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ABSTRACT

The Argumentativeness (ARG) and Verbal Aggressiveness (VA) scales have been used in hundreds of studies since their development. Numerous researchers have employed these scales in studies designed to explore differences in aggressive communication within and across cultures. Both scales have been translated into several languages, including Chinese, Korean, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Romanian, and Slovakian, among others and have been found to be reliable and valid. However, neither scale had yet been translated or tested in the Spanish-language. In a globalized world community in which technological advances have made it possible to communicate instantly, it seems both logical and necessary to translate the two scales into a language that arguably has the second largest number of speakers in the world (329 million), is spoken in more than 44 countries, and has an overwhelmingly increasing population in the United States.

The purpose of this study was to develop Spanish-language versions of the VA and ARG scales, and to test their validity and reliability in a Spanish-speaking country with native Spanish-language speakers. A total of 744 participants from three different universities in a northern state of Mexico took part in the study. The data analyses yielded a both valid and reliable Spanish-language VA and ARG scales. The universal characteristics of trait verbal aggressiveness and trait argumentativeness were supported.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Globalization and recent technological advances have made it possible for the world to communicate instantaneously. This ability to communicate within and between countries in a matter of seconds raises curiosity as to how it is that we communicate. More importantly, in a world where the “global economy becomes increasingly interconnected, through which global and domestic organizations merge, and through which technologies blur traditional spatial and temporal boundaries” (Stohl, 2001 as cited in Cheney, Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004, p. 381), being equipped with the right tools to communicate effectively becomes both a necessity and a requirement.

The Global Communicator

The importance of being an effective communicator is emphasized repeatedly in communication literature. Rudd and Lawson (2010) stressed that to become an effective global communicator one “requires understanding of, and appropriate exhibition of, a variety of traits [and that] examining these traits should provide valuable insight in helping to educate individuals for successful interactions in the globalized world” (p. 127). In accordance with Rudd and Lawson (2010), this study was designed to further expand the understanding, and appropriate exhibition of two specific communication traits that have been extensively linked to effective communicators: trait argumentativeness and trait verbal aggressiveness. The different levels of these traits
have been extensively related with other communication traits such as communication competence, among others (for more review see Avtgis & Rancer, 1997; Avtgis, Rancer, & Amato, 1998; Chesebro & Martin, 2003; Hackman, Johnson, & Barthel-Hackman, 1995; Ifert, Long, & Fortney, 1997; Infante & Rancer, 1982; Loffredo & Opt, 1998; Martin, Anderson, & Thweatt, 1998; Mongeau, 1989; Rancer, Kosberg, & Silvestri, 1992; Richmond, McCroskey, & McCroskey, 1989; Sanders, Gass, Wiseman, & Bruschke, 1992; Schrodt & Wheeless, 2001; Wheeless, 1975; Wigley, 1987; Wigley, Pohl, & Watt, 1989). The research suggests that most effective communicators exhibit high levels of trait argumentativeness, and low levels of trait verbal aggressiveness.

Measurement of the tendency to exhibit each of these traits is done with two scales developed by communication researchers. Infante and Rancer (1982) developed the Argumentativeness (ARG) scale, which measures a person’s general tendency to argue; while Infante and Wigley (1986) developed the Verbal Aggressiveness (VA) scale which measures the tendency to use verbal aggression when influencing others.

The proven effectiveness of the scales to measure an individual’s exhibition of each trait has made them a primary source for interpersonal and organizational communication research. The scales themselves have also been a focus of research. The ARG and VA scales have been translated and found valid and reliable in multiple languages, but neither had been translated and tested for equivalence from the English language to the Spanish language—one of the most spoken and more rapidly expanding languages in the world. The need for the development and testing of the Spanish-language versions of these scales is, thus, an obvious one. Spanish-language ARG and VA scales that are valid and reliable will facilitate understanding of effective
communicator styles that are applicable across cultures while further providing supporting evidence for their generalizability. The understanding of effective communicator styles can be further expanded into the organizational world, where people will be better equipped with the necessary tools for effective communication that can save organizations from communication breakdowns and lead them to an environment where channels of communication within, across, and outside the organization are sustainable. Such concepts have moved countries to the lead—economically, socially, and politically—and maintained their dominance by stressing the importance of successful cross-cultural interactions. For example, according to Consul General of Canada in Detroit, MI, Ray Norton, the economic success Canada has seen over the last two decades or so has been, in part, thanks to their citizens’ ability to communicate across cultures in the organizational setting (personal communication, April 25, 2012).

Similarly, public organizations, city managers, human resource managers, elected and appointed officials, politicians, non-profit and non-governmental organizations, to name a few, can all benefit from channels of communication that are effective and sustainable. Comprehending and promoting the applicability of trait verbal aggressiveness and trait argumentativeness in communication at the organizational and personal levels will open the door to policies and programs that promote equity through a language of tolerance: a process made possible by attaining higher levels of communication competence.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Communication Traits

The conceptualization of traits derives from personality theory in the field of psychology. Arguably, Joy Paul Guilford in 1959 was first in describing personality traits. According to Barratt (1995), “Guilford defined personality as an individual’s ‘unique pattern of traits,’ with a trait defined as ‘any distinguishable, relatively enduring way in which one individual differs from others.’” (p. 7). These traits, better known as personality traits, were meant to provide a measure of people’s behavioral patterns. In the field of communication, the measurement of humans’ patterns, consistencies, or differences in message-sending and message-receiving behaviors have been termed “communication traits” (Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 2003). The measurement, however, is a hypothetical construct—meant to give meaning to “certain communication behaviors and provide us with explanations about human communication that would not otherwise be available” (Rancer & Avtgis, 2006, p. 11).

Numerous communication traits have since been identified in the field of communication. Infante, Rancer, and Womack (2003) developed a taxonomy in which to place these traits. The taxonomy classifies these traits into four categories: apprehension traits (e.g. communication apprehension), presentation traits (e.g. communicator style), adaptation traits (e.g. self-monitoring), and aggressive traits (e.g. verbal aggressiveness)
Rancer & Avtgis, 2006). For a list of all traits within the taxonomy developed by Infante et al. (2003) and the list of the scales used to measure the presence of such traits, along with its definitions, refer to Table 1 in Appendix A.

As shown in Table 1, both trait argumentativeness and trait verbal aggressiveness fall into the classification of aggressive traits. Within the classification of aggressive traits, Infante (1987) presents a model that offers a framework to better understand the nature of aggressive communication. In his model, Infante, proposed two categories in which to divide aggressive communication: constructive and destructive. Assertiveness and argumentativeness are considered constructive traits, while hostility and verbal aggressiveness are considered destructive traits. Infante et al. (2003) define assertiveness as “a person’s general tendency to be interpersonally dominant, ascendant, and forceful” (p. 132). According to Rancer and Avtgis (2006), assertiveness falls under constructive communication “because it involves using verbal and nonverbal symbols to exert control, to obtain justified rewards, and to avoid violation of one’s rights” (p. 14).

Argumentativeness, like assertiveness is considered a constructive trait. In differentiating between assertiveness and argumentativeness, Infante and Wigley (2006) simplify the contrast by stating that “all argument is considered assertive, but not all assertiveness involves argument” (p. 16). In other words, assertiveness allows others to learn where you stand in a certain situation, while argumentativeness will involve discussing and defending your position in such situation.

Hostility and verbal aggressiveness, traits considered destructive, possess similarities when compared to assertiveness and argumentativeness. Trait verbal aggressiveness is a subset of hostility. While much communication research has been dedicated to verbal
aggressiveness, very little time has been devoted to the study of hostility in the communication field. Most of the research on hostility can be found in social psychology research. The leader of hostility in the field of social psychology, to date, is Leonard Berkowitz. Berkowitz’s (1998) work has helped explain hostility by suggesting it is “an attitude, a dislike of a particular person, object, or issue, accompanied by a desire to see this target injured or destroyed” (p. 265). Additionally, Berkowitz (1998) proposes the treatment of hostility as a behavior that is learned and thus can be modified. Infante, Rancer, and Avtgis (2010) further suggest that hostility is bound by situations, meaning that a person who exhibits hostility against a roommate can, and may refrain from being hostile towards their superior. Furthermore, a hostile person can easily resort to verbal aggressiveness; however, verbal aggressiveness is not always present in the behavior of a hostile individual. Since argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness have been more closely explored by communication researchers, and this study aims to build on that research, attention will be turned to both of these traits.

**Trait Argumentativeness**

As previously described, argumentative behavior and verbal aggressive behavior are similar in that they are both commonly regarded as attacking and aggressive forms of communication; however, they are very different from each other. Infante and Rancer (1982) defined argumentativeness as “a generally stable trait which predisposes the individual in communication situations to advocate positions on controversial issues, and to attack verbally the positions which other people take on these issues” (p. 72).

The notion of attacking positions rather than people is of utmost importance—especially in a Spanish-language version of the Argumentativeness Scale due to the
negative connotation the verb argumentar (to argue) carries in the Spanish-language. It is very common in Mexico, especially among those with no training in debate or argument (unlike lawyers, for example), to understand the verb argumentar as a strong discussion between two people generally involving verbal aggressiveness. Hence, the distinction between argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness is blurred and in much need of exploration so that the general population understands that discussion can be held without the use of verbal aggression.

A better grasp of the difference between trait argumentativeness and trait verbal aggressiveness is possible through the analysis of each trait’s structure. Trait argumentativeness is composed of two dimensions: ARGap, an individual’s tendency to approach arguments, and ARGav, an individual’s tendency to avoid arguments. The difference between the two dimensions produces ARGgt, the general tendency to argue. Infante and Rancer (1982) expressed their approach-avoidance model in the following formula:

\[ \text{ARGgt} = \text{ARGap} - \text{ARGav} \]

Five categories regarding predispositions to be argumentative can be derived from the two dimensions: low argumentatives, high argumentatives, conflicted-feelings moderate argumentatives, apathetic moderate argumentatives, and neutral moderate argumentatives. Low argumentatives are characterized by having a high motivation to avoid arguments and a low motivation to approach arguments. Conversely, high argumentatives display a high motivation to approach arguments and low motivation to avoid them. Conflicted-feelings moderate argumentatives exhibit both high motivation to approach and to avoid arguments; on the other hand, apathetic moderate argumentatives
show low motivation to approach arguments and low motivation to avoid arguments. Finally, neutral moderate argumentatives simply experience moderate motivations to approach and avoid arguments. Figure 1 in Appendix B presents these categories listed by Rancer and Avtgis (2006) in a diagram for easy comprehension.

Trait Verbal Aggressiveness

Trait verbal aggressiveness is “the tendency to attack the self-concepts of individuals, instead of, or in addition to, their positions on topics of communication” (Infante & Wigley, 1986, p. 61). Furthermore, Kinney (1994) suggested three broad areas of self-concept attack: group membership, personal failings, and relational failings. As previously mentioned, verbal aggressiveness is classified as a destructive trait, while argumentativeness is classified as a constructive trait. The classification difference rests in the locus of attack—the place where the attack is directed (Rancer & Avtgis, 2006). The locus of attack for trait argumentativeness is a person’s position (e.g., being pro-choice), whereas the locus of attack for verbal aggressiveness is a person’s self-concept (e.g., “You are stupid!”). Infante, Rancer, and Avtgis (2010) identified several types of verbally aggressive messages: character attacks, competence attacks, personal background attacks, physical appearance attacks, curses, teasing, ridicule, profanity, threats, and nonverbal emblems.

Such popularity should come as no surprise. High levels of verbal aggressiveness or excessive manifestations of verbal aggressiveness pose a greater threat to the effectiveness and sustainability of communication channels, as well as threats to the individual, than high levels of trait argumentativeness. High levels of verbal aggressiveness (VA), however, have been found to be a major cause of violence, causing
not only damage to one’s character, or self-concept, but resulting in physical damage as well (Berkowitz, 1962; Toch, 1969). While the consequences of possessing or expressing high levels of either trait are not the focus of this study, their importance is nonetheless worth mentioning.

Measuring Argumentative and Verbal Aggressiveness

Scales have been developed to measure the levels of each trait. The need to measure an individual’s argumentative trait stemmed from the interest in understanding “the behaviors and outcomes of those who seemed to enjoy and do well in an argument and those who seemed to dislike it and not do well” (Rancer & Avtgis, 2006, p. 39). Infante and Rancer (1982) developed the Argumentativeness Scale in order to identify those high, moderate, and low in motivation to argue. Likewise, Infante, and Wigley (1986) developed the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale in order to assist research focusing on the nature and control of verbal aggression (Rancer & Avtgis, 2006). Both scales have been used, tested, and found reliable in the United States and across the world. The generalizability of scales such as these is imperative, especially due to how influential research results from the United States are to the world in this era of globalization.

The literature on argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness is quite extensive, and a considerable amount of supportive validation research for both scales exists. However, such popularity comes with its challenges. The most recent challenge came in 2009 by Kotowski, Levin, Baker, and Bolt. In their multitrait-multimethod validity assessment of the ARG and VA scales Kotowski et al. attempted to refute the validity of the scales. Their attempt to do so fell short after Infante, Rancer, and Wigley (2011) demonstrated that, to an extent, some of the claims against the validity of the ARG and
VA scales were non-scientific. The challenges to the scales relate to their theoretical constructs and factor structures. The issues with the theoretical construct and factor structure of the ARG and VA scales, however, are addressed, and well documented in the original studies by Infante and Rancer (1982) and Infante and Wigley (1986) respectively. The parting point here will be to side with the considerable amount of research pointing to the validity and reliability of the scales, especially with the research that has offered scientific proof of conceptual and measurement equivalence of the scales across cultures (Suzuki & Rancer, 1994).

In order to validate the ARG scale Infante and Rancer (1982) performed several validity tests. One of the tests involved assessing whether or not argumentativeness related to the predisposition of an individual to communicate. To assess this, Infante and Rancer (1982) administered the ARG scale along with other measures of communicative predispositions like the McCroskey’s (1970) PRCA, to 44 students who were enrolled in introductory-level communication courses. The expected results were a negative correlation between the PRCA scores and the motivation to approach argument scores (ARGap), and a positive correlation between the PRCA scores and the motivation to avoid arguments scores. The results of this test supported their expectation: ARGap scores had a significant moderate correlation ($r = -.45, p < .05$) with the PRCA scores, while the ARGav scores had a significant positive correlation ($r = .41, p < .05$).

The ARG scale’s convergent and discriminant validity was assessed by conducting a “behavioral choice” study. A different sample of 51 students was administered the ARG scale, and a week later participants were asked to choose which study they would like to participate in order to fulfill the requirement for their research
The participants “read a brief description of the four studies: Debating a controversial issue with a fellow student, watching and rating television programs, conversing with a fellow student about goals in life, and delivering a public speech on topic of their choice” (Infante and Rancer, 1982, p.77). Participants indicated their desire to participate in or avoid the study using a seven-point scale. As reasoned by Infante and Rancer (1982) ARGap related positively ($r = .30, p < .05$) with the desire to participate in the debate, and negatively ($r = -.37, p < .05$) to avoid the debate. Conversely, ARGav as expected related negatively ($r = -.39, p < .05$) to the desire to participate in the debate, and positively ($r = -.35, p < .05$) with the desire to avoid the debate. No relation was expected between ARGap or ARGav and desire to participate in or avoid the other studies. These results supported the speculations of what is and is not measured by the ARG scale (Infante and Rancer, 1982).

In determining the validity for the VA scale one of the procedures used by Infante and Wigley (1986) was conducting a study to “determine if responses to the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale predict preference for verbally aggressive messages in a variety of social influence situations” (p. 66). The VA scale was administered to a different sample of 86 students enrolled in introductory communication courses. As conducted by Infante and Wigley (1982), “three weeks later, under the guise of an entirely different study,” (p. 66) gave participants “a booklet containing descriptions of three different interpersonal social influence situations developed in other research (Miler, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1977; Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981)” (p. 66). Each of the situations contained two verbally aggressive messages, the other four were “filler messages.” Using a seven-point likelihood scale, participants rated their likelihood of use in each situation. The test
results produced a positive correlation \( r = .69, p < .001 \) between the VA scale scores with the sum of the likelihood ratings of the six verbally aggressive messages in three different social influence situations. “Moreover, the verbal aggressiveness score correlated significantly with the likelihood ratings of each of the six messages \( rs \) ranging from .36 to .58, \( ps < .002 \)” (Infante & Wigley, 1986, p. 66).

**Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness across Cultures**

Most research on trait argumentativeness and trait verbal aggressiveness has been conducted in the United States, and though there have been multiple attempts to find differences and/or similarities across cultures, few cross-cultural research studies have been conducted outside the United States. Nicotera and Robinson (2010) criticized much of the cross-cultural work done over the last three decades. Their major criticism of these studies was in relation to the small effect sizes reported, or lack thereof, and the poor conceptualization of culture. A product of their criticism is the introduction of “cautionary tales” where they expose studies that made disturbingly biased and stereotypical speculations—speculations that span from assumptions of a population’s general aggression to the persistent essentialization of ethnicity and race (Nicotera & Robinson, 2010). Another dissatisfying characteristic of the studies reviewed by Nicotera and Robinson (2010) is that participants are often students from the United States rather than participants whose native language is the one being studied, or whose nationality is reflective of the language and culture being studied (this last criticism became a main factor in determining the methodology of this study).

Very few cross-cultural studies were regarded as exemplary by Nicotera and Robinson (2010). One of these studies was Avtgis and Rancer’s (2002) study of
argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness in the United States, Australia, and New Zealand which concluded that influences on argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness are multi-factorial. A research study by Suzuki and Rancer (1994) was another study well regarded by Nicotera and Robinson (2010). Suzuki and Rancer’s study tested for conceptual and measurement equivalence of the argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness scales in Japan; the authors found that both scales were generalizable to the Japanese population in the study, though some items were identified as unreliable. Another study which was deemed acceptable was Avtgis, Rancer, Kanjeva, and Chory’s (2008) study which tested for conceptual and methodological equivalence in Bulgaria and determined that argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness are etic in nature, in other words, that both constructs and measurement differentiations were equivalent across cultures.

Learning from the evaluations made by Nicotera and Robinson (2010), a successful cross-cultural study must either provide an appropriate construct of culture, acknowledge the fact that sometimes it is not culture what is being studied but instead a characteristic of culture, or should test for equivalence of constructs developed in the United States in the country of interest or with people emerged in the culture being studied. By opting for the latter, scholars can compare and contrast argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness within countries, between countries, between races, ethnicities, nationalities, or more systematically by language.

Though language has been chosen over culture to be studied here, a brief note on Mexican culture and perceptions of aggressiveness and argumentativeness should be addressed. It has been suggested “[m]acho attitudes are inculcated in Mexican males
almost from birth, and [that] machismo plays a pervasive role in shaping Mexican culture” (eDiplomat, 2012, para. 1). The historical emphasis on and perpetuation of masculine traits in Mexico suggest that Mexican culture is by nature more verbally aggressive and argumentative. The acceptance of males over-exhibiting masculine traits is what feminist theorists call *doing gender* (West & Zimmerman, 1987) as encompassed by social construction feminism (Lorber, 2012). According to West and Zimmerman (1987) gender is the product of social doings, “[d]oing gender means creating differences between girls and boys and women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or biological. Once the differences have been constructed, they are used to reinforce the ‘essentialness’ of gender.” (p. 137). This can perhaps shine light as to why at times Mexican culture is seen as more aggressive and argumentative.

Language, unlike culture, one might argue, is bound by universal rules—grammar, syntax, semantics, pragmatics—and though much controversy might arise from determining what makes up a language, there are still simple characteristics that, more likely than not, hold true universally as to what a language is. Considering the universal understanding of language, performing studies that focus on generalizability of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness across languages rather than across cultures becomes a more straightforward and tangible task.

The review of the current literature demonstrates evidence of very few studies focusing on the generalizability of the argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness scales across languages. From the three studies discussed by Nicotera and Robinson (2010), two stood out which focused on the task of studying argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness across languages: Suzuki and Rancer (1994), and Avtgis, Rancer,
Kanjeva, and Chory (2008). This study will borrow heavily from the methodology followed by Suzuki and Rancer (1994) due to the recent favorable review by Nicotera and Robinson (2010) and because this study is closely aligned with the philosophy that a trait or a concept can be more easily compared across languages rather than across cultures. The focus on the conceptual and measurement equivalence of the two constructs, argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness, rather than merely focusing on measuring differences between groups—participants from Japan compared to participants of the United States—separates the study done by Suzuki and Rancer (1994) from others.

*International Popularity of the Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness Scales*

The ARG scale “has been in use for [30] years and has been translated into numerous languages including Chinese, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Japanese, Korean, Romanian, Slovakian, and Thai” (Rancer & Avtgis, 2006, p. 43), and the VA scale “has been in use for [over 25] years and has also been translated into numerous languages, including, Chinese, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Japanese, Korean, Romanian, Slovakian, and Thai” (p. 46). Neither scale, however, has been translated into Spanish.

The importance of the ARG and VA scales is consequently eminent. With globalization in mind, it only seems logical to seek the development of the Spanish-language version of the scales; a language that has the second most number of speakers in the world (329 million), is spoken in more than 44 countries (Ethnologue, 2010), and has an overwhelmingly increasing population in the United States. The increasing popularity of the ARG and VA scales is indeed a major factor in pursuing conceptual and measurement equivalence in the Spanish language, however a few other factors add to the
importance and need for a Spanish-language version of both scales. A very obvious one is perhaps the fact that Mexico, one of the countries with a large Spanish speaking population is just south of the U.S. border. This geographical factor has produced a large and rapidly increasing Spanish speaking population in the United States, as previously mentioned. Furthermore, when turning our focus back to globalization, Mexico and the United States, by virtue of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), are economic partners. Mexican companies and entrepreneurs have made themselves noticed over the past decade. In 2000, CEMEX, a global company offering high quality materials for the construction industry, became the biggest producer of cement in North America when it acquired Southdown Inc. in the United States (CEMEX, 2012). Another Mexican company, Grupo Bimbo, has also made its way into the American marketplace. From 1994 when Bimbo Bakeries was first established to 2009 when Grupo Bimbo purchased the remaining U.S. fresh baked goods business of George Weston Ltd., making Bimbo Bakeries USA the largest bakery company in the USA (Bimbo Bakeries USA, 2012), Mexican corporations have made themselves competitive in the United States and have proven their potential and strength. These recent acquisitions of United States’ companies by Mexican companies accentuate, then, the importance for providing individuals with as many tools as possible to allow them to be competent global communicators. This holds true as well for the public sector. The examples given demonstrate the need for effective communicators in the business world, and governments and non-profit agencies are in equal need for individuals with strong communication competence.
This review of the literature has attempted to provide a case for the need and importance of developing Spanish-language versions of the ARG and VA scales. These scales offer a measurement method for trait argumentativeness and trait verbal aggressiveness—traits proven by research to have a significant relationship to effective and competent communicators. In an effort to further advance research on the widely used and accepted ARG and VA scales and their generalizability, this study seeks to answer the following research question:

RQ: Can the Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness scales, developed in the United States, be adapted for use with Spanish speaking populations?
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Research Design

This study was designed to develop and test the Spanish-language versions of the ARG and VA scales. Both scales, as reviewed earlier, have been translated into multiple languages and have been found to be reliable and valid. This study goes a step further by not only developing the Spanish-language versions of the scales, but also testing the scales in a country where Spanish is the official language, and with people who are native Spanish speakers.

Participants

Professors and administrators of three higher education institutions in the northern state of Mexico were contacted for permission to invite students in their classrooms to participate in the study. IRB approval was obtained from all three institutions.

A total of 17 professors were contacted for permission to invite their students to participate in the study. Permission was granted by 71% of them \( n = 12 \). Some allowed entry to more than one class. Students wishing to be considered for participation in the study had to be at least 18 years old and native Spanish speakers\(^1\). The total number of participants who agreed to participate in the study was 744. Multiple fields of study were represented in the sample such as: Nutrition, Medicine, Business Administration, Economics, Accounting, Engineering, Law, and Dentistry.
*Procedures*

The researcher travelled Durango, Mexico, to administer the Spanish-language versions of the ARG and VA scales to undergraduate students. The purpose of this was to guarantee a sampling of participants that are true native speakers of the Spanish-language and be immersed in the Spanish-language culture as well.

Following a survey methodology, participants were given a paper package that included the following instruments in the order listed:

- The Spanish-language ARG scale
- The Spanish-language VA scale
- The Spanish-language PRCA-24
- A short form version of the Behavioral Choice Questionnaire used by Infante and Rancer (1982) translated into Spanish, and;

The estimated time for completion of all five instruments was 25 minutes, participants took anywhere from 15 to 30 minutes to complete the package. Due to the limited amount of time to administer the survey and the length of the package, no demographic data were collected; however, a total of 47 intrigued students did report their gender.

Students in classrooms, where the researcher was previously extended permission to invite the class attendees, were given an oral and written form of consent which outlined their right to participate or to opt out. The students were offered an opportunity to ask questions regarding their rights and their ability to opt out of the study. A copy of
the IRB (Institutional Review Board) approval of the study can be found in Appendix S. The consent form can be found in Appendix R. A copy of the survey package distributed to the participants can be found in Appendix T.

Students wishing to participate in the study remained in the classroom and were given time to fill out the instruments in the package, those wishing not to participate simply left the room and returned the package to the researcher. Instructions regarding the completion of the package were given to participants once the researcher identified those students who were eligible and willing to participate. The researcher stayed in the classroom until the last participant finished the instruments (by remaining in the room, participants had the opportunity to ask questions). The researcher, however, was careful not to provide answers that may have influenced participants’ responses to the items.

In order to answer the research question, and due to time constraints faced by the research while in Mexico, it was essential for participants to provide responses to all five instruments at once. By providing responses to all instruments, the researcher had the necessary data to conduct validity studies after the data was collected.

*Development of Spanish Language Versions of ARG and VA Scales*

In an effort to develop the Spanish-language versions of the ARG and VA scales a process similar to the one used by Suzuki and Rancer (1994) was followed. Instrumentation conceptualization is given below.

*Argumentativeness* was measured using the Spanish-language version of the ARG scale which revealed an internal consistency of .81 for ARGap (motivation to approach an argument) and .78 for ARGav (motivation to avoid an argument). Infante and Rancer (1982) revealed an internal consistency of .91 for ARGap (motivation to approach
argument) items and .86 for ARGav (motivation to avoid argument) items. The scale’s reliability and validity, and the two factor model have been consistently supported by previous research (Infante, Rancer & Wigley, 2011; Suzuki & Rancer, 1994). The scale consists of 20 Likert scale items; 10 items measure participants’ tendency to approach arguments (ARGap), and 10 items measure participants’ tendency to avoid arguments (ARGav). An argumentativeness score is determined by subtracting the sum of the ARGav items from the sum of the ARGap items: (ARGgt = ARGap – ARGav). Scores between +14 and +40 indicate a high motivation to argue; scores between +13 and -4 indicate a moderate motivation to argue; and scores between -5 and -40 indicate a low motivation to argue.

Verbal aggressiveness was measured using the Spanish-language version of Infante and Wigley’s (1986) VA scale. Their 1986 research revealed an internal reliability of alpha .81. Reliability and validity, and the two factor model of this scale have also been supported by previous research (Infante, Rancer, & Wigley, 2011; Suzuki & Rancer, 1994). The scale consists of 20 Likert scale items; 10 items worded positively and 10 items worded negatively. To obtain a verbal aggressiveness score, both the responses from the positively and negatively worded items are added. The sum obtained from the negatively worded items is then subtracted from 60. The total obtained from the positively worded items is then added to the total obtained from the previous subtraction. Verbal aggressiveness scores are interpreted as follows: scores between 59 and 100 are considered high in verbal aggressiveness, scores between 39 and 58 are considered moderate in verbal aggressiveness, and scores between 20 and 38 are considered low in verbal aggressiveness.
Communication apprehension was measured using a Spanish-language version of McCroskey’s (1982) Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24). The use of this version of the instrument is preferred by McCroskey. The alpha is regularly above .90 and has strong predictive validity. The instrument consists of 24 items which yield sub-scores on the contexts of large groups (group discussions), small groups (meetings), dyadic interaction (interpersonal), and public speaking. The total scores, obtained by adding all the sub-scores, range from 24-120. Individuals who score less than 51 are considered to have low communication apprehension (CA). Individuals with moderate CA will score between 41 and 80, while those who score above 80 are considered to have high CA.

Scale Translations

Following research by Brislin (1976), Sechrest, Fay, and Zaidi (1972), and as done by Suzuki and Rancer (1994) Spanish-language versions of the ARG scale, the VA scale, the PRCA-24, the short version of the Behavioral Choice Questionnaire, and the Social Influence Situation Questionnaire were prepared through translation and back-translation in order to ensure the scales would have equivalent meaning in both languages. All instruments were first translated by the researcher who is bilingual in English and Spanish. An undergraduate student of Languages at the Universidad de las Américas, the researcher’s oldest cousin, who is a polyglot, analyzed the translated Spanish-language versions and then back-translated them into English. The researcher and a judge reviewed the back translations to ensure the best translation and proper conceptualization. In reviewing the back translation for all instruments, the researcher and the judge noted some discrepancies, some of them very minor like the proper tense
for a verb, or the multiple words in Spanish used to convey the same meaning of a word in English. Four major discrepancies are presented in Table 2. There were two instances were negation or confirmation were switched either at the translation into Spanish or during the back translation. The necessary adjustments were made to finalize the Spanish-language version of all instruments. Copies of all the instruments, their original versions, the finalized Spanish-language translation, and the English back translation may be found in Appendices C through Q.

Factor Structure Exploration

All collected data was entered and analyzed in SPSS. After data cleanup, a factor reduction method was implemented to check for theoretical structure equivalence. The returned factor components were then tested for reliability by conducting a Cronbach’s (1951) alpha.

Factor Structure Confirmation and Validity

In order to confirm factor structure, as posed by the creators of the ARG and VA scales, a two forced factor analysis was conducted. The items that loaded on each dimension were then tested for reliability using the Cronbach’s alpha test. The test also looked at the reliability should any of the items be deleted. After determining proper levels of reliability, tests for validity were conducted. Scores for each of the scales had to be determined. ARGgt scores were calculated by subtracting the ARGav total sum score from the ARGap total sum score. VA scores were obtained by adding all scores from items loading on the VA dimension. The PRCA-24 scores were calculated as instructed by McCroskey (2012).
The ARG scale’s convergent and discriminant validity was tested by determining correlations of the ARGap and ARGav scores with the PRCA-24 score, and the Behavioral Choice Questionnaire scores. Conceptual validity for the VA scale was decided after exploring correlation with the Social Influence Situation Questionnaire scores.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Development of the Spanish-Language Version of the ARG Scale

Principal component analysis extraction method with Varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization to simple structure were executed for both studies using SPSS. Following Infante and Rancer’s (1982) factor analysis criteria: eigenvalues of at least 1.0 were required for factor rotation. For an item to be considered loaded it had to load at least .50 on a factor and no more than .30 on any other factor; lastly, at least three items needed to load under a factor to be considered. Some minor modifications of these criteria were sometimes necessary.

The exploratory factor analysis followed by a Scree test (Catell, 1966), generated two factors that met the set criteria by Infante and Rancer (1982). The Scree plot in Figure 2, Appendix B shows there were two distinct factors. The ARG Scale factor loadings displayed two factors clearly interpretable as the ARGap (Eigenvalue = 4.4) and ARGav (Eigenvalue = 2.8) factors (see Table 3, Appendix A). A total of eight items loaded on the first factor: six items loaded on the first factor (ARGap) from .50 to .68 on primary factor loading while the highest secondary loading was .38; items 11 and 7 which had a primary loading close to .50 and a secondary loading somewhat close to .30 were also included after deliberation between the author and one of the researchers who first developed the scale. For the second factor (ARGav) a total of seven items loaded:
six items loaded from .50 to .76 on primary factor loading while the second highest loading was -.25; item 8 were included for reasons similar to items 11 and 7 of the first factor (ARGap).

Since the item loadings exhibited the two dimensions proposed by Infante and Rancer (1982) and due to the loss of five items from the original English version of the scale, a second principal component factor analysis was performed forcing the analysis to produce two factors, ARGap and ARGav. Maintaining the same Eigenvalues, eighteen items loaded successfully on the forced two factor analysis. As seen in Table 4 under the ARGap factor nine items had primary loadings of .56 to .65 (highest secondary loading was -.19), item 2 had a primary loading of .49 and secondary loading of .07. Six items under the ARGav factor had primary loadings of .60 to .69 (highest secondary loading was -.22); items 3, and 16 had loadings close to the set criteria and were also included. Items 1 and 14 did not load.

Scores for the Spanish-language version of the ARG scale were then calculated by subtracting the sum of the ARGav items from the sum of the ARGap items. The ARGgt scores for the 743 participants who completed the instrument ranged from -13 to +41 (mean = 18.87; median = 19.0; standard deviation = 9.5). A distribution of the ARGgt scores with a normal curve is presented in Figure 4, Appendix B. Scores below 0 were considered to be low in ARGgt (2.6%). Scores between 0 and +13 represent those moderate in ARGgt (25.9%). Scores above +14 were those high in ARGgt (71.5%).

Development of the Spanish-Language Version of the VA Scale

Principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization with a Scree plot test were executed to explore factor component of the
Spanish-language version of the VA scale developed by Infante and Wigley (1986). The scree plot results seen in Figure 3 displayed the presence of four possible factors. Further review of the factor loadings on Table 5 suggested two factors were clearly interpretable as Verbal Aggression (Eigenvalue = 3.5) and Benevolence (Eigenvalue = 3.0). The Verbal Aggressiveness factor had five items load from .50 to .77 on primary factor while second highest secondary loading was .47; a sixth factor had a primary loading of .45 and a secondary loading of .40. Five items loaded from .60 to .73 on primary factor while second highest loading was .21; two more items had primary loadings at .45 and .48 and secondary loadings of .21 and -.37 respectively.

Two more factors were identified in the analysis. A third factor emerged which contained items that referenced attacks only after a failed influence attempt. This factor was interpreted as the Failed Interaction Attack (FIA) factor. The FIA had four items with primary loadings of .54 to .59 while second highest loading was .43 (Eigenvalue = 1.3; alpha = .51). The fourth factor included three items that referenced attacks specific to one’s self-concept or character, this dimension was termed the Self-Concept/Character Attack (SCA). All items under the SCA factor had primary loadings of .63 while the highest secondary loading was .42 (Eigenvalue = 1.1; alpha = .57). The fifth factor was discarded since it violated the criteria of having three or more items loading; therefore item 17 and 20 did not load.

The researcher then determined the basic premise of the FIA and SCA factors were considered to fall under the theoretical construct of verbal aggressiveness per Infante and Rancer’s (1982) definition of the construct. A second principal component analysis—a forced two factor analysis—was required to further confirm the theoretical
factor structure of the verbal aggressiveness scale. In the second study the two factors produced were clearly interpretable as the VA dimension and the Benevolence dimension (for a discussion on the factor composition validity of the original VA scale, see Infante, Rancer, & Wigley III, 2011, and Kotowski, Levine, Baker, & Bolt, 2009). Table 6 shows eight items loading under the VA factor (Eigenvalue = 3.8) with primary loadings of .50 to .69 while the highest secondary loading was .16, items 4 and 16 had loadings close enough to the criteria to be included. Nine items loaded on the Benevolence factor, six of them had primary loadings of .50 to .67 with a highest secondary loading of -.14. Items 10, 17, and 20 had acceptable values and were also considered to have loaded; item 3 on the other hand did not load.

VA scores were calculated by adding the ten items that loaded under the VA dimension: 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 19. The distribution of the scores seen in Figure 5 was approximately normal (n = 738) with a mean of 23.02, a median of 23.0 and standard deviation of 6.8. Scores ranged from 10 to 45. Scores below 24 represent people who exhibit low levels of VA. Scores between 24 and 37 represent those exhibiting moderate levels of VA. Scores above 37 represent people who have high levels of VA. Just over half of the participants (53.5%) scored low in verbal aggressiveness, while 43.9% scored moderate in verbal aggressiveness, leaving 2.6% who scored high in verbal aggressiveness.

*Validity Testing of the Spanish-Language Versions of the ARG and VA Scales*

Validity of the Spanish-language version of the ARG scale was tested using two instruments: the Spanish-language version of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1982), and the Spanish-language version of the
Behavioral Choice Questionnaire (Infante & Rancer, 1982). According to Infante and Rancer (1982) “argumentativeness is a predisposition toward communication, [and they] reasoned that it should be slightly or moderately related to other communicative predispositions” (p. 77). In their 1982 study Infante and Rancer found support for their hypothesis that argumentativeness and communication apprehension were related. To assess the concurrent validity of the Spanish-language ARG scale, participants completed the Spanish-language version of the PRCA-24—the most widely used and reliable (alpha regularly > .90) instrument utilized to measure communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1982). The PRCA-24 score was calculated, following McCroskey’s (2012) scoring method, from the sum of the subscores of the group discussion, meetings, interpersonal, and public speaking dimensions. A total of 734 participants completed the inventory. Figure 6 shows scores were normally distributed with a mean of 62.7 (standard deviation = 15.1). The scores ranged from 27 to 114. Only 10.6% of participants scored high in communication apprehension, while 68.1% scored in the average range of communication apprehension. Cronbach’s alpha for the Spanish-language version of the PRCA-24 was .90.

Correlation between the PRCA-24 and the Spanish-language version of the ARG scale was assessed after determining the PRCA-24 scores. The correlations were significant and in the expected direction. There was a statistically significant slightly moderate negative correlation ($r = - .30, p < .01$) between communication apprehension and tendency to approach arguments (ARGap), and a moderate positive significant ($r = .40, p < .01$) correlation between communication apprehension and the tendency to avoid arguments (ARGav).
To assess the convergent and discriminant validity of the Spanish-language version of the ARG scale, a Spanish-language version of the behavioral choice questionnaire adapted from the one used by Infante and Rancer (1982) was also administered. Participants \((n = 740)\) were asked to choose from four study options in which they were likely to participate if given the chance to do so. The options included: 1) participate in a debate, 2) rate a TV program, 3) participate in a conversation with a fellow student about goals in life, and 4) deliver a public speech. Using a five point scale, the participants rated their desire to participate in or avoid each study. Desire to participate in a debate was expected to yield a positive relationship with ARGap. Moreover, ARGap should not predict desire to participate or avoid the other study options. ARGav and desire to participate in a debate were expected to relate negatively. Finally, ARGav was not expected to predict desire to participate or avoid the other choices.

As seen in Table 7, correlation between argumentativeness and desire to participate in a debate were significant and in the expected direction \((r = .24, p < .01)\). Other significant but low correlations were observed between the other behavioral choice studies and ARGap. ARGav had a significant negative low correlation \((r = -.18, p < .01)\) with the desire to participate in a debate and with desire to give a public speech \((r = -.16, p < .01)\). No significant correlations were observed with desire to rate a TV program and desire to participate in a conversation with a fellow student about goals in life. Thus, convergent validity results were supported, and the discriminant validity results were for the most part, also supported.
Validity on the Spanish-language version of the VA scale was measured with a questionnaire employed by Infante and Wigley (1986) “to determine if responses to the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale predict[ed] preference for verbally aggressive messages in a variety of social influence situations” (p. 66). The questionnaire presented participants with three different social situations (see Appendix O). Unlike the validity tests conducted by Infante and Rancer (1982), and Infante and Wigley (1986) which occurred separately with separate groups of participants each time, the validity tests for this study were administered to one set of participants during the same time period in which they completed the other scales.

Six coping strategies were offered: two were considered to be verbally aggressive, and four were simply “filler messages” used to reduce the chance of respondents determining the purpose of the questionnaire (Infante & Wigley, 1986). Participants were asked to put themselves in each of the situations and indicate on a seven-point likelihood scale the likelihood of using each of the particular strategies provided. The six verbally aggressive messages were expected to have the strongest correlation with participant’s VA scores. Results returned significant positively related correlations, in the slight to moderate range between the verbally aggressive messages and the VA scores. As shown in Table 8 the two statements identified as verbally aggressive had the highest significant correlation with the VA scores ($r = .19, p < .01$ for both). The two statements identified as verbally aggressive in Situation B were the only two to correlate positively with the VA scores ($r = .12, p < .01$; and $r = .18, p < .01$). Four different messages in Situation C were significantly correlated with VA scores, the two identified as verbally aggressive, however, had the highest correlation ($r = .33, p < .01$; and $r = .25,$
Results of this study supported the assumption that verbal aggressiveness would correlate with message selection in different situations of interpersonal social influence.

Reliability Testing of the Spanish-Language Versions of the ARG and VA Scales

Reliability for the Spanish-language versions of the ARG and VA scales were determined by calculating Cronbach’s (1951) coefficient alpha for all the participants. An alpha coefficient greater than .70 is considered acceptable by most social sciences. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the first factor analysis produced a coefficient alpha of .77 for the eight item ARGap scale and .78 for seven item ARGav scale. The two forced factor analysis returned an alpha of .81 for the ten items Spanish-language version of ARGap scale and .78 for the eight items ARGav scale.

Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the Spanish-language VA Scale principal component factor analysis according to the factor loadings were as follow: six item loading under the VA component yielded an alpha = .71; the five items loading under the Benevolence component yielded an alpha = .61. Following the unidimensional construct of verbal aggressiveness as established by Infante and Wigley, a Cronbach’s alpha was conducted to determine the reliability for the scale composed by the ten items loading in both the VA and Benevolence factors, the alpha was .53. The ten-item Spanish-language VA scale determined from the forced two factor analysis returned an alpha of .77. The Cronbach’s alpha for the nine items Spanish-language Benevolence scale produced in the same analysis was .71.

The reliability tests for all scales, produced the expected results, and therefore provided support for both scales’ internal consistency.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to develop and test the Spanish-language versions of the ARG and VA scales. Although these scales have been subject to many studies, and have been translated into multiple languages, neither had ever been translated into Spanish. In addition, there were very few studies that have taken the scales outside the United States to develop and test translated versions of the scales on native speakers of the language studied.

This study explored the conceptual and measurement equivalence of the Argumentativeness (ARG) and the Verbal Aggressiveness (VA) scales across languages. The results supported the generalizability of the Spanish-language versions of the two-factor solutions of the ARG Scale and the VA Scale developed in the United States (RQ). Additionally, satisfactory internal consistency was observed for the ARGav, ARGap and VA dimensions.

Reliable and valid Spanish-language ARG and VA scales resulted from this study. The analyses showed that trait argumentativeness was conceptualized and understood in the Spanish-language very much the same way it conceptualized and defined by Infante and Rancer (1982). Conceptualization and understanding of verbal aggressiveness as put forth by Infante and Wigley (1986) was not as clear as trait argumentativeness. As the results showed from the first factor analyses, the Spanish-language version of the VA
scale returned four valid factors. Two of these factors were VA and Benevolence—the positively worded items from Infante and Wigley’s (1986) VA structure. The third factor (FIA) was deemed to be a dimension measuring verbal attacks only after the person had attempted to influence another person and failed. The fourth factor (SCA) included items that exclusively addressed attacks on a person’s self-concept or character. An introspective analysis of interpersonal interactions in Mexico generated a set of explanations regarding what may have caused this difference in conceptualization of verbal aggressiveness. First, when interacting with others in Mexico, there is often a use of insults as terms of endearment or admiration. For example an individual may say to his friend “¡Qué cabrón eres!” The phrase in English could mean “What a jerk you are!” or “You are freaking awesome!” While context clearly drives the meaning of the phrase, what is important, is that a term usually to insult someone becomes a term to express extreme admiration. Second, there are clear and understood levels of permissible and impermissible (or taboo) insults. The clear emergence of the Self-Concept/Character Attack (SCA) dimension exemplifies this implicit understanding of insults going beyond the accepted boundaries. For example, during times of disagreement and conflict, an individual may call the other person stupid, hoping to, consciously or unconsciously, offend or hurt that person. This insult would be seen as acceptable and while offending the other person, it is less likely, to deeply hurt the individual. However, if those same individuals have entered a conversation where levels of anger, frustration, and despise have highly escalated and one individual desires to inflict serious psychological pain on the other person, that person will use an attack on the person’s self-concept or character: “¡Eres un fracasado bueno para nada, mal padre, mal esposo y no vales nada!” (You are
A set of insults such as these are considered, in Mexico, a “low blow.” Conflict will then usually escalate after such an insult into physical aggression, or a deep feeling of helplessness and/or weeping. While anecdotal, the researcher’s experience in Mexico, having been raised there, can lend insight into the use of language in Mexico.

While the Spanish-language version of the VA scale yielded four factors, the concept of verbal aggressiveness was still supported. The exploratory factor structure demonstrated that verbal aggressiveness could be measured by six of the ten items derived from the Spanish-language translation of the original English VA scale. The forced two factor structure demonstrated all ten items from the original scale translated into Spanish measured VA. The suggestion for future research is to conduct a more advance confirmatory factor analysis for concept and measurement equivalence, similar to what was done by Suzuki and Rancer (1994).

The Spanish-language version of the ARG Scale proved to be convergent with the theoretical framework posed by Infante and Rancer (1982). The first exploratory factor analysis produced the very clearly interpretable factors of ARGap (eight items) and ARGav (seven items). The forced two factor analysis maintained 18 items of the Spanish-language translated version of the ARG scale, thus successfully measuring the concept of argumentativeness. These results provide further support for the generalizability of the ARG scale.

While the general preconception of the Mexican culture is for people to be more aggressive, or stern, as a result of the culture’s emphasize on masculinity as a symbol of power—the Macho culture—the results from the VA scores suggest otherwise. At least
in comparison to the United States where Infante and Wigley (1986) found their sample to yield a mean of 49.10 which falls under the range of high levels of VA, the mean for the Mexican sample for this study was 23.02, interpreted as being right at the beginning of the moderate levels of VA and at the very end of the low levels of VA. An interpretation of these results would indicate that the Mexican sample studied here, compared to the United States sample studied in 1986 by Infante and Wigley, by far, exhibits lower levels of verbal aggressiveness. This conclusion is relatable to the examples given above where perhaps to the outsider the culture may seem more aggressive, however, for the insider verbal aggression is part of the culture, and as long as the verbal aggression is not directed specifically toward someone’s self-concept or character, its usage is normative.

On the other hand, the results for the Spanish-language version of the ARG scale suggest higher levels of argumentativeness for the Mexican sample studied here than for the United States sample studied by Infante and Rancer (1982). The mean observed for the participants’ general tendency to argue in this study was 18.8, meaning high motivation to argue. Infante and Rancer (1982) found an ARGgt mean of 4.44, interpretable as moderate motivation to argue. The higher levels of ARGgt could have resulted from the students in the School of Law who are trained to engage in arguments for their profession; however, this speculation was not subject to statistical analysis. These higher levels of ARGgt may also provide insight as to why the Mexican culture is perceived as more aggressive. While argumentativeness differs from verbal aggressiveness in the locus of attack, the Mexican sample showed they have a higher inclination to argue but a lower inclination to be verbally aggressive. Researchers in the
future will be able to more closely study the levels of each trait and their relationship to the Mexican culture with the help of the Spanish-language ARG and VA scales developed in this study.

The research, however, should not stop there. As was introduced earlier in this work, the need for effective global communicators is critical in this age of globalization. The close relationship held by Mexico and the United States requires individuals who will be able conduct business by building effective and sustainable interpersonal relationships both in Mexico and the United States. Awareness of concepts such as argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness, and mastery of levels that are suitable for each country to perform business, will give individuals an edge in comparison to those who lack this awareness.

Limitations of the Study

Future research, based upon the work presented here, must note that this study was handicapped in terms of time limitations. Due to the short time the researcher had while in Mexico, the validity studies, which are usually conducted in a series of follow up studies, were conducted in one single session. Ideally we would have allowed for a few weeks to elapse prior to administering validity questionnaires. Additionally, this study was also limited to responses from undergraduate students, representing a convenience sample. Future studies should aim for the golden standard of research and seek a random sample of the population; researchers should also collect data on age and gender—which was not done in this study—for both factors have been found to influence both traits.
Applications of the Study

The study of effective communication has been emphasized over and over again. At the 2012 Ohio Communication Association conference, a panel of professionals including Dr. Theodore Avtgis (2012) shared the importance of communication competence in the field of medicine as it relates to first respondents. Dr. Avtgis emphasized that training first respondents in communication demonstrated an ability to provide a response in 30 minutes less than the average time before communication courses where provided. In critical situations 30 minutes means life or death.

The practicality of communication theory was later overemphasized by Rancer (2012) in his keynote speech at the same conference. Dr. Rancer called for a problem-based approach to communication. The observations made by him, and other scholars participating at the conference, related to the importance of applied communication research. This study fits into that paradigm in that the study aims at providing the necessary tools to perform problem-based intercultural communication research. The application of communication is one that comes with common sense. The smallest most basic form of interactions between humans is communication. Providing the tools that help us better understand the concepts, and processes behind this basic interaction, are elemental in seeking to arm ourselves with the skills necessary to produce effective results whether at home, at work, or in a social setting. This study opens the door for scholars to further explore the practicality of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness and hopes to provide a good starting ground for that research to extend to Spanish-language people and cultures which employ Spanish as their native language.
ENDNOTES

1 Age, gender, and other demographic data were not collected for this study.
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APPENDICES
### APPENDIX A

#### TABLES

**Table 1**

*A Taxonomy of Communication Traits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Measurement Instrument</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension</td>
<td>Communication apprehension</td>
<td>Personal Report of Communication Apprehension – 24 (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1982)</td>
<td>“An individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons.” (McCroskey, 1977, p.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver apprehension</td>
<td>Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) (Wheeless, 1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“[R]elated to fear of misinterpreting, inadequately processing, and/or not being able to adjust psychologically to messages sent by others.” (Wheeless, 1975, p. 263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational reception apprehension</td>
<td>Informational Reception Apprehension Test (IRAT) (Wheeless, Preiss, &amp; Gayle, 1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“[A] pattern of anxiety and antipathy that filters informational reception, perception and processing, and/or adjustment (psychologically, verbally, physically) associated with complexity, abstractness, and flexibility.” (Wheeless, Preiss, &amp; Gayle, 1997, p. 166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Communicator style</td>
<td>Communicator Style Measure (CSM) (Norton, 1978)</td>
<td>“[T]he way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood.” (Norton, 1978, p. 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>Measurement Instrument</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosiveness</td>
<td>General Disclosiveness</td>
<td>Scale (Wheeless, 1978)</td>
<td>“Personality trait that reflects a person’s predilection to disclose to other people in general.” (Infante, Rancer, &amp; Avtgis, 2010, p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Communicative adaptability</td>
<td>Communicative Adaptability Scale (CAS) (Duran, 1983)</td>
<td>“Communicative adaptability is conceptualized as the ability to perceive socio-interpersonal relationships and adapt one’s behaviors and goals accordingly.” (Duran, 1992, p. 255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical reflector</td>
<td>Rhetorical Reflector Scale (RR) (Hart, Carlson, &amp; Eadie, 1980)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“People who have the tendency to conceive their ‘selves’ not as fixed entities, but as social ‘characters’ who take on whatever role is necessary for the particular situation.” (Infante, Rancer, &amp; Avtgis, 2010, p. 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Sensitivity</td>
<td>Rhetorical Sensitivity Scale (RS) (Hart, Carlson, &amp; Eadie, 1980)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“A person who believes there is no single self but a complex network of selves. The rhetorical sensitive person is in between the noble self and the rhetorical reflector.” (Infante, Rancer, &amp; Avtgis, 2010, p. 127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>Measurement Instrument</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication competence</td>
<td>Communication Competency</td>
<td>Assessment Instrument (CCAI) (Rubin, 1982); Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1988)</td>
<td>“Communication competence is comprised of knowledge, skill, and motivation dimensions, and […] is an impression formed about the appropriateness of another’s communicative behavior.” (Rubin, 1985, 173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive flexibility</td>
<td>Communication Flexibility Scale</td>
<td>(Martin &amp; Rubin, 1995)</td>
<td>“[A] person’s (a) awareness that in any given situation there are options and alternatives available, (b) willingness to be flexible and adapt to the situation, and (c) self-efficacy in being flexible. (Martin, Anderson, &amp; Thweatt, 1998, p. 532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (Rathus, 1973); Lorr and More Assertiveness Inventory (Lorr and More, 1980)</td>
<td>“Assertiveness is a person’s general tendency to be interpersonally dominant, ascendant, and forceful.” (Infante, Rancer, &amp; Avtgis, 2010, p. 132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentativeness</td>
<td>Argumentativeness Scale (Infante &amp; Rancer, 1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td>“[A] generally stable trait which predisposes the individual in communication situations to advocate positions on controversial issues, and to attack verbally the positions which other people take on these issues.” (Infante &amp; Rancer, 1982, p. 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>Measurement Instrument</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>Hostility Inventory</td>
<td>&quot;[A]n attitude, a dislike of a particular person, object, or issue, accompanied by a desire to see this target injured or even destroyed.&quot; (Berkowitz, 1998, p. 264)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Buss &amp; Durke, 1957);</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Multidimensional anger Inventory (MAI) (Siegel, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Verbal Aggressiveness Scale</td>
<td>&quot;[T]he tendency to attack the self-concepts of individuals, instead of, or in addition to, their positions on topics of communication.&quot; (Infante &amp; Wigley, 1986, p. 61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Infante &amp; Wigley, 1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Conflict</td>
<td>Taking Conflict Personally</td>
<td>&quot;[A] negative emotional reaction to participating in a conflict, within a Lewinian frame.&quot; (Hample &amp; Dallinger, 1995, p. 297)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally</td>
<td>(TCP) (Hample &amp; Dallinger, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for</td>
<td>Tolerance for Disagreement</td>
<td>&quot;[T]he amount of disagreement an individual can tolerate before he or she perceives the existence of conflict in a relationship.&quot; (Richmond, McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 2005, p. 178)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>(TFD) (Teve, Richmond &amp; McCroskey, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Table 2

## Major Revisions for Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Original (English)</td>
<td>I prefer being with people who rarely disagree with me.</td>
<td>Agreement discrepancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish-Language Translation</td>
<td>Prefiero estar con gente que muy raramente no está de acuerdo conmigo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back Translation (English)</td>
<td>I prefer to be with people generally don't agree with me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Spanish-Language Translation</td>
<td>Prefiero estar con gente que generalmente está de acuerdo conmigo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Original (English)</td>
<td>When people refuse to do a task I know is important, without good reason, I tell them they are unreasonable.</td>
<td>Mistranslation used <em>con</em> (with) instead of <em>sin</em> (without)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish-Language Translation</td>
<td>Cuando la gente se reúsa a hacer algún deber que sé que es importante, con buena razón, les digo que son irrasionales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spanish-Language Translation</td>
<td>Cuando la gente no cede en algún asunto de importancia, pierdo mi temperamento y les digo cosas algo fuertes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original (English)</td>
<td>When people simply will not budge on a matter of importance I lose my temper and say rather strong things to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Spanish-Language Translation</td>
<td>Cuando la gente se reúsa a hacer algún deber que sé que es importante, sin buena razón, les digo que son irrasionables.</td>
<td>Omission of “without good reason”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back Translation (English)</td>
<td>When people refuse to carry out an important activity, I tell them they are unreasonable.</td>
<td>Rewording of “without good reason”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Back Translation</td>
<td>When people don’t agree with me on an important issue, I lose my temper and I almost insult them.</td>
<td>Algo fuertes understood as “almost insult”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Spanish-Language</td>
<td>Cuando la gente no cede en algún asunto de importancia, pierdo mi temperamento y les digo cosas un tanto fuertes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original (English)</td>
<td>While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.</td>
<td>Acquaintance mistranslation. Understood as someone you know well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCA-24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Back-Translation</td>
<td>I feel very nervous while participating in a conversation with a person I know.</td>
<td>Rewording of conocido to infer not knowing the person well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Spanish-Language</td>
<td>Mientras participo en una conversación con una persona que no conozco bien, me siento muy nervioso/a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable and Label</td>
<td>Component</td>
<td>ARGap</td>
<td>ARGav</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg17 Me siento vigorizado/a después de un argumento sobre un tema controversial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg15 Consido un argumento un desafío intelectual excitante.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg20 Siento emoción cuando espero que una conversación en la que me encuentro se esté encaminando a un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg13 No me gusta perderme la oportunidad de argumentar un tema controversial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg9 Gozo un buen argumento sobre un tema controversial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg2 Argumentar sobre una cuestión controversial mejora mi inteligencia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg11 Gozo defender mi punto de vista sobre un problema.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg7 Tengo un sentimiento bueno, placentero cuando gano un punto en un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg12 Estoy feliz cuando evito un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg19 Trato de evitar meterme en argumentos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg5 Una vez que termino un argumento me prometo no volver a meterme en otro.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg6 Argumentar con una persona crea más problemas para mí que resolverlos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg10 Me da un sentimiento desagradable cuando me doy cuenta de que estoy a punto de entrar en un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg3 Gozo evadir argumentos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg8 Cuando termino un argumento con alguien me siento nervioso/a y triste.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg16 Me encuentro incapaz de pensar en puntos efectivos durante un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg18 Tengo la habilidad de prosperar en un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg4 Soy energético/a y entusiasta cuando argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Label</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>ARGap</th>
<th>ARGav</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arg14</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface. ARGap = Motivation to approach arguments; ARGav = Motivation to avoid arguments.
Table 4

*Factor Loadings for Forced Two Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Spanish-language ARG Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Label</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>ARGap</th>
<th>ARGav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arg15 Considero un argumento un desafío intelectual excitante.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg9 Gozo un buen argumento sobre un tema controversial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg18 Tengo la habilidad de prosperar en un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg13 No me gusta perderme la oportunidad de argumentar un tema controversial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg7 Tengo un sentimiento bueno, placentero cuando gano un punto en un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg11 Gozo defender mi punto de vista sobre un problema.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg17 Me siento vigorizado/a después de un argumento sobre un tema controversial.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg4 Soy energético/a y entusiasta cuando argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg20 Siento emoción cuando espero que una conversación en la que me encuentro se esté encaminando a un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg2 Argumentar sobre una cuestión controversial mejora mi inteligencia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg10 Me da un sentimiento desagradable cuando me doy cuenta de que estoy a punto de entrar en un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg12 Estoy feliz cuando evito un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg19 Trato de evitar meterme en argumentos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg8 Cuando termino un argumento con alguien me siento nervioso/a y triste.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg5 Una vez que termino un argumento me prometo no volver a meterme en otro.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg6 Argumentar con una persona crea más problemas para mí que resolverlos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg3 Gozo evadir argumentos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg16 Me encuentro incapaz de pensar en puntos efectivos durante un argumento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg1 Cuando estoy en un argumento, me preocupa que la persona con la que estoy argumentando forme una impresión negativa de mí.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arg14 Prefiero estar con gente que generalmente está de acuerdo conmigo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface. ARGap = Motivation to approach arguments; ARGav = Motivation to avoid arguments.
Table 5

*Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Spanish-language VA Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Label</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va18 Cuando nada parece funcionar al tratar de influenciar a otros, grito y berreo para obtener algún movimiento de ellos/ellas.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va19 Cuando no tengo la habilidad para rebatir la posición de otros, intento hacerlos/hacerlas sentir defensivos/defensivas para debilitar sus posiciones.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va11 Cuando los individuos me insultan, me da mucho placer decirles hasta lo que no.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va9 Cuando la gente no cede en algún asunto de importancia, pierdo mi temperamento y les digo cosas un tanto fuertes.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va7 Cuando la gente se comporta de maneras que son de mal gusto, los insulto para que entren en comportamiento propio.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va13 Me gusta picarle a la gente que hace cosas que son muy estúpidas para estimularles su inteligencia.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va5 Cuando otros hacen algo que yo considero estúpido, intento ser extremadamente gentil con ellos/ellas.</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va1 Soy extremadamente precavido/a de evitar atacar la inteligencia de un individuo cuando ataco sus ideas.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va8 Intento hacer que la gente se sienta bien consigo misma aun cuando sus ideas son estúpidas.</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va12 Cuando los individuos me desagradan demasiado, intento no demostrarlo en lo que digo o como lo digo.</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va10 Cuando la gente critica mis defectos, lo tomo de buen humor y no trato de devolvérselas.</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va6 Si individuos que trato de influenciar realmente se lo merecen, ataco su carácter.</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va3 Hago mucho esfuerzo por evitar hacer que otras personas se sientan mal consigo mismas cuando las trato de influenciar.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Label</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va2 Cuando los individuos son muy tercos uso insultos para ablandar su terquedad.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va4 Cuando la gente se niega a hacer algún deber que sé que es importante, sin razón alguna, les digo que son irrazonables.</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va16 Cuando la gente hace cosas que son malas o crueles, ataco su carácter para ayudarles a corregir su comportamiento.</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va14 Cuando ataco las ideas de una persona, intento no herir su auto-concepto.</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va15 Cuando intento influenciar a personas, hago un gran esfuerzo por no ofenderlos.</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va17 Me niego a participar en argumentos cuando tienen que ver con ataques personales.</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va20 Cuando un argumento cambia a ataques personales, intento muy duro de cambiar el tema.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface. VA = Verbal Aggressiveness; Ben. = Benevolence; FIA = Failed Interaction Attack; SCA = Self Concept/Character Attack.*
Table 6

*Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Spanish-language VA Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Label</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>Ben.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>va7 Cuando la gente se comporta de maneras que son de mal gusto,</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va9 Cuando la gente no cede en algún asunto de importancia, pierdo mi</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va2 Cuando los individuos son muy tercos uso insultos para ablandar su</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va6 Si individuos que trato de influenciar realmente se lo merecen, ataco su</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va11 Cuando los individuos me insultan, me da mucho placer decirles hasta</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va18 Cuando nada parece funcionar al tratar de influenciar a otros, grito y</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va19 Cuando no tengo la habilidad para rebatir la posición de otros, intento</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va4 Cuando la gente se niega a hacer algún deber que sé que es importante,</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va16 Cuando la gente hace cosas que son malas o crueles, ataco su carácter</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va14 Cuando ataco las ideas de una persona, intento no herir su auto-</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va15 Cuando intento influenciar a personas, hago un gran esfuerzo por no</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va1 Soy extremadamente precavido/a de evitar atacar la inteligencia de un</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va5 Cuando otros hacen algo que yo considero estúpido, intento ser</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va12 Cuando los individuos me desagrada demasiado, intento no demostrarlo</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va8 Intento hacer que la gente se sienta bien consigo misma aun cuando sus</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable and Label</td>
<td>Component</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va10 Cuando la gente critica mis defectos, lo tomo de buen humor y no trato de devolvérselas.</td>
<td>-.21 .48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va20 Cuando un argumento cambia a ataques personales, intento muy duro de cambiar el tema.</td>
<td>.05 .46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va17 Me niego a participar en argumentos cuando tienen que ver con ataques personales.</td>
<td>-.05 .41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va3 Hago mucho esfuerzo por evitar hacer que otras personas se sientan mal consigo mismas cuando las trato de influenciar.</td>
<td>.22 .39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface. VA = Verbal Aggressiveness; Ben. = Benevolence.*
Table 7

Summary of Correlations with Tests for Spanish-Language ARG Scale Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>ARGap</th>
<th>ARGav</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Language PRCA-24</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Language Behavioral Choice Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participar en un debate</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calificar un programa de televisión</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participar en una conversación con un compañero estudiante</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar un discurso en público</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** p = .000.
* p < .01.
Table 8

**Summary of Correlations with Spanish-Language Social Influence Situation Questionnaire for Spanish-Language VA Scale Validity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>VA Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le diría a mi amigo/a que si el/ella no me acompaña a mi nuevo trabajo, iré solo/a. (n=731)</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuaría muy lastimado/a y luego atacaría el carácter de mi amigo/a por negarse a ir y por lastimarme tanto. (n=731)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trataría de ser muy placentero/a y amigable con el fin de hacer que mi amigo/a entre en “el estado mental adecuado” antes de pedirle que me acompañe a mi nuevo trabajo. (n=729)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le señalaría a mi amigo/a que he hecho muchas cosas por el/ella y que me debe el acompañarme a mi nuevo trabajo. (n=730)</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le diría a mi amigo/a que de verdad quiero el nuevo trabajo y deseo que me acompañe como un favor personal. (n=730)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugeriría que mi amigo/a es de mente simple por no ver mi lado en el asunto. (n=730)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les diría a los Pérez que todos los vecinos estarían acongojados si cortan el árbol de sombra. (n=716)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le daría una explicación completa a los Pérez sobre mi situación y trataría de razonar con ellos. (n=716)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les diría a los Pérez que el hecho de cortar el árbol es un acto egoísta, y que no podía creer que fueran tan desconsiderados. (n=716)</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les prometería a los Pérez que haría algo especial por ellos en el futuro si no cortan el árbol. (n=715)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hablaría con los otros vecinos que han conocido a los Pérez por más tiempo y vería pudieran convencer a los Pérez de no cortar el árbol. (n=716)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acabarían por llamar a los Pérez por un “mal nombre” para asegurar que supieran que tan alterado/a estaba, y decirles que se mudaran si no pueden llevarse bien con el resto de nosotros. (n=716)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sería agradable y cortés a mi compañero/a de cuarto, y luego le pediría que apagara el estéreo. (n=716)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le prometería un favor a mi compañero/a de cuarto si el/ella apaga el estéreo ahora. (n=716)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le recordaría favores pasados que he hecho y diría que mi compañero/a de cuarto me debe unas horas de silencio. (n=716)</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation C</td>
<td>VA Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuaría alterado, le diría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que es un/a estúpido/a y exigiría que apagara su estéreo. (n=715)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le diría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que nuestros vecinos se quejarán si no apaga el estéreo. (n=716)</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le preguntaría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que si está sordo, y le diría que apagara el estéreo mientras que todavía sea físicamente capaz de hacerlo. (n=716)</strong></td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Boldfaced items are the messages considered to be verbally aggressive.  
*p < .01
Figure 1. Argumentative Predispositions. Adapted from “Categories of Trait Argumentativeness” Argumentative and Aggressive Communication: Theory, Research, and Application by A. S. Rancer, and T. A. Avtgis, 2006, p. 17.
Figure 2. Scree Plot Results for Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Spanish-Language ARG Scale Factor Analysis.
Figure 3. Scree Plot Results for Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Spanish-Language VA Scale Factor Analysis.
Figure 4. Spanish-Language ARGgt Score Distribution with Normal Curve.
Figure 5. Spanish-Language VA Score Distribution with Normal Curve.
Figure 6. Spanish-Language PRCA-24 Score Distribution with Normal Curve.
APPENDIX C

ARGUMENTATIVENESS SCALE (ORIGINAL ENGLISH VERSION)

Instructions: This questionnaire contains statements about arguing controversial issues. Indicate how often each statement is true for you personally by placing the appropriate number in the blank. Use the following ratings to respond to each statement:

1 = Almost never true; 2 = Rarely true; 3 = Occasionally true; 4 = Often true; 5 = Almost always true

____ 1. While in an argument, I worry that the person I am arguing with will form a negative impression of me.
____ 2. Arguing over controversial issues improves my intelligence.
____ 3. I enjoy avoiding arguments.
____ 4. I am energetic and enthusiastic when I argue.
____ 5. Once I finish an argument, I promise myself that I will not get into another.
____ 6. Arguing with a person creates more problems for me than it solves.
____ 7. I have a pleasant, good feeling when I win a point in an argument.
____ 8. When I finish arguing with someone, I feel nervous and upset.
____ 9. I enjoy defending my point of view on an issue.
____ 10. I get an unpleasant feeling when I realize I am about to get into an argument.
____ 11. I enjoy a good argument over a controversial issue.
____ 12. I am happy when I keep an argument from happening.
____ 13. I do not like to miss the opportunity to argue about a controversial issue.
____ 14. I prefer being with people who rarely disagree with me.
____ 15. I consider an argument an exciting intellectual exchange.
____ 16. I find myself unable to think of effective points during an argument.
____ 17. I feel refreshed after an argument on a controversial issue.
____ 18. I have the ability to do well in an argument.
____ 19. I try to avoid getting into arguments.
____ 20. I feel excitement when I expect that a conversation I am in is leading to an argument.
APPENDIX D

ARGUMENTATIVENESS SCALE (SPANISH-LANGUAGE VERSION)

Instrucciones: Este cuestionario contiene declaraciones sobre argumentación de temas controvertibles. Indica poniendo el número apropiado en el espacio en blanco a la izquierda de la declaración qué tan seguido cada declaración es cierta para su personalidad.

1 = Casi nunca es cierto; 2 = Raramente cierto; 3 = Ocasionalmente cierto; 4 = A menudo cierto; 5 = Casi siempre cierto

1. Cuando estoy en un argumento, me preocupa que la persona con la que estoy argumentando forme una impresión negativa de mí.
2. Argumentar sobre una cuestión controvertible mejora mi inteligencia.
3. Gozo evadir argumentos.
4. Soy energético/a y entusiasta cuando argumento.
5. Una vez que termino un argumento me prometo no volver a entrar en otro.
6. Argumentar con una persona crea más problemas para mí que resolverlos.
7. Tengo un sentimiento bueno, placentero cuando gano un punto en un argumento.
8. Cuando termino un argumento con alguien me siento nervioso/a y triste.
9. Gozo un buen argumento sobre un tema controvertible.
10. Me da un sentimiento desagradable cuando me doy cuenta de que estoy a punto de entrar en un argumento.
11. Gozo defender mi punto de vista sobre un problema.
12. Estoy feliz cuando evito un argumento.
13. No me gusta perderme la oportunidad de argumentar un tema controvertible.
14. Prefiero estar con gente que generalmente está de acuerdo conmigo.
15. Considero un argumento un desafío intelectual excitante.
16. Me encuentro incapaz de pensar en puntos efectivos durante un argumento.
17. Me siento refrescado/a y satisfecho/a después de un argumento sobre un tema controvertible.
18. Tengo la habilidad de prosperar en un argumento.
19. Trato de evitar meterme en argumentos.
20. Siento emoción cuando espero que una conversación en la que me encuentro se esté encaminando a un argumento.
APPENDIX E

ARGUMENTATIVENESS SCALE (BACK-TRANSLATED VERSION)

Instructions: This questionnaire contains statements on the arguing about controversial topics. Indicate to what extent is each statement true about yourself by assigning the appropriate number to each statement on the blank space at the left.

1 = Almost never; 2 = Rarely true; 3 = Occasionally true; 4 = Almost true; 5 = Almost always true

1. When I’m in an argument/arguing, I worry about* the impression that the other person might create of me. (*the possibility that the other person might have a negative impression of me.)
2. Arguing about a controversial issue ameliorates my intelligence.
3. I enjoy avoiding arguments.
4. I’m energetic and enthusiastic when I argue.
5. Once I’m done with an argument I promise myself not to get involved in another one again.
6. Arguing with another person creates more problems for me than it helps me solve them.
7. I have a pleasant and good feeling when I win over an argument.
8. When I’m done arguing with someone else I feel nervous and sad.
9. I enjoy a good argument on a controversial topic.
10. I feel an unpleasant sentiment when I realize that I’m about to enter in an argument.
11. I enjoy defending my point of view about an issue.
12. I feel happy when I avoid an argument.
13. I don’t like missing the chance of arguing on a controversial issue.
14. I prefer to be with people who generally don’t agree with me.
15. I consider that an argument is an intellectual and exciting challenge.
16. During an argument I feel incapable of thinking on effective points.
17. I feel refreshed and satisfied after an argument about a controversial topic.
18. I have the ability of winning in an argument.
19. I try to avoid getting involved in arguments.
20. I feel excited when I expect the conversation in which I’m participating is turning into an argument.
APPENDIX F

VERBAL AGGRESSIVENESS SCALE (ORIGINAL ENGLISH VERSION)

Instructions: This survey is concerned with how we try to get people to comply with our wishes. Indicate how often each statement is true for you personally when you try to influence other persons. Use the following scale:

1 = Almost never true; 2 = Rarely true; 3 = Occasionally true; 4 = Often true; 5 = Almost always true

____ 1. I am extremely careful to avoid attacking individuals’ intelligence when I attack their ideas.
____ 2. When individuals are very stubborn, I use insults to soften their stubbornness.
____ 3. I try very hard to avoid having other people feel bad about themselves when I try to influence them.
____ 4. When people refuse to do a task I know is important, without good reason, I tell them they are unreasonable.
____ 5. When other do things I regard as stupid, I try to be extremely gentle with them.
____ 6. If individuals I am trying to influence really deserve it, I attack their character.
____ 7. When people behave in ways that are in very poor taste, I insult them in order to shock them into proper behavior.
____ 8. I try to make people feel good about themselves even when their ideas are stupid.
____ 9. When people simply will not budge on a matter of importance I lose my temper and say rather strong things to them.
____ 10. When people criticize my shortcomings, I take it in good humor and do not try to get back at them.
____ 11. When individuals insult me, I get a lot of pleasure out of really telling them off.
____ 12. When I dislike individuals greatly, I try not to show it in what I say or how I say it.
____ 13. I like poking fun at people who do things which are very stupid in order to stimulate their intelligence.
____ 14. When I attack a person's ideas, I try not to damage their self concepts.
____ 15. When I try to influence people, I make a great effort not to offend them.
____ 16. When people do things which are mean or cruel, I attack their character in order to help correct their behavior.
____ 17. I refuse to participate in arguments when they involve personal attacks.
18. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence others, I yell and scream in order to get some movement from them.

19. When I am not able to refute others’ positions, I try to make them feel defensive in order to weaken their positions.

20. When an argument shifts to personal attacks, I try very hard to change the subject.
APPENDIX G

VERBAL AGGRESSIVENESS SCALE (SPANISH-LANGUAGE VERSION)

Instrucciones: Esta encuesta tiene que ver con cómo tratamos de que la gente cumpla con nuestros deseos. Indique que tan seguido es cierta cada declaración para su personalidad cuando intenta influenciar a otras personas. Use la siguiente escala:

1 = Casi nunca es cierto; 2 = Raramente cierto; 3 = Ocasionalmente cierto; 4 = A menudo cierto; 5 = Casi siempre cierto

1. Soy extremadamente precavido/a de evitar atacar la inteligencia de un individuo cuando ataco sus ideas.
2. Cuando los individuos son muy tercos uso insultos para ablandar su terquedad.
3. Hago mucho esfuerzo para evitar hacer que otras gentes se sientan mal sobre ellos mismos cuando trato de influenciarlos.
4. Cuando la gente se reúsa a hacer algún deber que se que es importante, sin buena razón, les digo que son irrazonables.
5. Cuando otros hacen algo que yo considero estúpido, intento ser extremadamente gentil con ellos/ellas.
6. Si individuos que trato de influenciar realmente se lo merecen, ataco su carácter.
7. Cuando la gente se comporta de maneras que son de mal gusto, los insulto para que entren en comportamiento propio.
8. Intento hacer que la gente se sienta bien consigo misma aún cuando sus ideas son estúpidas.
9. Cuando la gente no cede en algún asunto de importancia, pierdo mi temperamento y les digo cosas un tanto fuertes.
10. Cuando la gente critica mis defectos, lo tomo de buen humor y no trato de devolvérselas.
11. Cuando los individuos me insultan, obtengo placer en decirles hasta lo que no.
12. Cuando los individuos me desagradan demasiado, intento no demostrarlo en lo que digo o como lo digo.
13. Me gusta picarle a la gente que hace cosas que son muy estúpidas para estimularles su inteligencia.
14. Cuando ataco las ideas de una persona, intento no herir su auto-concepto.
15. Cuando intento influenciar a gente, hago un gran esfuerzo por no ofenderlos.
16. Cuando la gente hace cosas que son malas o crueles, ataco su carácter para ayudarles a corregir su comportamiento.
17. Me reúso a participar en argumentos cuando envuelven ataques personales.

18. Cuando nada parece funcionar en tratar de influenciar a otros, grito y berreo para obtener algún movimiento de ellos/ellas.

19. Cuando no tengo la habilidad para refutar la posición de otros, intento hacerlos/hacerlas sentir defensivos/defensivas para debilitar sus posiciones.

20. Cuando un argumento cambia a ataques personales, intento muy duro cambiar el tema.
APPENDIX H

VERBAL AGGRESSIVENESS SCALE (BACK-TRANSLATED VERSION)

Instructions: This survey is intended to measure the extent to which we try to persuade others to do what we desire. Indicate how often each statement is true when you try to persuade others. Use the following scale:

1 = Almost never; 2 = Rarely true; 3 = Occasionally true; 4 = Almost true; 5 = Almost always true

1. I try to avoid attaching another individual’s intelligence when I argue his ideas.
2. When individuals are very stubborn, I insult them to soften their stubbornness.
3. I do quite an effort to avoid making others feel upset about themselves when I try to influence them.
4. When people refuse to carry out an important activity, I tell them they are unreasonable.
5. When others do something I consider stupid, I try to be extremely kind to them.
6. When the people I’m trying to persuade really deserve it, I attack them.
7. When people behave in ways that upset me, I insult them to make them behave properly.
8. I try to make people feel good with themselves even when their ideas are stupid.
9. When people don’t agree with me on an important issue, I lose my temper and I almost insult them.
10. When others criticize my defects, I take it in a good mood and don’t try to turn it back on them.
11. When others insult me, it makes me feel good to insult them back.
12. When I dislike others a lot, I try not to show it to them when I tell them something.
13. I like to pick on others who do things that are too stupid, so that I stimulate their intelligence.
14. When I attack a person’s ideas, I try not to hurt their self-efficacy concept.
15. When I try to persuade other people, I do an effort not to offend them.
16. When people do bad or cruel things, I attack their temper to help them change their behavior.
17. I refuse to participate in arguments that involve personal attacks.
18. When nothing seems to be working when I try to persuade others, I yell and scream to obtain something from them.
19. When I don’t have the ability to refute others stand, I try to make them
feel defensive to change their position.

20. When an argument turns into personal attacks, I try to change the topic.
APPENDIX I

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION (PRCA-24)

(ORIGINAL ENGLISH VERSION)

Instructions: This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are undecided, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this.

___ 1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
___ 2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in a group discussion.
___ 3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
___ 4. I like to get involved in group discussions.
___ 5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
___ 6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
___ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
___ 8. Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in meetings.
___ 9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
___ 10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
___ 11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
___ 12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
___ 13. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
___ 14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
___ 15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
___ 16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
___ 17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
___ 18. I’m afraid to speak up in conversations.
___ 19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
___ 20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
___ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
___ 22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
___ 23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
24. While giving a speech I get so nervous, I forget facts I really know.
APPENDIX J

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION (PRCA-24)

(SPANISH-LANGUAGE VERSION)

Instrucciones: Este instrumento está compuesto de 24 declaraciones sobre sus sentimientos acerca de comunicación con otras personas. Por favor indique en el espacio previsto el grado con el que cada declaración se aplica a usted marcando si esta (1) fuertemente de acuerdo, (2) de acuerdo, (3) indeciso/a, (4) en desacuerdo, (5) fuertemente en desacuerdo con cada declaración. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas. Muchas de las declaraciones son similares a otras declaraciones. No se preocupe por esto.

____ 1. No me gusta participar en discusiones de grupo.
____ 2. Generalmente, estoy cómodo/a mientras participo en una discusión de grupo.
____ 3. Estoy tenso/a y nervioso/a mientras participo en una discusión de grupo.
____ 4. Me gusta estar involucrado/a en discusiones de grupo.
____ 5. Participación en una discusión de grupo con gente nueva me pone tenso/a y nervioso/a.
____ 6. Estoy calmado/a y relajado/a mientras participo en un discusión de grupo.
____ 7. Generalmente, estoy nervioso/a cuando tengo que participar en una junta.
____ 8. Usualmente estoy calmado/a y relajado/a mientras participo en juntas.
____ 9. Estoy muy calmado/a y relajado/a cuando soy llamado/a a expresar una opinión en una junta.
____ 10. Tengo miedo de expresarme en juntas.
____ 11. Comunicación en juntas usualmente me hace incómodo/a.
____ 12. Estoy muy relajado cuando contesto preguntas en una junta.
____ 13. Mientras participo en una conversación con una persona que no conozco bien me siento muy nervioso/a.
____ 14. No tengo miedo a hablar en conversaciones.
____ 15. Normalmente estoy muy tenso/a y nervioso/a en conversaciones.
____ 17. Mientras converso con un/a nuevo/a conocido/a, me siento muy relajado/a.
____ 18. Tengo miedo a hablar en conversaciones.
____ 19. No tengo miedo a dar un discurso.
____ 20. Ciertas partes de mi cuerpo se sienten muy tensas y rígidas mientras doy un discurso.
____ 21. Me siento relajado/a mientras doy un discurso.
____ 22. Mis pensamientos se vuelven confusos y revueltos cuando estoy dando un discurso.
23. Enfrento la perspectiva de dar un discurso con confianza.

24. Mientras dando un discurso me pongo tan nervioso/a, me olvido de hechos que realmente sé.
APPENDIX K

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION (PRCA-24)

(BACK-TRANSLATED VERSION)

Instructions: This instrument is made of 24 statements on your feelings towards communicating with others. Please indicate on the line provided the degree to which you agree to each statement, (1) being strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Many of the statements are related or similar to one another, do not worry about that.

____ 1. I do not like participating in group discussions.
____ 2. Generally, I feel comfortable while participating in a group discussion.
____ 3. I am tense and nervous when participating in a group discussion.
____ 4. I like being involved in group discussions.
____ 5. Participating in a group discussion with people I don’t know makes me feel tense and nervous.
____ 6. I’m relaxed and calm while participating in a group discussion.
____ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to intervene at a meeting.
____ 8. Usually, I am calm and relaxed when I intervene at a meeting.
____ 9. I feel very calm and relaxed when I’m asked to share my opinion at a meeting.
____ 10. In a meeting, I am afraid of sharing what I think.
____ 11. Communicating in a meeting makes me feel uncomfortable.
____ 12. I am relaxed when answering questions in a meeting.
____ 13. I feel very nervous while participating in a conversation with a person I do not know well.
____ 15. Normally, I am very tense and nervous when having a conversation.
____ 16. Normally, I am calm and relaxed when having a conversation.
____ 17. While I converse with a person I just met, I feel relaxed.
____ 18. Having a conversation makes me feel scared.
____ 19. I am not afraid about giving a speech.
____ 20. Certain body parts become tense and rigid while I am giving a speech.
____ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
____ 22. My thoughts become confusing and scrambled when I am giving a speech.
____ 23. I am confident when thinking about giving a speech.
24. While giving a speech I become nervous and I start to forget what I already know.
APPENDIX L

BEHAVIORAL CHOICE QUESTIONNAIRE

(ORIGINAL ENGLISH VERSION)

On a 1 to 5 scale where 1 is “A great deal” and 5 is “Not at all,” please indicate how much desire you would have to participate in the following research study scenarios.

_____ 1. Participate in a debate.

_____ 2. Rate a TV program.

_____ 3. Participate in a conversation with a fellow student about goals in life.

_____ 4. Deliver a public speech.
APPENDIX M

BEHAVIORAL CHOICE QUESTIONNAIRE

(SPANISH LANGUAGE VERSION)

En una escala del 1 al 5 donde 1 es “Muchísimo” y 5 es “Para nada”, por favor indique cuánto deseo tendría de participar en los siguientes escenarios de estudios de investigación.

_____ 1. Participar en un debate.
_____ 2. Calificar un programa de televisión.
_____ 3. Participar en una conversación con un compañero estudiante sobre metas en la vida.
_____ 4. Dar un discurso público.
APPENDIX N

BEHAVIORAL CHOICE QUESTIONNAIRE

(BACK-TRANSLATED VERSION)

On a 1 to 5 scale where 1 is “A lot” and 5 is “Not at all,” please indicate how you would like to participate in the following situations.

_____ 1. Participating in a debate.

_____ 2. Rating a TV program.

_____ 3. Participating in a conversation with a fellow student about goals in life.

_____ 4. Giving a speech in public.
APPENDIX O
SOCIAL INFLUENCE SITUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
(ORIGINAL ENGLISH VERSION)

This communication study is investigating what people would say in various social influence situations. Some situations will be described for you. Imagine yourself in each situation. Communication strategies will then be listed. *Indicate how likely or unlikely it would be that you would use each of the strategies, if you were actually in the situation, by placing a number in the blank next to each strategy.* The scale is:

- 7 = extremely likely to use
- 6 = moderately likely to use
- 5 = slightly likely to use
- 4 = neutral (neither likely or unlikely to use)
- 3 = slightly unlikely to use
- 2 = moderately unlikely to use
- 1 = extremely unlikely to use

Rate each strategy individually (you may use the same numerical rating for more than one strategy).
A. You have been carrying on a close relationship with an opposite sex friend for the past two years. You have recently received two employment offers: one in the immediate vicinity and one in over 1000 miles away. Although both of you wish to stay together, you think the distant job is more challenging and attractive. Your friend wants you to take the local position so that she/he can remain close to friends and relatives. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies in order to get your friend to accompany you to the distant job?

1. _____ I would tell my friend that if she/he does not accompany me to the new job, I will go alone.

2. _____ I would act very hurt and then attack my friend’s character for refusing to go and hurting me so much.

3. _____ I would try to be very pleasant and friendly in order to get my friend in the “right frame of mind” before asking her/him to accompany me to the new job.

4. _____ I would point out to my friend that I have done many things for her/him and that she/he owes it to me to accompany me to the new job.

5. _____ I would tell my friend that I want the new job very badly and I wish she/he would accompany me there as a personal favor to me.

6. _____ I would suggest my friend was simple-minded for not seeing my side of the issue.
B. You have been living six months in a house that you purchased. You learn that your next-door neighbors, the Smiths, plan to cut down a large shade tree that stands near your property in order to construct their new two-car garage. However, in the long run, loss of the shade tree will adversely affect the beauty of your home, your comfort, and perhaps the value of your home. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies in order to get the Smiths to leave the tree standing?

7. _____ I would tell the Smiths that all the neighbors would be upset if they cut down the shade tree.

8. _____ I would give the Smiths a full explanation of the situation and try to reason with them.

9. _____ I would tell the Smiths cutting down the tree would be a very selfish act, and I could not believe they would be so inconsiderate.

10. _____ I would promise the Smiths that I would do something special for them in the future if they would not cut down the tree.

11. _____ I would talk to other neighbors who have known the Smiths for a longer time and see if they could convince the Smiths not to cut down the tree.

12. _____ I would end up calling the Smiths a “bad name” to insure they would know how upset I was, and tell them to move if they cannot get along with the rest of us.
C. Your roommate is playing her/his stereo loudly the night before you must take a midterm examination for a class. You have to study the entire evening if you are going to do well on the exam. You need to ask your roommate to turn off the stereo. She/he has been known to get upset at such a request. How likely would you be to employ each of the following strategies in order to get your roommate to turn off the stereo?

13. _____ I would be nice and polite to my roommate, and then ask her/him to turn off the stereo.

14. _____ I would promise to do a favor for my roommate if she/he would turn off the stereo now.

15. _____ I would recall past favors I’ve done and say my roommate owes me a few hours of quiet.

16. _____ I would act upset, tell my roommate she/he is stupid and demand that she/he turn off the stereo.

17. _____ I would tell my roommate that our neighbors will complain if she/he does not turn off the stereo.

18. _____ I would ask my roommate whether she/he is deaf, and tell her/him to turn off the stereo while she/he is still physically able to do so.
APPENDIX P
SOCIAL INFLUENCE SITUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
(SPANISH-LANGUAGE VERSION)

Este estudio de comunicación está investigando lo que la gente diría en varias situaciones de influencia social. Algunas situaciones serán descritas para usted. Imagínese en cada una de las situaciones. Estrategias de comunicación serán enlistadas después. *Indique, escribiendo un número en el espacio al lado de cada estrategia, que tan probable o improbable sería para usted usar cada una de las estrategias si estuviera de hecho en tal situación.* La escala es como sigue:

- 7 = extremadamente probable de usar
- 6 = moderadamente probable de usar
- 5 = un tanto probable de usar
- 4 = neutral (ni probable ni improbable)
- 3 = un tanto improbable de usar
- 2 = moderadamente improbable de usar
- 1 = extremadamente improbable de usar
Califique cada estrategia individualmente (puede utilizar la misma clasificación para más de una estrategia).

A. Ha llevado una relación cercana con un amigo/a del sexo opuesto durante los últimos dos años. Ha recibido dos propuestas de trabajo: una en la vecindad inmediata y otra a más de 1000 millas de distancia. Aunque ambos de ustedes desean permanecer juntos, usted piensa que el trabajo distante es más desafiante y atractivo. Su amigo/a quiere que usted acepte la posición local para que él/ella pueda permanecer cerca de amigos o parientes. ¿Qué tan probable sería que usted empleara cada una de las siguientes estrategias con el fin de hacer que su amigo/a lo/a acompañe al trabajo distante?

1. _____ Le diría a mi amigo/a que si él/ella no me acompaña a mi nuevo trabajo, iré solo/a.

2. _____ Actuaría muy lastimado/a y luego atacaría el carácter de mi amigo/a por negarse a ir y por lastimarme tanto.

3. _____ Trataría de ser muy placentero/a y amigable con el fin de hacer que mi amigo/a entre en “el estado mental adecuado” antes de pedirle que me acompañe a mi nuevo trabajo.

4. _____ Le señalaría a mi amigo/a que he hecho muchas cosas por él/ella y que me debe el acompañarme a mi nuevo trabajo.

5. _____ Le diría a mi amigo/a que de verdad quiero el nuevo trabajo y deseo que me acompañe como un favor personal.

6. _____ Sugeriría que mi amigo/a es de mente simple por no ver mi lado en el asunto.
B. Ha estado viviendo seis meses en una casa que compró. Acaba de enterarse que sus vecinos de al lado, los Pérez, planean cortar un árbol grande de sombra que está cerca de la propiedad suya para construir su nueva cochera doble. Sin embargo, a largo plazo, la pérdida del árbol de sombra afectará adversamente la belleza de su casa, su comodidad, y tal vez el valor de su casa. ¿Qué tan probable sería que usted empleara cada una de las siguientes estrategias con el fin de que los Pérez dejen el árbol en su lugar?

7. _____ Le diría a los Pérez que todos los vecinos estarían acongojados si cortan el árbol de sombra.

8. _____ Le daría una explicación completa a los Pérez sobre mi situación y trataría de razonar con ellos.

9. _____ Le diría a los Pérez que el hecho de cortar el árbol es un acto egoísta, y que no podía creer que fueran tan desconsiderados.

10. _____ Le prometería a los Pérez que haría algo especial por ellos en el futuro si no cortan el árbol.

11. _____ Hablaría con los otros vecinos que han conocido a los Pérez por más tiempo y vería pudieran convencer a los Pérez de no cortar el árbol.

12. _____ Acabarían por llamar a los Pérez por un “mal nombre” para asegurar que supieran que tan alterado/a estaba, y decirles que se mudaran si no pueden llevarse bien con el resto de nosotros.
C. Su compañero/a de cuarto está tocando su estéreo con el volumen muy alto la noche antes de su examen semestral. Tiene usted que estudiar toda la noche si quiere sacarse una buena calificación en el examen. Necesita preguntarle a su compañero/a de cuarto que apague el estéreo. Es sabido que esta solicitud tiende a enfadarlo/a. ¿Qué tan probable sería que usted empleara cada una de las siguientes estrategias con el fin de que su compañero/a de cuarto apague el estéreo?

13. _____ Sería agradable y cortés a mi compañero/a de cuarto, y luego le pediría que apagara el estéreo.

14. _____ Le prometería un favor a mi compañero/a de cuarto si él/ella apaga el estéreo ahora.

15. _____ Le recordaría favores pasados que he hecho y le diría que mi compañero/a de cuarto me debe unas horas de silencio.

16. _____ Actuaría alterado, le diría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que es un/a estúpido/a y exigiría que apagara su estéreo.

17. _____ Le diría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que nuestros vecinos se quejarán si no apaga el estéreo.

18. _____ Le preguntaría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que si está sordo, y le diría que apagara el estéreo mientras que todavía sea físicamente capaz de hacerlo.
APPENDIX Q
SOCIAL INFLUENCE SITUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
(BACK-TRANSLATED VERSION)

This study aims to find out what people would say in various social situations, some of which will be described to you. Put yourself in each of the following situations. The communication strategies will be given later. Indicate, by writing a number on the space next to each strategy, how probable is it for you to use that particular strategy in case you really were in that situation.

The scale is as follows:

7 = extremely probable to be used
6 = moderately probable to be used
5 = somehow probable to be used
4 = neutral (neither probable nor improbable to be used)
3 = a bit probable to be used
2 = moderately improbable to be used
1 = extremely improbable to be used

Classify each strategy individually (you may use the same number for more than one communication strategy).
A. You have been in a close relationship with a friend of the opposite sex for the past two years. You have received two job offers: one at a nearby neighborhood and the other more than 1000 miles away. Although both of you wish to remain together, you find the second offer more challenging and attractive. Yet, your friend wants you to take the first one so that s/he can remain near his/her friends and relatives.

How probable is it for you to use each of the following communication strategies in order to persuade your friend to go with you?

1. _____ I would tell my friend that if s/he does not come with me I will go by myself.

2. _____ I would appear very hurt and offended, then I would provoke my friend for refusing to come with me and for hurting me so much.

3. _____ I would try to be pleasing and friendly in order to get my friend into “the adequate mental state” before I ask him/her to come with me to my new job.

4. _____ I would point out that I have done many things for him/her, and so s/he has to come with me.

5. _____ I would tell my friend that I truly want the new job and that I wish that s/he comes with me.

6. _____ I would infer that my friend has a simple mind for not considering my point of view on the issue.
B. You have been living for six months at a house you bought. You just found out that your neighbors, the Pérez, are planning on cutting down a tree that is near your property so they can build a bigger garage. However, in the long run, the loss of the tree’s shadow will significantly affect the view of your hose, your commodity, and even your house’s value.

How probable is it for you to use each of the following strategies in order to persuade the Pérez not to cut down the tree?

1. _____ I would tell the Pérez that all the other neighbors would be upset if they cut down the tree.

2. _____ I would try to my situation to the Pérez so that I can make them understand.

3. _____ I would tell the Pérez that they are being selfish and that I had never though they were that inconsiderate.

4. _____ I would promise the Pérez that I will do something special for them in the future if they leave the tree.

5. _____ I would talk to the other neighbors that have known the Pérez for a longer time and would ask them to convince the Pérez of not cutting down the tree.

6. _____ I would end up calling the Pérez bad names to make sure they are aware of how upset I would be and I would tell them that they should move away if they cannot get along with the rest of us.
C. Your roommate’s stereo volume is too high and you will be having an exam the following day, you have to stay up all night to study enough so that you can get a good grade. You need to ask your roommate to turn it off. Yet, you know that such a request tends to upset him.

How probable is it for you to use each of the following strategies in order to make your roommate turn off his stereo?

1. _____ I would be nice and polite to my roommate and then I would ask him to turn it off.

2. _____ I would promise him/her a favor.

3. _____ I would remind him of previous favors I have done for him/her, and I would say that he owes me some silent hours.

4. _____ I would act altered, I would tell my roommate that he is a jerk and I would make him turn off the stereo.

5. _____ I would tell my roommate that our neighbors will get upset if he doesn’t turn off the stereo.

6. _____ I would ask my roommate if s/he is deaf and I would tell him to turn off the stereo while s/he is still physically capable of doing so.
APPENDIX R

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVED INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Project

Title of study: The Development and Testing of the Spanish-Language Versions of the Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness Scales

Introduction: This research project hopes to acquire information on the generalizability and perception of communication traits in native Spanish-speakers. The project is also being conducted in order for the researcher to fulfill the thesis requirements set forth by the School of Communication at the University of Akron.

Today, you are invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Cristina Gonzalez Alcala, a graduate student in the School of Communication at the University of Akron, OH, USA.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to further advance the field of communication by developing and testing the Spanish-language version of scales that have been developed in the United States. The results of this study will help scholars of communication better understand communication traits across cultures, while providing an insight to cross-cultural traits.

Procedures: If you agree to participate in this project, you will be asked to complete 5 questionnaires today. The estimated time for completing one of these questionnaires ranges from 3 to 15 minutes at most. No follow-up studies will be conducted.

Risks and discomforts: There are no known risks or discomforts associated with the completion of these questionnaires.

Benefits: You will receive no direct benefit from participating in this study; however, your participation will help better understand the phenomenon being examined.

Right to refuse or withdraw: Participation in this research is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, or discontinue participation at any time. There will be no penalties or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Anonymous and confidential data collection: No identifying information will be collected, furthermore your anonymity will be protected by not asking you to sign and return the informed consent form.

Any and all information collected will be kept in a secure location, and only the researcher and thesis committee members (3 professors) will have access to the data. Publications and or presentations of the research results will not have any individual identification of participants. Data will be used only in its aggregate form. Nobody will be able to link your responses to you.

Who to contact with questions: Should you have any questions about this study, please contact Cristina Gonzalez Alcala at 001-502-767-5339 or Dr. Andrew Rancer, Professor of Communication at 001-330-972-7600. This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board to ensure compliance with ethical guidelines by which this study is bound. To ask questions about your rights as a research participant, please call Ms. Sharon McWhorter, Associate Director for Research Services at 001-330-972-7666.

Acceptance: I have read and understood the information provided above and all of my questions have been answered. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. My completion and return of the questionnaires will serve as my consent. I have been given a copy of this consent for future reference.

School of Communication
College of Fine and Applied Arts
Akron, OH 44325-1063
330-972-7600 • http://www.uakron.edu/schlcomm

The University of Akron is an Equal Education and Employment Institution

[Signature]

IRB 5/21/1

Date
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL NOTICE

NOTICE OF APPROVAL

May 4, 2011

Christina Gonzalez
130 N. Rose Blvd.
Akron, Ohio 44302

From: Sharon McWhorter, IRB Administrator

Re: IRB Number 20110502 "The Development and Validity of the Spanish-Language Versions of the Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness Scales"

Thank you for submitting your Exemption Request for the referenced study. Your request was approved on May 3, 2011. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:

☐ Exemption 1 – Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices.

☒ Exemption 2 – Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior.

☐ Exemption 3 - Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior not exempt under category 2, but subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.

☐ Exemption 4 – Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.

☐ Exemption 5 – Research and demonstration projects conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine public programs or benefits.

☐ Exemption 6 – Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies.

Annual continuation applications are not required for exempt projects. If you make changes to the study’s design or procedures that increase the risk to subjects or include activities that do not fall within the approved exemption category, please contact me to discuss whether or not a new application must be submitted. Any such changes or modifications must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

Please retain this letter for your files. This office will hold your exemption application for a period of three years from the approval date. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit another Exemption Request. If the research is being conducted for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, the student must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

☐ Approved consent form/s enclosed

Cc: Andrew Rancer – Advisor
Cc: Stephanie Woods – IRB Chair

Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Akron, OH 44325-2102
330-972-7666 • 330-972-6081 Fax
The University of Akron is an Equal Education and Employment Institution
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APPENDIX T
SURVEY PACKAGE

CUESTIONARIO # 1 – Tiempo estimado para completarlo: 5 a 10 minutos

Instructions: Este cuestionario contiene declaraciones sobre argumentación de temas controvertidos. Indica poniendo el número apropiado en el espacio en blanco a la izquierda de la declaración qué tan seguido cada declaración es cierta para su personalidad.

1 = Casi nunca es cierto; 2 = Raramente cierto; 3 = Ocasionalemente cierto; 4 = A menudo cierto; 5 = Casi siempre cierto

___ 1. Cuanto estoy en un argumento, me preocupa que la persona con la que estoy argumentando formará una impresión negativa de mí.

___ 2. Argumentar sobre una cuestión controversial mejora mi inteligencia.

___ 3. Gozo evadir argumentos.

___ 4. Soy energético/a y entusiasta cuando argumento.

___ 5. Una vez que termino un argumento me prometo no volver a entrar en otro.

___ 6. Argumentar con una persona crea más problemas para mí que resolverlos.

___ 7. Tengo un sentimiento bueno, placentero cuando gano un punto en un argumento.

___ 8. Cuando termino un argumento con alguien me siento nervioso/a y triste.


___ 10. Me da un sentimiento desagradable cuando me doy cuenta de que estoy a punto de entrar en un argumento.

___ 11. Gozo defender mi punto de vista sobre un problema.

___ 12. Estoy feliz cuando evito un argumento.

___ 13. No me gusta perderme la oportunidad de argumentar un tema controversial.

___ 14. Prefiero estar con gente que generalmente está de acuerdo conmigo.

___ 15. Considero un argumento un desafío intelectual excitante.

___ 16. Me encuentro incapaz de pensar en puntos efectivos durante un argumento.

___ 17. Me siento refrescado/a y satisfecho/a después de un argumento sobre un tema controversial.

___ 18. Tengo la habilidad de prosperar en un argumento.

___ 19. Trato de evitar meterme en argumentos.

___ 20. Siento emoción cuando espero que una conversación en la que me encuentro se esté encaminando a un argumento.
CUESTIONARIO #2 – Tiempo estimado para completarlo: 5 a 10 minutos

Instrucciones: Esta encuesta tiene que ver con cómo tratamos de que la gente cumpla con nuestros deseos. Indique que tan seguido es cierta cada declaración para su personalidad cuando trata de influenciar a otras personas. Use la siguiente escala:

1 = Casi nunca es cierto; 2 = Raramente cierto; 3 = Ocasiolamente cierto; 4 = A menudo cierto; 5 = Casi siempre cierto

1. Soy extremadamente precavido/a de evitar atacar la inteligencia de un individuo cuando ataco sus ideas.
2. Cuando los individuos son muy tercos uso insultos para ablandar su tenacidad.
3. Hago mucho esfuerzo para evitar hacer que otras gentes se sientan mal sobre ellos mismos cuando trato de influenciarlos.
4. Cuando la gente se reúsa a hacer algún deber que se que es importante, sin buena razón, les digo que son irrazonables.
5. Cuando otros hacen algo que yo considero estúpido, intenro ser extremadamente gentil con ellos/ellas.
6. Si individuos que trato de influenciar realmente se lo merecen, ataco su carácter.
7. Cuando la gente se comporta de maneras que son de mal gusto, los insulto para que enten en comportamiento propio.
8. Intento hacer que la gente se sienta bien consigo misma aún cuando sus ideas son estúpidas.
9. Cuando la gente no cede en algún asunto de importancia, pierdo mi temperamento y les digo cosas un tanto fuertes.
10. Cuando la gente critica mis defectos, lo tomo de buen humor y no trato de devolvérselas.
11. Cuando los individuos me insultan, obtengo placer en decirles hasta lo que no.
12. Cuando los individuos me desagradan demasiado, intenro no demostrarlo en lo que digo o como lo digo.
13. Me gusta picarle a la gente que hace cosas que son muy estúpidas para estimularles su inteligencia.
14. Cuando ataco las ideas de una persona, intento no herir su auto-concepto.
15. Cuando intenro influenciar a gente, hago un gran esfuerzo por no ofenderlos.
16. Cuando la gente hace cosas que son malas o crueles, ataco su carácter para ayudarles a corregir su comportamiento.
17. Me reúso a participar en argumentos cuando envuelven ataques personales.
18. Cuando nada parece funcionar en tratar de influenciar a otros, grito y berreo para obtener algún movimiento de ellos/ellas.
19. Cuando no tengo la habilidad para refutar la posición de otros, intenro hacerlos/hacerlas sentir defensivos/defensivas para debilitar sus posiciones.
20. Cuando un argumento cambia a ataques personales, intenro muy duro cambiar el tema.
CUESTIONARIO # 3 – Tiempo estimado para completarlo: 7 a 15 minutos

Instrucciones: Este instrumento está compuesto de 24 declaraciones sobre sus sentimientos acerca de comunicación con otras personas. Por favor indique en el espacio previsto el grado con el que cada declaración se aplica a usted marcando si esta (1) fuertemente de acuerdo, (2) de acuerdo, (3) indiferente/a, (4) en desacuerdo, (5) fuertemente en desacuerdo con cada declaración. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas. Muchas de las declaraciones son similares a otras declaraciones. No se preocupe por esto.

1. No me gusta participar en discusiones de grupo.
2. Generalmente, estoy cómodo/a mientras participo en una discusión de grupo.
3. Estoy tenso/a y nervioso/a mientras participo en una discusión de grupo.
4. Me gusta estar involucrado/a en discusiones de grupo.
5. Participación en una discusión de grupo con gente nueva me hace tenso/a y nervioso/a.
6. Estoy calmado/a y relajado/a mientras participo en un discurso de grupo.
7. Generalmente, estoy nervioso/a cuando tengo que participar en una junta.
8. Normalmente estoy calmado/a y relajado/a mientras participo en juntas.
9. Estoy muy calmado/a y relajado/a cuando soy llamado/a a expresar una opinión en una junta.
10. Tengo miedo de expresarme en juntas.
11. Comunicación en juntas usualmente me hace incómodo/a.
12. Estoy muy relajado cuando contesto preguntas en una junta.
13. Mientras participo en una conversación con una persona que no conozco bien me siento muy nervioso/a.
14. No tengo miedo a hablar en conversaciones.
15. Normalmente estoy muy tenso/a y nervioso/a en conversaciones.
17. Mientras converso con un/a nuevo/a conocido/a, me siento muy relajado/a.
18. Tengo miedo a hablar en conversaciones.
19. No tengo miedo a dar un discurso.
20. Ciertas partes de mi cuerpo se sienten muy tensas y rígidas mientras doy un discurso.
21. Me siento relajado/a mientras doy un discurso.
22. Mis pensamientos se vuelven confusos y revueltos cuando estoy dando un discurso.
23. Enfrente la perspectiva de dar un discurso con confianza.
24. Mientras dando un discurso me pongo tan nervioso/a, me olvido hechos que realmente sé.
CUESTIONARIO # 4 – Tiempo estimado para completarlo: 3 a 5 minutos

En una escala del 1 al 5 donde 1 es “Muchísimo” y 3 es “Para nada”, por favor indique que tanto desearía participar en los siguientes escenarios de estudios de investigación.

_____ 1. Participar en un debate.
_____ 2. Calificar un programa de televisión.
_____ 3. Participar en una conversación con un compañero estudiante sobre metas en la vida.
_____ 4. Dar un discurso público.
CUESTIONARIO # 5 – Tiempo estimado para completarlo: 5 a 10 minutos

Este estudio de comunicación investiga lo que la gente diría en varias situaciones de influencia social. Algunas situaciones serán descritas para usted. Imagínese en cada una de las situaciones. Estrategias de comunicación serán enlistadas después. Indíque, escribiendo un número en el espacio al lado de cada estrategia, qué tan probable o improbable sería para usted usar cada una de las estrategias si estuviera en tal situación. Use la escala a continuación:

7 = extremadamente probable de usar
6 = moderadamente probable de usar
5 = un tanto probable de usar
4 = neutral (ni probable ni improbable)
3 = un tanto improbable de usar
2 = moderadamente improbable de usar
1 = extremadamente improbable de usar

Califique cada estrategia individualmente (puede utilizar la misma clasificación para más de una estrategia).

A. Ha llevado una relación cercana con un amigo/a del sexo opuesto durante los últimos dos años. Ha recibido dos propuestas de trabajo: una en un lugar cercano y otra a más de 1000 millas de distancia. Aunque ambos de ustedes desean permanecer juntos, usted piensa que el trabajo distante es más desafiante y atractivo. Su amigo/a quiere que usted acepte el trabajo cercano para que él/ella pueda permanecer cerca de amigos o parientes. ¿Qué tan probable sería que usted empleara cada una de las siguientes estrategias con el fin de hacer que su amigo/a lo/a acompañe al trabajo distante?

1. _____ Le diría a mi amigo/a que si él/ella no me acompaña a mi nuevo trabajo, iré solo/a.
2. _____ Actuaría muy lastimado/a y luego atacaría el carácter de mi amigo/a por negarse a ir y por lastimarme tanto.
3. _____ Trataría de ser muy placentero/a y amigable con el fin de hacer que mi amigo/a entre en "el estado mental adecuado" antes de pedirle que me acompañe a mi nuevo trabajo.
4. _____ Le señalaría a mi amigo/a que he hecho muchas cosas por él/ella y que me debe el acompañarme a mi nuevo trabajo.
5. _____ Le diría a mi amigo/a que de verdad quiero el nuevo trabajo y deseo que me acompañe como un favor personal.
6. _____ Sugeriría que mi amigo/a es de mente simple y no ver mi lado en el asunto.
7 = extremadamente probable de usar; 6 = moderadamente probable de usar; 5 = un tanto probable de usar; 4 = neutral (su probable ni improbable); 3 = un tanto improbable de usar; 2 = moderadamente improbable de usar; 1 = extremadamente improbable de usar.

B. Ha estado viviendo seis meses en una casa que compró. Acaba de enterarse que sus vecinos de al lado, los Pérez, planean cortar un árbol grande cerca de su propiedad que brinda sombra a su casa, para construir una nueva cochera doble. Sin embargo, a largo plazo, la pérdida del árbol que de sombra afectará adversamente la belleza de su casa, su comodidad, y tal vez el valor de su casa. ¿Qué tan probable sería que usted empleara cada una de las siguientes estrategias con el fin de que los Pérez dejen el árbol en su lugar?

7. ______ Le diría a los Pérez que todos los vecinos estarían acongojados si cortan el árbol.
8. ______ Le diría una explicación completa a los Pérez sobre mi situación y trataría de razonar con ellos.
9. ______ Le diría a los Pérez que el hecho de cortar el árbol es un acto egoísta, y que no podía creer que fueran tan inconsiderados.
10. ______ Le prometería a los Pérez que haría algo especial para ellos en el futuro si no cortan el árbol.
11. ______ Hablaría con los otros vecinos que han conocido a los Pérez por más tiempo y vería si pudieran convencer a los Pérez de no cortar el árbol.
12. ______ Acabaría por llamar a los Pérez por un “mal nombre” para asegurar que supieran qué tan alterado/a estoy, y decírles que si no pueden llevarse bien con el resto de nosotros.

C. Su compañero/a de cuarto tiene el estéreo con el volumen muy alto la noche antes de su examen semestral. Usted tiene que estudiar toda la noche si quiere sacarse una buena calificación en el examen. Necesita preguntarle a su compañero/a de cuarto que apague el estéreo. Es sabido que esta solicitud tiende a enfadarlo/a. ¿Qué tan probable sería que usted empleara cada una de las siguientes estrategias con el fin de que su compañero/a de cuarto apague el estéreo?

13. ______ Sería agradable y cortés con mi compañero/a de cuarto, y luego le pediría que apagara el estéreo.
14. ______ Le prometería un favor a mi compañero/a de cuarto si el/ella apaga el estéreo ahora.
15. ______ Le recordaría favoritos pasados que he hecho y le diría que me debe unas horas de silencio.
16. ______ Actuaría alterado, le diría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que es un/a estúpido/a y exigiría que apagara su estéreo.
17. ______ Le diría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que nuestros vecinos se quejarán si no apaga el estéreo.
18. ______ Le preguntaría a mi compañero/a de cuarto que si está sordo, y le diría que apagara el estéreo mientras que todavía sea físicamente capaz de hacerlo.

FIN DEL ESTUDIO
MUCHÍSIMAS GRACIAS POR SU PARTICIPACIÓN