known teacher) or to a peer (known only casually if at all) (7:269, 272-273).

The first hypothesis was confirmed, but the second was not. That is, greater non-immediacy scores were found in the communications about negative as opposed to positive experiences, but differences in non-immediacy scores were not solely a function of the receiver's status (7:271). Rather, it was found that the success-failure factor interacted with the authority-peer factor in such a way that (1) there were significantly greater non-immediacy scores in communications about failure experiences than in communications about success experiences regardless of the receiver's status; (2) the success-failure difference in non-immediacy scores was significantly greater in the peer addressee condition than in the authority addressee condition; and (3) that non-immediacy
scores in communications of failure to peers were higher though not significantly so than non-immediacy scores in communications of failure to superiors (7:271-272).

Mehrabian accounted for the absence of a difference in non-immediacy scores due to the receiver's status by pointing out that the subjects were communicating about success and failure and that the strength of their concern for adequacy (i.e., their desire to appear successful) apparently exceeded the strength of the addressee factor per se (7:272). Whether they wrote for a peer or for a superior made no difference in non-immediacy scores compared to what they wrote about, success or failure. Beyond this, the fact that the authority addressees were better known to the subjects than were the peer addressees may have accounted for the higher non-immediacy scores in communications of failure to peers vs. communications of failure to authorities (7:271, 273). If this is in fact the case, then the authority-peer roles with regard to stressfulness may have actually been reversed in the eyes of the subjects by the extraneous degree-of-familiarity factor. That is, the peer addressees may have been perceived as being the more evaluative and therefore the more stressful addressees.

More data on scoring reliability were also reported in this study. Using a rank order correlation
method of arriving at a reliability score, $\rho$ equaled 0.97. Mehrabian accounted for this higher figure than past ones by the fact that on previous experiments, most of the reliability measures had been taken on inter-judge agreement on individual communication units; here the reliability measure was taken on judges' agreement on each subject's non-immediacy score (7:271). Since this figure, the ratio of non-immediacy features to communication units, is used in the statistical analyses, much greater confidence may be put in the scoring reliability of the non-immediacy features than might have been warranted by previously reported reliability scores.

Finally, of importance to the linguistic non-immediacy hypothesis is that intercorrelations among mean non-immediacy scores, content analyses of the communications by experienced clinical psychologists, and Dollard and Mowrer's Discomfort-Relief Quotient were all significant (7:272). Mehrabian concluded that all three measures "seem equally sensitive for assessing the degree of induced (experienced) affect in a verbal communication" (7:273), but that the DRQ needs a larger communication than does the non-immediacy analysis to work efficiently, and that the non-immediacy analysis has greater reliability than clinicians' judgments (7:273).

In assessing the strength of the findings in this research report, it is important to note that demand
characteristics were virtually eliminated. That is, even though the subjects "knew" they were in an experiment, they were quite unlikely to speculate correctly about what the experimenter wanted from them in the way of linguistic responses. On this account, the results of this study are the soundest of all the studies reviewed. To the extent to which this study supports previously reported results, it lends credibility to the linguistic non-immediacy hypothesis.

Decoding. The first of Mehrabian's published research reports on linguistic non-immediacy was a decoding study. Subjects were thirty-two students in a psychology class at UCLA. They were presented booklets containing, in addition to instructions and an answer sheet, fifteen pairs of "ostensibly equivalent" sentences. One sentence in each pair was labeled "Speaker A," the other "Speaker B." Subjects were asked to designate on a seven point scale "the degree of preference, evaluation, or affect of Speaker A and Speaker B for the italicized person, object, event, etc., for each pair of statements." A higher score on the seven point scale meant that the reader perceived a more negative speaker attitude toward the

5With no mention of the distribution of males and females.
referent in a statement (17:32). The hypothesis that untrained persons decode differences in linguistic non-immediacy as indicating differences in communicators' attitudes was confirmed. That is, "for all five Types of Immediacy variations, the less Immediate statements are assigned significantly higher scores (p < .001) [on the seven point scales] than the more Immediate statements" (17:32).

The other relevant point in this experiment was a significant Immediacy by Subjects interaction, indicating that subjects varied in their ability to decode the various types of non-immediacy (17:33-34). This finding raises questions about the consensual nature of linguistic non-immediacy features.

The finding that readers perceived differences in communicator attitudes toward referents in each pair of statements is limited by the very fact that the statements were presented in contrasting pairs (17:33). That is, the demand characteristics of the experiment may have accounted for some of the perceived differences in the pairs of statements. The subjects may have inferred from the instructions and from the pairings that they should find a difference, and so proceeded to do so. How much of the total variance is accounted for by this factor is unknown.
The second experiment dealing with the decoding of linguistic non-immediacy was similar to the first except that the pairs of statements attributed to Speaker A and Speaker B were designated "explicitly neutral" (13:415) instead of "ostensibly equivalent." It also tested different non-immediacy features. Ninety-two UCLA undergraduates⁶ were given booklets containing a set of instructions, an answer sheet, and thirty-five pairs of sentences. The instructions directed the subjects to assume that Speakers A and B shared identical experiences with the referents in the sentences attributed to them. Each subject was asked to designate which speaker, in his opinion, expressed the more positive "preferential, evaluative, or affective" attitude toward the referent (underlined in the sentences) (13:416). It was hypothesized "that untrained subjects judge the more immediate of two explicitly neutral communications as indicating a more positive attitude" (13:415). The data were analyzed by using the subjects' mean agreement frequencies. With a normal expectation of 0.50 mean agreement frequency (i.e., choose A or B), six out of seven non-immediacy categories tested exceeded 0.50 significantly (13:416).

⁶ With no mention of the distribution of males and females.
The conclusion that non-immediacy is a consensually functional channel in written communication is negated by the fact that in both the decoding experiments, statements were presented in directly contrasting pairs. Whether percipients decode written communications in the manner observed under normal circumstances is open to question.  

Assessment. In retrospect, there are two major weaknesses in the studies just reviewed. The first involves the demand characteristics of the experiments. For example, in cases where subjects were encouraged to vary their style, where they were asked to make judgments about contrasting pairs of statements, or where they were asked to make statements about someone they liked very much or disliked very much, it is unknown to what extent the observed differences in non-immediacy scores or in perceived communicator attitude were due to the experimenter's instructions. Six of the seven reports reviewed above suffer in varying degrees from this problem. In fact, demand characteristics were so strong in the two experiments dealing with the decoding of linguistic non-immediacy as to make their findings completely

7Mehrabian himself mentions this reservation; see Albert Mehrabian, "The Effect of Context on Judgments of Speaker Attitude," Journal of Personality, XXXVI (1968), 22.
uncertain. That is, on the basis of Mehrabian's work it cannot be said with any certainty that linguistic non-immediacy is decoded with consistency by receivers of language.

The other major weakness of Mehrabian's research in linguistic immediacy is his failure to take into account in subsequent research the sex differences found in the dissertation. In the dissertation he found that females' positive and negative statements had significantly different non-immediacy scores regardless of whether they were statements about a liked or a disliked person. This was not the case with the males' statements. Male subjects were also shown to produce statements with generally higher non-immediacy scores than females, regardless of the instructions eliciting the statements. In the eight experiments reviewed above after the dissertation, Mehrabian had equal numbers of each sex in three experiments, no mention of the male-female distribution was made in three experiments, and two experiments used all female subjects. In view of the sex differences found in the dissertation, some of the observed differences in non-immediacy in the subsequent experiments must be due to the distribution of sexes in the samples used in each experiment. How much of the variance is accounted for by the sex variable is unknown.
On the positive side, the aspect of Mehrabian's research of most interest to this investigator was reported in an experiment in which sexes were balanced and in which demand characteristics were at a minimum. Its purpose of assessing the influence of receiver (whether peer or superior) on the encoding of non-immediacy was totally masked by another experiment. And the results of this experiment confirmed the general non-immediacy hypothesis of the other experiments, thereby lending credibility to their findings despite the reservations regarding demand characteristics and sex differences.

Another strength of Mehrabian's research is the high scoring reliability on the analysis of communications. Most encouraging is that the highest reliability, 0.97, was a measure of judges' agreement on the non-immediacy scores of communications. Lower reliability scores had been reported on inter-judge agreement on division of sentences into communication units and assignment of non-immediacy features. However, it was the ratio of non-immediacy features to communication units on which Mehrabian based all his conclusions. Since non-immediacy score is the figure Mehrabian employed in his statistical analyses, it is the figure employed in the statistical analyses of the present investigation. Due to the highly reliable nature of the non-immediacy score, this investigator ran no reliability tests of his own.
Speech Communication and Non-immediacy

If people actually encode and decode language in accord with the non-immediacy hypothesis as Albert Mehrabian's research indicates, a fundamental question to the researcher in speech communication is: does this occur in public speaking situations? That is, in non-experimental situations, and before live audiences do speakers encode language, and do those audiences decode language, in the manner predicted by the non-immediacy hypothesis? To answer that question is the major objective of this investigation. The point of view of the investigation is (1) that linguistic non-immediacy is important in the public speaking situation if and only if audiences perceive it and behave accordingly, and (2) of that non-immediacy perceived by an audience, what is its source in the speaker? The most obvious and easily examined speaker variable was sex. However, the circumstances under which the experiment was conducted made it a rather easy matter to obtain information on speakers' personalities also. This investigator reasoned that since non-immediacy was an indicator of speaker affect, it was likely that individual differences with regard to personality played an important role in the encoding and decoding of linguistic non-immediacy. The Omnibus Personality Inventory (8) was chosen for its ease of administration and scoring.
The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. The mean non-immediacy scores of speeches do not differ as a function of audience composition: all peers, peers plus a superior of whose presence the speakers had been warned in advance, or peers plus a superior of whose presence the speakers had not been warned in advance.  

2. Speakers' non-immediacy scores do not differ as a function of sex.

3. Speakers' non-immediacy scores do not differ as a function of personality.

4. Audience perceptions of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of audience composition: peers, peers plus a superior (warned), or peers plus a superior (unwarned).

5. Audience perceptions of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of speaker sex.

6. Audience perceptions of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of speaker personality.

In the event of the rejection of the null hypotheses, the following alternate hypotheses will be accepted:

1. The mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers is less than the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers plus a superior (warned); the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers plus a superior (warned) is less than the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers plus a superior (unwarned).

2. Speakers' non-immediacy scores differ as a function of sex.

3. Speakers' non-immediacy scores differ as a function of personality.

---

8 Hereafter, the three audience conditions will be referred to as peers, peers plus a superior (warned), and peers plus a superior (unwarned).
4. Audiences perceive speakers to peers as
having more positive attitudes than speakers
to peers plus a superior (warned); audiences
perceive speakers to peers plus a superior
(warned) as having more positive attitudes
than speakers to peers plus a superior
(unwarned).

5. Audience perceptions of speaker attitudes
differ as a function of speaker sex.

6. Audience perceptions of speaker attitudes
differ as a function of speaker personality.

Hypotheses one and four are designed to test,
in the public speaking situation, Mehrabian's assumption
"that authorities are most often seen as more evaluative
and more stressful [than peers, and that] subjects are
expected to experience more negative affect towards or
preference for these addresses than peers" (7:267) in
both its encoding and its decoding aspects. Hypotheses
two, three, five, and six are designed to test factors
relating to the encoding and decoding of linguistic
non-immediacy which remain the same across the three
types of audiences faced by the speakers.
CHAPTER II
PROCEDURE AND DESIGN

In order to test these hypotheses, a procedure was developed for collecting data so as to completely eliminate the problem of demand characteristics. These data were analyzed and submitted to the appropriate statistical tests.

I. PROCEDURE

Separate procedures were developed for collecting the data on the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy and for collecting the data on the decoding of linguistic non-immediacy. That is, different subjects performed under different sets of conditions. They generated different types of data, and the data were processed into useful form in a different manner.

Encoding

Subjects. The subjects for the encoding portion of the experiment were student leaders contacted by the investigator on the campus of Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. They were officers in fraternities,
sororities, the student government association, the student union and dormitory governing boards. As such they were considered by the investigator to fulfill the criterion of an experienced communicator. This criterion was established in order to reduce as much as possible the variance among speakers on the factor of communication experience. Nine females and nine males were used in the experiment. At the time they spoke, they were sophomores, juniors, or seniors. Appendix A provides information on the subjects' academic backgrounds.

Collection of Data. The speaking situation provided for the subjects was called the Speech 1 Enrichment Program. Prospective subjects were informed that the Speech 1 Enrichment Program was being directed by the investigator with the approval of Dr. Owen Peterson, director of Speech 1 instructors, and that it was intended to aid Speech 1 students in practical application of the course by bringing before them student leaders who were experienced communicators. They were further informed that the Speech 1 Enrichment Program was a series of symposium meetings consisting of a panel of four such student leaders and a single Speech 1 class. Each panel member would speak on the topic Problems in Campus Communication for five to eight minutes, then the floor would be open to the class for
questions and comments. The prospective subject was then invited to be a part of the program. All subjects were therefore volunteers, and in the investigator's judgment took the task very seriously.

If the prospective subject seemed interested at this point, the conversation turned to the details of the program. If his schedule permitted appearance on a panel the necessary three times required by the statistical design, the discussion moved to such things as formality. Subjects were encouraged to wear what was comfortable. Some therefore came "dressed" for the occasion, and some obviously came straight from class. Subjects were also encouraged to make their speeches informal, to simply talk about their experiences in communication on campus, both failures and successes, and about any solutions they might have for the problems encountered.

All the symposium meetings were held in room 106 in the Music and Dramatic Arts Building on the Baton Rouge campus of Louisiana State University. Room 106 is used to teach courses in radio. It was chosen for the experiment because of the attached control room. In the control room was concealed a General Electric Model 4TDLB2 video tape recorder. All subjects' speeches were covertly recorded. Simultaneously, a boom mike, part of the normal equipment of the studio, eight to ten feet to the right side of the podium, was used to covertly
secure audio tape recordings of the speeches. From the audio tapes manuscripts of the speeches were made. These provided the basic data for the portion of the experiment dealing with the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy. The video tapes were later played to other Speech 1 classes and as such provided the treatments for the portion of the experiment dealing with the decoding of linguistic non-immediacy.

After the necessary encoding data had been collected, the subjects were contacted by letter from the investigator and informed that as a follow-up to the Speech 1 Enrichment Program, the Omnibus Personality Inventory (8) would be administered to selected participants in the program. All of the eighteen subjects took the test at one of the several hours it was offered over a period of two weeks. Two took the test unsupervised, i.e., on their own time, and mailed the completed form to the investigator. After all of the forms were in, the investigator informed all eighteen subjects by letter that they had not only been a part of the Speech 1 Enrichment Program, but they had also participated in his dissertation research.

Treatments. Each subject spoke three times, giving, as was suggested by the investigator, "essentially the same talk" each time. The experiment was designed
to compare three audience conditions. Treatment One was an all-peer audience, the speech 1 class, the other panel members, and the investigator as moderator. Treatment Two was the same as Treatment One, except that a superior was present who was a professor in the Speech Department, and the subjects had been notified ahead of time\(^9\) that he would be there to observe the symposium. Treatment Three was the same as Treatment Two, except that the subjects had not been notified ahead of time of the superior's presence. Following Mehrabian's assumption that a student communicator will experience negative affect when an authority is the receiver of his communication, it was assumed that Treatment One would be the weakest stimulus, that Treatment Two would be stronger, and that Treatment Three would be the strongest, and that non-immediacy scores of speeches given under these three conditions would be lowest for Treatment One, higher for Treatment Two, and highest for Treatment Three. In Treatments Two and Three, the superior was introduced by the investigator as a professor in the Speech Department who taught in the area of communication and who was

\(^9\)Due to the impossibility of establishing a constant length of time from the time of notification of the superior's presence to the Enrichment Program meeting, subjects were contacted by the investigator at such time as they were available. Therefore the time lapse between warning and speaking ranged from four hours in the case of three speakers to a maximum of three days.
interested in the Speech 1 Enrichment Program. The superiors were instructed to react normally and not to feign pleasure or displeasure with the speakers.

No speaker spoke under all three conditions. As was dictated by the statistical design, each speaker spoke under one of the three conditions, then under another one, and then under the first again in his three appearances on a panel.

**Decoding**

**Subjects.** Whereas in the encoding portion of the experiment, the subjects were the speakers on the Speech 1 Enrichment Program, the subjects in the decoding portion of the experiment were the members of the Speech 1 classes who saw the video tapes of the speeches. They were told about the Speech 1 Enrichment Program. These classes were informed that their help was being solicited in evaluating the speakers who had been on the Speech 1 Enrichment Program. The speakers were introduced only as students in leadership positions on campus.

**Collection of Data.** Evaluation forms were distributed to each Speech 1 class before it viewed a tape. The students were instructed in the use of the Evaluation Form (See Appendix C). They were asked to make three judgments of the speakers' attitudes by answering three questions: "How did you perceive the speaker's
attitude toward his audience; How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his subject; How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his role as a communicator?" Each question was "answered" by marking four seven-interval evaluative semantic differential scales under each question. The four scales were: positive-negative; good-bad; honest-dishonest; pleasant-unpleasant. A separate set of three questions was provided the subjects for each speaker viewed on the video tape. Each speaker was evaluated immediately after his speech was viewed.

**Treatments.** A treatment in the decoding portion of the experiment was a video tape of a meeting of the Speech 1 Enrichment Program in which the speeches were given under one of the three audience conditions: peers, peers plus a superior (warned), or peers plus a superior (unwarned). It was hypothesized that, if linguistic non-immediacy is encoded as a function of receiver status, it is likely to be perceived by an audience in terms of one or more of the three questions on the Evaluation Form. The questions were derived from Wiener and Mehrabian's contention that differences in linguistic non-immediacy indicate differences in the communicator's attitude toward the receiver of his communication, toward the referent of his communication, or toward the communication itself (20:1, 3, 4, 30, 49).
Analytical Treatment of the Data

Encoding. The speeches given by the eighteen subjects as part of the Speech 1 Enrichment Program constituted the basic data for the encoding portion of the experiment. In order to put this data into usable form, manuscripts were first made from the audio tapes of the speeches. The manuscripts of the complete speeches were divided into communication units by the investigator. To facilitate scoring, these were then retyped, separating communication units by starting each one on a new line. Each communication unit was assigned a certain number of non-immediacy features. For illustration here are a few scored communication units from the actual speeches of the subjects:

the way you present something means a lot.  \( C_c, P_c, I_r, X \)

"\( C_c \)" is for "you" interpreted by the investigator to mean people in general, including the communicator.

"\( P_c \)" is for "the way" interpreted by the communicator to refer to a part, aspect, attribute, or characteristic of the communicator. "\( I_r \)" is for "something," the implicit referent, i.e., the referent is not actually named but a general pronominal is put in its place.

"\( X \)" is for "a lot," interpreted by the investigator to qualify the communicator-referent relationship.
in that we all fit together to make $C_c$, $X$, $P_c$ ah a hand or to make a class $P_c$, $P_c$, $U_r$

"$C_c$" is for "we." "$X$" is for "all." The three "$P_c$" symbols refer to three characteristics of the communicator as part of "we"—"fit together," "to make ah a hand," and "to make a class." "$U_r$" is assigned for the unilateral action of the communicator as part of "we" toward the referent(s) "hand" and "class."

I think the main reason why this does happen $M$, $X$, $P_c$ is because ah all the administrators on this $P_r$, $P_r$, $X$ campus are interested in the students. $P_r$

"$M$" is for the qualification "I think." The two "$X$" symbols are for the two intensifiers, "main," and "all." "$P_c$" is for "reason" as part, aspect, etc. of the communicator. The three "$P_r$" symbols are for the three specifications of the referent, "administrators"—"on this campus," "are interested," and "in the students."

Since Wiener and Mehrabian's explication of non-immediacy is rather brief and designed principally for analyzing single written sentences rather than connected oral discourse, the investigator found it necessary to develop a corpus of generalizations for the application of non-immediacy analysis to the encoding data of this experiment. These rules were based on Wiener and Mehrabian's application of non-immediacy analysis to a clinical interview (20:195-210, particularly 208-210) as well as their explicit rules presented in CHAPTER ONE,
above. However, there were still many cases in the subjects' speeches of which there were no explicit examples. In cases like this, the investigator elaborated rules based on the non-immediacy hypothesis as Mehrabian applied it to the clinical interview materials. For example, there was very little precedent in Wiener and Mehrabian or in Mehrabian's early research for the use of the "I" feature (Implicit) with pronominals such as "something," or "people," or "these." Therefore, the investigator constructed a rule which called for the "$I_r$" symbol for

| everything | someone | something | things    |
| nothing    | others  | somebody  | anybody  |
| people     | it      | person    | that     |
| them       | what    | they      |          |

and for no "$I_r$" for

| him        | her     | a person |
| the person | the people | the individual |
| an individual | these | this |
| here       |         |          |

The rule was, like Mehrabian's work, based on the distance metaphor (See p. 1, above). The former list, in the sentences in which they were encountered, denoted in the investigator's judgment, more distance from the communicator than did the words in the latter list. The rules governing all nine of the non-immediacy features were elaborated to some extent by this method. When a feature was encountered which indicated a distancing of the communicator-referent relationship, the explicit rules and examples for the relevant feature were examined.
If the encountered feature was judged by the investigator to obey the explicit rule or a rule implicit in Mehrabian's own scoring, it was added to the list of explicit examples of the explicit rule. To the best of the investigator's knowledge, these elaborated rules were applied consistently across all speeches analyzed in the same way Mehrabian's explicit rules were applied.

**Decoding.** The preparation of the data for the decoding portion of the experiment consisted mainly of computing semantic differential scale scores. If, for example, Question One on the Evaluation Form had been answered in the following manner, the scores for the scales would be 3, 5, 6, and 1, respectively.

- **positive**: ___:___:___:___: X :___:___ negative
- **bad**: ___:___:___:___: X :___:___ good
- **dishonest**: ___:___:___:___: X :___:___ honest
- **pleasant**: ___:___:___:___:___ : X : unpleasant

That is, although the scales were not numbered, in each case the interval nearest the negative pole was scored 1, and the interval nearest the positive pole was scored 7. The score for the question would be 15, and if the scores for Questions Two and Three were 22 and 17 respectively, the score for the speaker would be 54.
II. DESIGN

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF THE DATA

In any statistical study, the design employed is dictated by the extraneous sources of variance the experimenter wishes to remove from the performance of his subjects. In the present experiment, it was appropriate to employ an analysis of variance in a Lucas Switchback Design and two types of analysis of variance in Completely Randomized Designs.

**Lucas Switchback Design**

Three conditions of the present study dictated the use of the Lucas Switchback Design (11). First, the investigator desired to use small groups of subjects who would nevertheless generate a large body of data. Second, in order to satisfy the first condition, subjects would have to perform more than once. Third, the investigator was interested in within subjects variation in the encoding of non-immediacy.

The investigator desired small groups of subjects because of the volunteer nature of the Speech 1 Enrichment Program. He reasoned that high morale and commitment would be easier to establish within small groups.

Each speaker spoke three times. He spoke under one audience condition, then under another one, and then under the first one again. The Lucas Switchback Design
removes differences among a subject's performance which are solely due to his repeating treatments. For example, a subject may have been less anxious the second time he spoke as compared to the first time and even less anxious the third time. This change over time in the subject may have affected the non-immediacy of his language. The switchback design removes any change over time (over performances) in the variable being measured. As a practical matter of experimental technique, an advantage to having subjects repeat treatments was the esprit de corps it helped create in each group of subjects.

Since the major purpose of the experiment was to investigate whether a speaker varies the non-immediacy of his language according to receiver status, sex, and personality, and since receiver status was the only thing that changed over the three performances of each speaker, the investigator desired to determine if each speaker changed his language from audience to audience. The Lucas design allows the investigator to determine whether each speaker, taken separately, altered his language according to the audience conditions under which he spoke.

The Lucas design allows the use of a small number of subjects because each subject performs three times. In the present study, each of eighteen speakers spoke three times, yielding fifty-four speeches. The design compensates for repeated performances by taking as its
basic quantitative unit the mean of the first and third performances of a subject minus twice the subject's second performance. This "D score" is the quantity used in the statistical analysis. A different D score is computed for each speaker.

Both encoding and decoding data were submitted to analysis by the switchback design. First there was the encoding data consisting of non-immediacy scores. Here a D score was the mean of a subject's non-immediacy scores in the first and third times he spoke minus twice the subject's non-immediacy score the second time he spoke. Then there was the decoding data consisting of evaluation form scores. Here a D score was the mean of all Evaluation Form scores for a speaker in the first and third times he spoke minus twice the speaker's mean Evaluation Form score for the second time he spoke. D scores were also computed for each of the three questions on the Evaluation Form, and these were submitted to the switchback analysis as were the Evaluation Form totals.

The encoding data analyzed by the switchback design yielded information on how a speaker altered the non-immediacy of his language as a function of receiver status. The decoding data analyzed by the switchback design yielded information on how video tape audiences
perceived differences in a speaker's attitudes which were a function of the receiver status in the live audiences he had spoken to.

Here is how the Lucas Switchback Design assigns subjects to treatments, regardless of whether the data being analyzed are non-immediacy scores or evaluation form scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
<th>4 Ss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in the body of the table are treatment numbers. For example, the first four subjects spoke first under Treatment One (peers), then under Treatment Two (peers plus a superior, warned) then under Treatment One again. The last four speakers spoke first under Treatment Three (peers plus a superior, unwarned) then under Treatment Two (peers plus a superior, warned) then under Treatment Three again.

In his explication of the switchback design, Lucas points out that for an efficient statistical test, there must be at least two subjects on each sequence of three treatments. Therefore, in order to compensate for unexpected absences of subjects, four subjects (two male, two female) were scheduled for each sequence of three
meetings of the Speech 1 Enrichment Program. Those anticipated absences did occur. Subjects were deleted in order to equalize sexes overall and to equalize the number of subjects on each treatment sequence. After deletions, data from three subjects per treatment sequence were included in the switchback analysis.

**Completely Randomized Design**

Since the Lucas Switchback Design analyzes only one treatment variable, the decoding data from the speakers' first speeches were separately analyzed to determine if there was a sex difference or a sex by Treatment interaction.

The analysis of variance was a split plot arrangement of treatments in a completely randomized design. Whole plots consisted of a two by three factorial arrangement (sex by treatment), and subplots consisted of a three by four factorial arrangement (question by scale).

A second analysis of variance was run on data from the speakers' first speeches to yield sums of squares and sums of cross products. These figures were used to compute within sex by treatment combination correlation coefficients. The input for this analysis included each speaker's sex, the treatment condition under which he spoke, the non-immediacy score of that speech, his scores on each of the fourteen OPI scales, and his Evaluation Form scores.
Because of the necessity for equal numbers of subjects on each sequence of three treatments (as well as the largest number possible) and because of failures of certain subjects to complete a full sequence of three treatments, it was not possible to get equal numbers of subjects on each treatment by sex combination for this analysis. Therefore, it was impossible to evaluate the sex by treatment interaction on the encoding of non-immediacy. However, even if there had been such an interaction, it would have been treated as unimportant in this experiment, for, as will be clear below, there was no sex difference and no sex by treatment interaction on the decoding data. A sex by treatment interaction or a sex difference on the encoding data, if it existed, did not result in a concomitant affect on audiences' perceptions of speaker attitudes.

The analysis enabled the investigator to compute correlation coefficients for all possible combinations of variables included in the analysis. The correlations relevant to the present study were those between non-immediacy scores and each of the fourteen OPI scales and those between non-immediacy scores and the Evaluation Form totals and individual questions.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. RESULTS

Encoding

Here the questions to be answered are (1) do the data indicate that speakers encode linguistic non-immediacy as a function of the situational factor of receiver status and (2) do speakers encode linguistic non-immediacy as a function of the non-situational factors of sex and personality.

Situational. The three audience conditions under which subjects spoke were, Treatment One, peers, Treatment Two, peers plus a superior (warned), and Treatment Three, peers plus a superior (unwarned). The dependent variable was the non-immediacy score of a subject's speech. The non-immediacy score was the ratio of non-immediacy features to the total number of communication units. Mehrabian's assumption, though unproved with written discourse, is that communicators will use more non-immediate language in communications to authorities than in communications to peers. Null Hypothesis One was that there is no difference in
non-immediacy scores of speeches given under the three audience conditions. Alternate Hypothesis One was that the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers is less than the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers plus a superior (warned); the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers plus a superior (warned) is less than the mean non-immediacy score of speeches to peers plus a superior (unwarned).

The F value for Treatments in Table I is non-significant. Null Hypothesis One was not rejected, and it was concluded that the non-immediacy scores of speeches did not differ as a function of audience composition. That is, the non-immediacy scores of the speeches given under the three treatments did not differ beyond chance. Based on the data from this experiment, neither the presence of a superior nor the warning of his presence caused a difference among the non-immediacy scores of the speeches.

Non-situational. The two non-situational factors considered in this experiment were sex and personality. Null Hypothesis Two was not tested. Due to subjects' absences, it was impossible to provide data from equal numbers of subjects in each treatment-sex combination as was required by the analysis. However, even if a test of Hypothesis Two had revealed a sex difference or a sex by Treatment interaction, the failure to reject
TABLE I. Switchback analysis of variance for non-immediacy scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Mean non-immediacy scores for treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment One</th>
<th>Treatment Two</th>
<th>Treatment Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Five indicated that sex was not a functional variable with regard to audience perception of speaker attitudes in the public speaking situation.

Null Hypothesis Three was that speakers' non-immediacy scores do not differ as a function of personality. It was tested against Alternate Hypothesis Three: that speakers' non-immediacy scores differ as a function of personality. Table III presents correlations between the non-immediacy scores of speakers' first speeches, regardless of the treatment and the sex of speaker, and the speakers' scores on the OPI.

Two scales show a significant positive correlation with non-immediacy scores. Therefore Null Hypothesis Three was rejected, and Alternate Hypothesis Three was partially accepted. With the TO scale and the PI scale, the higher the subject scored the greater was the non-immediacy score of his first speech, regardless of which type of audience he spoke to and regardless of whether he was male or female.

Concerning the TO scale (Theoretical Orientation), high scorers "endorse items reflecting an interest in reading about science, like speculating about problems which have challenged experts, enjoy conducting research and doing assignments requiring original research work, like looking for faulty reasoning in an argument and prefer the man of ideas to the practical man."
TABLE III. Correlations between non-immediacy scores and OPI scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>+.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>+.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>+.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>+.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>+.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>+.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>+.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>+.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>+.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>+.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>+.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
Low scorers on the other hand "do not like to read scientific or mathematical articles, or to write about the possible outcomes of a significant research discovery; prefer having a theory explained to them rather than attempting to understand it on their own; prefer several shorter problems to a long, rather involved one; and do not expect that mathematics will ultimately prove more important than theology (8:5)."

Based on the data yielded in this experiment, a person prone to grapple with problems until they are solved, no matter who might have already arrived at an answer, is likely to use more non-immediate language, regardless of sex and audience composition, than a person uninterested in such long term attendance to detail or intricate chains of reasoning.

Concerning the PI scale (Personal Integration), high scorers "do not often feel as though they had done something wrong or wicked, that no one seems to understand them, that there is a barrier between them and others, or that they are not as happy as others seem to be."

On the other hand, low scorers "at times feel completely inadequate, have strange and peculiar thoughts, wonder who they really are, and what they should really be like, and sometimes have impulses accompanied by such a strong feeling of urgency that they can think of little else (8:6)."
Therefore, based on the data yielded by this experiment, a person with a healthy self-concept, i.e., a person who accepts himself and feels accepted by others, is likely to use more non-immediate language, regardless of sex and audience composition, than a person who feels inadequate and lacks a clear self-identity.

Decoding

Here the questions to be answered are (1) do the data indicate that audiences decode linguistic non-immediacy as a function of the situational factor of receiver status and (2) do the data indicate that audiences decode linguistic non-immediacy as a function of the non-situational factors of sex and personality.

Situational. The Evaluation Forms completed by the Speech 1 classes who viewed the video tapes were designed to determine whether audiences perceived speakers' attitudes to differ according to the audience condition under which they spoke. Mehrabian's research has shown that differences in the non-immediacy of written language does cue differences in the communicator's attitudes, the greater the non-immediacy, the more negative the speaker's attitude. Although no differences in encoding non-immediacy due to receiver status were detected above, the decoding data indicate that Treatment Three, peers plus a superior (unwarned), did apparently trigger some
kind of perceptible response from the speakers, though not a response that altered linguistic non-immediacy.

Null Hypothesis Four was that audience perceptions of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of audience composition. It was tested against Alternate Hypothesis Four: audiences perceive speakers to peers as having more positive attitudes than speakers to peers plus a superior (warned); audiences perceive speakers to peers plus a superior (warned) as having more positive attitudes than speakers to peers plus a superior (unwarned). These data are presented in Tables IV through XI.

In the case of the Evaluation Form totals as well as Question One and Question Three, evaluations of speakers to peers and speakers to peers plus a superior did not differ except by chance. However, speakers to peers plus a superior (warned) were perceived to have significantly more positive attitudes than speakers to peers plus a superior (unwarned). Therefore Null Hypothesis Four was rejected and Alternate Hypothesis Four was partially accepted.

Non-situational. An analysis of variance was run on the decoding data for the speakers' first speeches. The main purpose was to determine if there was a sex difference or a sex by Treatment interaction.10

10 Of importance in assessing the sensitivity of the Evaluation Form scales to the attitudes they were intended to measure was the Treatment by scale interaction (See Appendix B).
TABLE IV. Switchback analysis of variance for Evaluation Form totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.63</td>
<td>5.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1^a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1394</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1^b</td>
<td></td>
<td>147.1200</td>
<td>10.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
**P < .01

^aTreatment One vs. Treatments Two, Three
^bTreatment Two vs. Treatment Three

TABLE V. Means for Evaluation Form totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment One</th>
<th>Treatment Two</th>
<th>Treatment Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.42</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>65.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI. Switchback analysis of variance for Evaluation Form Question One: How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his audience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>5.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>10.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  aTreatment One vs. Treatments Two, Three  
**P < .01  bTreatment Two vs. Treatment Three

TABLE VII. Means for Evaluation Form Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment One</th>
<th>Treatment Two</th>
<th>Treatment Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>21.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII. Switchback analysis of variance for Evaluation Form Question Two: How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his subject?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IX. Means for Evaluation Form Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment One</th>
<th>Treatment Two</th>
<th>Treatment Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>22.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE X. Switchback analysis of variance for Evaluation Form Question Three: How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his role as a communicator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>8.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>16.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .01  

*Treatment One vs. Treatments Two, Three  
*Treatment Two vs. Treatment Three

### TABLE XI. Means for Evaluation Form Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment One</th>
<th>Treatment Two</th>
<th>Treatment Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>21.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis Five was that audience perceptions of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of speaker sex. It was tested against Alternate Hypothesis Five, that audience perceptions of speaker attitudes differ as a function of speaker sex. These data are presented in Table XII.

As Table XII shows, there was neither a sex difference nor a sex by Treatment interaction on the decoding data. Therefore Null Hypothesis Five was not rejected. Speakers were not perceived to have different attitudes due to their sex, even when taking into consideration audience composition.

Personality is the other non-situational factor whose relationship to the decoding of linguistic non-immediacy is to be examined. Null Hypothesis Six was that audience perceptions of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of speaker personality. It was tested against Alternate Hypothesis Six: that audience perceptions of speaker attitudes differ as a function of speaker personality. However, to simply run correlations between Evaluation Form scores and the scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory would be to lose sight of non-immediacy as the major concern of this experiment. The solution is to recall that above it was found that two OPI scales (TO and PI) had significant positive correlations with non-immediacy scores. Therefore, to
TABLE XII. Analysis of variance, subjects’ first speeches, Evaluation Form data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>6.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>13.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Question</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Question</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex X Question</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>22.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question X Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Scale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Question X Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Question X Scale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex X Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex X Question X Scale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05 

**P < .01
get some idea of the relationship between personality and the decoding of linguistic non-immediacy, correlations were run between non-immediacy scores of speakers' first speeches and their corresponding Evaluation Form scores. If the TO and PI scales are significantly associated with non-immediacy scores and non-immediacy scores are shown to be significantly associated with Evaluation Form scores, then it must be concluded that speaker personality bears a substantial relationship to the manner in which audiences decode linguistic non-immediacy. Table XIII presents these data.

Question Three correlated significantly with non-immediacy scores, and that was a negative correlation. Therefore, Null Hypothesis Six was rejected, and Alternate Hypothesis Six was partially accepted. The higher the non-immediacy score of a speech, regardless of the speaker's sex or the audience composition, the more negative was his attitude perceived to be toward his role as a communicator. Table III above indicated a positive correlation between non-immediacy scores and The Omnibus Personality Inventory scales, TO and PI. Coupled with the finding of a negative correlation between non-immediacy scores and Question Three on the Evaluation Form, the inference to be drawn concerning audience perceptions of speakers' attitudes, speakers' personalities, and non-immediacy is that high non-immediacy scores co-occur with high scores on TO and
## TABLE XIII. Correlations: Non-immediacy scores and Evaluation Form scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Form</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question One</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Two</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Three</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
PI, and that this language-personality combination results in more negative audience assessments of speakers' attitudes toward their role as a communicator. Low scores on TO, PI and non-immediacy result in more positive audience assessments of speakers' attitudes toward their role as a communicator.

It is significant also to note that all four of the correlations are negative, that overall, a speaker using more non-immediate language was taken to have more negative attitudes toward his audience, toward his subject, and toward himself.

II. DISCUSSION

Encoding

The finding that the non-immediacy score of a speech was not dependent on receiver status casts doubt on the universality of Wiener and Mehrabian's premise that non-immediacy scores vary as a function of the speaker's attitude toward the referent of his communication, toward the act of communicating, or toward his addressee (20: 1, 3, 4, 30, 49). This experiment indicated that linguistic non-immediacy in the public speaking situation is encoded independent of the situational variable of audience composition: peers, peers plus a superior (warned), or peers plus a superior (unwarned). These findings confirm the results of a research report by
Mehrabian (et al., 7:272) in which no difference in non-immediacy scores was found due solely to the status of the receiver of a written communication. The investigator had assumed that confronting the communicator with the actual presence of a superior would be a stronger stimulus than having the communicator write a message to an absent superior (7:269). However, the anxiety-producing stimulus was apparently not strong enough, by itself, to cause differences in non-immediacy scores. One possible reason for the subjects' failure to respond as predicted was that the speaking situations in which they found themselves were not materially different from situations they confronted daily in their campus leadership roles. Another possibility is that receiver status interacted with message content, as Mehrabian, et al. found (7:271). However, the covert nature of the experiment prevented control of the speeches' content.

The data indicate that, where linguistic non-immediacy is not encoded in the public speaking situation as a function of receiver status, it may be related rather to aspects of the speaker's personality. The Theoretical Orientation and Personal Integration Scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory showed significant positive correlations with non-immediacy scores of speeches, independent of sex and treatment. High scorers on the TO and PI scales, regardless of sex, tend to produce language with
high non-immediacy scores and to disregard receiver status in the production of that language.

Further investigations of the encoding of linguistic non-immediacy in the public speaking situation should be designed to assess the possibility of a receiver status-message content interaction. It may well be that speakers, like writers, as Mehrabian, et al. found, make status distinctions in non-immediacy depending on what they are speaking about. Further investigations should also be designed to assess the role of personality in status distinctions as reflected in non-immediacy. This direction is suggested by examination of the OPI scales of those subjects whose speeches had higher non-immediacy scores in the more stressful audience conditions. Low scorers on both the PI and AL scales produced speeches whose non-immediacy scores reflected the relative stressfulness of the audience conditions. Each low scorer produced a lower non-immediacy score on Treatment One than on Treatment Two and a lower non-immediacy score on Treatment Two than on Treatment Three. The suggestion is that speakers with strong feelings of inadequacy and unclear self-identity (low PI, 8:6) and speakers who are more sensitive than most and who have difficulty coping with life (low AL, 8:6), may be more likely to have performed in accord with the non-immediacy hypothesis than speakers with other personality constructs. The possibility that the non-immediacy
hypothesis is valid only for certain people in the public speaking situation should be investigated.

Decoding

Situational. Although the encoding data revealed no differences in the non-immediacy scores of speeches due to receiver status, the decoding data demonstrated such differences. Evaluation Form totals as well as Questions one and three taken separately showed that the presence of a superior (unwarned) did cause more negative speaker attitudes to be perceived by the audiences. However, the channel or channels through which this attitude difference was communicated to the audiences was not indicated by this experiment. Since the content of each speaker's speech was essentially the same all three times he spoke, and since the encoding of that content was analyzed via non-immediacy scores and found not to vary beyond chance, two other possibilities seem most likely. One is that the speakers revealed their anxiety at the presence of a superior (unwarned) through such para-linguistic communication behaviors as, for example, lessened eye contact, fidgeting, or hesitation phenomena. That these cues function as negatively loaded communication behaviors is confirmed almost daily in normal communication experience.

A second possibility is suggested by the personality data. Since it was Treatment Three which produced the
significantly lower Evaluation Form scores, the question arises whether the speakers who spoke under condition three had a combination of personality scores which contributed to low Treatment Three scores. According to the switchback design's assignment of subjects to treatments, some subjects spoke twice under Treatment Three, some once, and some not at all. If those subjects who spoke under Treatment Three twice had personalities different from the other subjects, this could have contributed to the fact that Treatment Three scores were lower than both Treatment One and Treatment Two scores.

Non-situational. The analysis of variance of the decoding data on the subjects' first speeches did not reveal a sex difference or a sex by Treatment interaction. Therefore, a speaker's sex apparently did not influence the manner in which his attitudes were perceived by audiences.

However, personality did prove to be variable in audiences' perceptions of speakers' attitudes. A significant negative correlation was found to exist between Evaluation Form scores on Question Three and non-immediacy scores, regardless of the sex of the speaker or the treatment in which he spoke. That is, the greater the non-immediacy score of a speaker's speech, the more negative was his attitude toward his role as a communicator judged to be. Recalling that high scorers on the TO and PI scales
of the OPI have a propensity for high non-immediacy scores, the conclusion must be drawn that high non-immediacy scores co-occur with high scores on the TO and PI personality scales, and that together these may substantially affect the manner in which an audience perceives a speaker's attitudes. Therefore, non-immediacy in language is a communication behavior by which the personality dimensions of Theoretical Orientation and Personal Integration are manifested to a speaker's audience.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Null Hypothesis One was not rejected. It was concluded that the mean non-immediacy scores of speeches do not differ as a function of audience composition.

Null Hypothesis Two was not tested. However, the failure to reject Null Hypothesis Five indicates that, even if Null Hypothesis Two had been rejected, sex was not a functional variable in audiences' perceptions of speaker attitudes.

Null Hypothesis Three was rejected. Alternate Hypothesis Three was partially accepted. It was concluded that speakers' non-immediacy scores differ as a function of some personality factors.

Null Hypothesis Four was rejected. Alternate Hypothesis Four was partially accepted. It was concluded that audiences perceive speakers to peers plus a superior (warned) as having more positive attitudes than speakers to peers plus a superior (unwarned).

Null Hypothesis Five was not rejected. It was concluded that audience perception of speaker attitudes do not differ as a function of speaker sex.

80
Null Hypothesis Six was rejected. Alternate Hypothesis Six was partially accepted. It was concluded that audience perceptions of speaker attitudes differ as a function of speaker personality when certain personality dimensions co-occur with high non-immediacy scores.


### APPENDIX A

**Subjects Speaking in the Speech 1 Enrichment Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Year of College Study</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Speech Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Speech Social Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Math Spanish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>English Social Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agri-business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Aero-space Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Speech Journalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Petroleum Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Speech Journalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Journalism English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Orthogonal comparisons of Treatment means within each Evaluation Form semantic differential scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale One:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>51.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>10.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Two:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>22.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Three:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>11.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>11.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Four:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>80.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

aTreatment One vs. Treatments Two, Three
bTreatment Two vs. Treatment Three

Treatment by scale interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Treatment 1</th>
<th>Treatment 2</th>
<th>Treatment 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

SPEECH 1 ENRICHMENT PROGRAM: EVALUATION FORM

The questions below are designed to enable those of us connected with the Speech 1 Enrichment Program to judge the effectiveness of the speakers who have appeared on the Program. This will help us in choosing speakers for future programs.

The questions are to be "answered" in a manner which may be unfamiliar to you. Four pairs of terms follow each question. For example, to the question

How is the weather today?

you would answer

safe X: __: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___dangerous

or

safe __: __: __: __: __: ___: X dangerous

if you think your answer to the question is very closely related to the term at either end of the scale.

If you think your answer is quite closely related to either end of the scale, answer:

safe __: X: __: __: __: __: ___dangerous

or

safe __: __: __: __: __: __: X: ___dangerous

If you think your answer is only slightly related to either end of the scale, answer:

safe: __: __: __: X: __: __: ___dangerous

or

safe: __: __: __: __: X: __: ___dangerous

Finally, if you think your answer is irrelevant to the scale or is neutral to the scale, answer:

safe: __: __: __: X: __: ___dangerous
IMPORTANT: (1) Place your X's in the middle of the spaces. 
(2) Check every scale; omit none. 
(3) Never mark more than one X on a single scale.

Your answers to one question should not depend on your answers to any other questions. Your judgment of one speaker should not depend on your judgment of another speaker. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

You will be asked to evaluate each speaker immediately after seeing his video taped speech. So work rapidly. We are concerned with your true first impressions, your immediate feelings. (instructions adapted from Osgood, et al., 1957).

1. How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his audience?
   - positive ___:___:___:___:___:___:___negative
   - bad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___good
   - dishonest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___honest
   - pleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___unpleasant

2. How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his subject?
   - pleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___unpleasant
   - negative ___:___:___:___:___:___:___positive
   - bad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___good
   - honest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest

3. How did you perceive the speaker's attitude toward his role as a communicator?
   - honest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___dishonest
   - unpleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___pleasant
   - negative ___:___:___:___:___:___:___positive
   - good ___:___:___:___:___:___:___bad
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