

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Holly Ruth Miller for the Master of Science degree in
Experimental Psychology presented on May, 1993. Title:
The Examination of Interpersonal Flexibility,
Self-Esteem, and Death Anxiety.

Abstract approved:


Stephen F. Davis

Individuals engage in interpersonal communication in numerous situations daily. Many studies attempting to delineate the characteristics of individuals who are more socially inclined than others have been conducted. The present study sought to evaluate the relationship between interpersonal flexibility, self-esteem, and death anxiety. Using college students as subjects, it was found that the degree of interpersonal flexibility and level of self-esteem did not differ between men and women. However, a significant positive correlation was found between interpersonal flexibility and level of self-esteem. Yet another significant positive relationship was shown between death anxiety and self-esteem. Additionally, women reported significantly higher levels of death anxiety than did men.

THE EXAMINATION OF INTERPERSONAL FLEXIBILITY,
SELF-ESTEEM, AND DEATH ANXIETY

Thesis

Presented to
the Division of Psychology and Special Education
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Holly Ruth Miller

May 1993

John O. Schuenn

Approved for the Major Department

Faye N. Vowell

Approved for the Graduate Council

Acknowledgments

Completing this thesis brings both happiness and sadness. My experience at Emporia State University has resulted in many special moments. The best friends I have had my entire life are here. With them, I have shared my joys and frustrations. My mentor, Dr. Stephen Davis, has also been of vital importance in both my undergraduate and graduate career. I would not be where I am without his guidance and support. The faculty and staff, especially Shari Parks, have been very helpful and supportive. My special thanks and everlasting appreciation go to Dr. Stephen Davis, Kaira Miller, and Myra Pfeifer.

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapters	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Method.....	11
3. Results.....	17
4. Conclusions.....	22
5. References.....	25
6. Appendices.....	29

Chapter 1

Introduction

The demands required of individuals in today's society are immense. These demands are reflected in the multiple roles one may assume during the course of any given day. Inherent in the transition from one role to the next is the need for interpersonal or functional flexibility. Interpersonal flexibility refers to an individual's ability to function effectively in each role, specifically the roles involving interpersonal interactions (Paulhus & Martin, 1988). The woman, who is able to relate to her two-year-old child and has the ability to make a proposal to a board of directors, exemplifies interpersonal flexibility.

Self-esteem is a relevant issue in interpersonal flexibility. Self-esteem consists of "self-confidence and perceived positive appraisal by significant others" (Lorr, Youniss, & Stefic, 1991, p. 508). One could anticipate that high self-esteem individuals would be more comfortable and flexible in interpersonal situations; they feel comfortable with themselves and have the confidence to interact with others.

Conversely, it is predictable that low self-esteem individuals would have low amounts of functional flexibility, resulting in a shy, withdrawn personality.

Death anxiety also may be a personality variable that is related to interpersonal flexibility. This proposal is based on two related findings. First, death anxiety and self-esteem have been shown to be negatively related (Davis, Martin, Wilee, & Voorhees, 1978). Second, as noted, self-esteem is predicted to be positively related to interpersonal flexibility (Paulhus & Martin, 1988). Therefore, one could postulate that the individual who scores high in death anxiety would be inhibited in interpersonal situations. The present study sought to examine self-esteem and death anxiety as related to the concept of interpersonal or functional flexibility.

Interpersonal Flexibility

Interpersonal flexibility is defined as "the ease of carrying off a particular response when required by the situation" (Paulhus & Martin, 1987, p. 354). In other words, interpersonal flexibility refers to the adaptive ability of an individual to change his/her behavior to fit the demands of the situation at hand.

This adaptivity would, in turn, be reflected in the quality of one's interpersonal interactions (Paulhus & Martin, 1987). Those individuals who are high in interpersonal flexibility would appear to have more successful interactions.

The concept of interpersonal flexibility also can be linked to the social psychological concept of self-monitoring (Paulhus & Martin, 1988). Self-monitoring refers to the ability of an individual to adjust his/her behavior to fit the situation. Individuals who score high in self-monitoring would be very adept at making their behavior match the interpersonal situation at hand. Conversely, individuals who score low in self-monitoring would keep their behavior constant across situations and therefore not be as interpersonally flexible. Despite the similarities between interpersonal flexibility and self-monitoring, the two concepts are not identical. Interpersonal flexibility refers to filling multiple roles through adaptation; whereas, self-monitoring refers to actually monitoring one's actions and words when in the presence of different individuals. Nonetheless, one would expect the individual scoring high in self-monitoring

to likewise score high in interpersonal flexibility.

A relatively new scale was developed by Paulhus and Martin (1987) to provide an accurate measurement of interpersonal flexibility. The Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities (BIC) was developed to measure 16 personality traits related to interpersonal capabilities. The BIC yields a reliability coefficient of .81 (Paulhus & Martin, 1987). The BIC was administered to 164 (79 men, 85 women) undergraduate college students (Paulhus & Martin, 1987). The results indicated that there was a positive correlation between interpersonal capabilities and self-esteem. Furthermore, those capabilities that were negative (lazy) and non-direct (submissive) did not contribute to high self-esteem. These findings provides further support for the proposed relationship between self-esteem and interpersonal capabilities.

Self-Esteem

Self-esteem is viewed as "the outcome of implicit self-evaluations that a person makes with regard to personal worthiness" (Joubert, 1991, p. 115). In other words, self-esteem refers to the degree with which one views himself/herself in regard to value--"I am a good

person" as opposed to "I am a bad person." This concept of self is usually formulated early in life and is based on experience (Ames & Felker, 1979). As the number of experiences increases, so does the foundation from which we evaluate all subsequent experiences. Consequently, early experiences are vital in determining one's level of interaction with others throughout life.

Bohrnstedt and Felson (1983) reported that self-esteem can be operationalized as a function of popularity. Those individuals high in self-esteem tend to view themselves as being more popular than others, and thus, should display more interactions in interpersonal situations. As mentioned previously, studies investigating the relationship between self-esteem and social behavior have been reported. For example, Wheeler and Miyake (1992) investigated self-esteem as it relates to upward and downward comparisons in social situations. An upward comparison would be that comparison which is "boastful" and self-enhancing; whereas, a downward comparison would be considered as "cutting others down" in an attempt to make one appear superior. It was reported that those

individuals with high self-esteem were more "boastful" in interpersonal situations.

Crocker, Thompson, McGraw, and Ingerman (1987) reported similar data. They found that individuals with low self-esteem adopted a negative attitude toward others. Moreover, those individuals scoring low in self-esteem engaged in less self-enhancing behaviors in interpersonal situations; whereas, those individuals scoring high in self-esteem engaged in more self-enhancing behavior. These findings support the contention that low self-esteem individuals experience generalized negativity and, therefore, engage in less "self-promotion."

Following the same line of results, Stake (1985) conducted a study to investigate the concept of social self-esteem, or the level of self-esteem one has in interpersonal situations. The results indicated individuals high in social self-esteem and low in achievement self-esteem relied more on social interactions for their positive self image. Furthermore, low self-esteem individuals rated themselves lower, overall. As a result, the findings from the Crocker et al. (1987) study were supported.

One might conclude low self-esteem individuals exhibit a negative pattern of responding to everyday situations and hence, should be hindered in interpersonal interactions.

Self-esteem also appears to be a crucial component in social power as well (Freeman & Lanning, 1989). Social power refers to those attributes that are related to leadership, such as achievement, dominance, masculinity, and self-esteem. Those individuals who avoid power in interpersonal situations tend to be unassuming women with low self-esteem. Conversely, those individuals who welcome social power tend to be males who are masculine, dominating, and exhibit high self-esteem. One could postulate that the latter group would be more successful interpersonally.

This theme is continued in a study by Schlenker, Weigold, and Hallam (1990). They reported those individuals with high self-esteem were more egotistical when evaluation by others was high. Self-enhancement, then, was the mode of preference in interpersonal situations for those high in self-esteem. Conversely, those individuals exhibiting low self-esteem became less self-enhancing as evaluation apprehension

increased. Many social situations can be viewed as evaluative. In fact, one might find it difficult to describe any social situation lacking this element. Schlenker et al. postulate that high self-esteem individuals assume a self-assertive coping strategy; whereas, low self-esteem individuals adopt a more self-protective strategy in evaluative situations. This line of reasoning again leads one to the conclusion that high self-esteem individuals should be more successful in interpersonal situations due to self-promotion.

Finally, it is noteworthy that several researchers have reported that men have higher self-esteem scores than do women (Davis, Bremer, Anderson, & Tramill, 1983; Davis, Martin, Wilee, & Voorhees, 1978; Marron & Kayson, 1984). With the passage of time, however, the self-esteem gap between men and women may be narrowing (Buzzanga, Miller, Perne, Sander, & Davis, 1989). This latter finding could be attributed to the increase in self-esteem engendered by greater numbers of women entering the work force.

Death Anxiety

Death anxiety is defined as a fear surrounding death (Thorson, 1991). Sadowski, Davis, and Loftus-Vergari (1979-80) maintain that death anxiety "reflects a fundamental sense of powerlessness or an inability to control one's environment" (p. 203). This anxiety would include the fear of one's own death and/or the fear of others dying.

Templer (1970) has developed a scale to measure death anxiety. It was validated utilizing psychiatric patients. Those patients deemed high in death anxiety by psychiatric interviews, scored higher on the Death Anxiety Scale (DAS) than control patients. The DAS also correlates significantly (.74) with another validated measure of death anxiety, Boyar's Fear of Death Scale (Templer, 1970). The statements contained in the DAS were chosen as a result of item analysis and resulted in the development of a 15-item true/false inventory.

Research using the DAS has established the existence of a negative relationship between death anxiety and self-esteem (Buzzanga et al., 1989; Davis et al., 1983; Davis et al., 1978). Thus, as death

anxiety increases, self-esteem decreases. Research also supports the contention that death anxiety is more apparent in women than in men (Buzzanga et al., 1989; Davis et al., 1983; Davis et al., 1978).

Rationale for Present Study

The present study was designed to determine the nature of the relationship between interpersonal flexibility and death anxiety. A final purpose of the present study was to validate the negative relationship between death anxiety and self-esteem. In order to ascertain gender effects, men and women were evaluated independently.

Several predicted outcomes might be entertained. First, men and women who score low in self-esteem should be less interpersonally flexible than men and women who score high in self-esteem (Paulhus & Martin, 1987). The fact that women have higher reported death anxiety than men supports the prediction that women would be less interpersonally flexible than men. As noted, death anxiety is negatively correlated with self-esteem. In turn, self-esteem appears to be positively related to functional flexibility.

Chapter Two

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 64 undergraduate students (35 women, 29 men) enrolled at a regional midwestern university. The mean age of the male subjects was 19.59 years; while the mean age of the female students was 20.36 years.

Apparatus

The instruments utilized in the present study consisted of an informed consent document (see Appendix A), demographic information sheet which requested gender, age, classification and major (see Appendix B), the Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities (BIC) (Paulhus & Martin, 1987) (see Appendix C), the Death Anxiety Scale (DAS) (Templer, 1970) (see Appendix D), and the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) (see Appendix E). The demographic sheet, TSBI, DAS, and BIC were combined to form a self-administering questionnaire booklet.

The TSBI measures self-esteem using a 16-item Likert-type scale. It is considered to be an accurate measure of an individual's self-esteem, as well as

interpersonal success (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). The TSBI has a reliability coefficient of .88 (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974).

The DAS consists of 15 true-false statements and yields a test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 (Templer, 1970). As noted previously, the DAS correlates highly with other established measures of death anxiety.

The BIC evaluates 16 interpersonal behaviors (see Table 1). Using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = very) the subject responds to 5 questions about each of these behaviors. (The BIC yields a reliability coefficient of .81 (Paulhus & Martin, 1988). The 5 scores for each behavior are added together to yield a single, composite interpersonal capability score.

Table 1

The 16 Interpersonal Behaviors of the BIC

Behavior	Explanation
<u>GREGARIOUS</u>	This behavior refers to how "friendly, neighborly, and approachable" individuals view themselves.
<u>UNASSUMING</u>	This behavior refers to how "humble, modest, and not vain" individuals view themselves.
<u>ALOOF</u>	This behavior refers to how "impersonal, unsociable, and vain" individuals view themselves.
<u>ARROGANT</u>	This behavior refers to how "conceited, boastful, and cocky" individuals view themselves.
<u>AMBITIOUS</u>	This behavior refers to how "success-oriented, industrious, and persistent" individuals view themselves.
<u>WARM</u>	This behavior refers to how "tender, kind and sympathetic" individuals view themselves.

Table 1 (Continued)

Behavior	Explanation
<u>LAZY</u>	This behavior refers to how "unproductive, not industrious, and laid back" individuals view themselves.
<u>COLD</u>	This behavior refers to how "uncharitable, hardhearted, and unsympathetic" individuals view themselves.
<u>EXTROVERTED</u>	This behavior refers to how "outgoing, vivacious, and enthusiastic" individuals view themselves.
<u>TRUSTING</u>	This behavior refers to how "naive, gullible, and not crafty" individuals view themselves.
<u>INTROVERTED</u>	This behavior refers to how "withdrawn, shy, and unsparkling" individuals view themselves.
<u>CALCULATING</u>	This behavior refers to how "cunning, sly, and crafty" individuals view themselves.

Table 1 (Continued)

Behavior	Explanation
<u>DOMINANT</u>	This behavior refers to how "assertive, forceful, and firm" individuals view themselves.
<u>AGREEABLE</u>	This behavior refers to how "forgiving, well-mannered, and cooperative" individuals view themselves.
<u>SUBMISSIVE</u>	This behavior refers to how "timid, meek and unaggressive" individuals view themselves.
<u>HOSTILE</u>	This behavior refers to how "quarrelsome, impolite, and uncooperative" individuals view themselves.

Source: Paulhus and Martin (1987).

Procedure

All testing took place during a regularly scheduled class session. The informed consent form was handed out to the subjects to read and complete. The experimenter read the consent form out loud to ensure that the subjects were aware of the issue of confidentiality and conditions for withdrawal from the experiment. The informed consent forms were then collected and the test booklets distributed to all participating subjects. Subjects were instructed to read the instructions at the top of each form. The booklets were collected upon completion, and subjects were thanked for their participation. While no time limit was imposed, all subjects completed the booklets within 30 minutes.

Chapter Three

Results

Separate Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated for the relations of the TSBI and BIC, DAS and BIC, and TSBI and DAS for the entire sample, the sample of men, and the sample of women. The correlations for the entire sample are shown in Table 2. As can be seen, the correlation between the TSBI and BIC, $r(63) = .32$, $p < .05$, and between the TSBI and DAS, $r(63) = -.45$, $p < .01$, were significant.

The correlations shown by the sample of men are found in Table 3. As with the entire sample, the correlations between the TSBI and BIC, $r(28) = .36$, $p < .05$, and between the TSBI and DAS, $r(28) = -.47$, $p < .01$, were statistically reliable.

Table 4 depicts the correlations of the sample of women. As with the previous samples, the correlations between the TSBI and BIC, $r(34) = .30$, $p < .05$, and between the TSBI and DAS, $r(34) = -.45$, $p < .01$, were significant.

Differences in self-esteem, death anxiety, and interpersonal flexibility between men and women also

were examined. Men and women did not differ significantly in terms of interpersonal flexibility, $t(63) = .03$, $p < .96$, and self-esteem, $t(63) = .22$, $p < .80$. However, women had significantly higher, $t(63) = 2.46$, $p < .01$, death anxiety scores than did the men.

Table 2

Correlation Coefficients for Interpersonal Flexibility
(BIC), Self-Esteem (TSBI), and Death Anxiety (DAS) -
Entire Sample.

Inventory	BIC	TSBI	DAS
BIC	---	.32*	-.04
TSBI		---	-.45**
DAS			---

*p < .05 **p < .01

Table 3

Correlation Coefficients for Interpersonal Flexibility
(BIC), Self-Esteem (TSBI), and Death Anxiety (DAS) -
Men

Inventory	BIC	TSBI	DAS
BIC	---	.36*	-.09
TSBI		---	-.47**
DAS			---

*p < .02 **p < .01

Table 4

Correlation Coefficients for Interpersonal Flexibility
(BIC), Self-Esteem (TSBI), and Death Anxiety (DAS)-
Women.

Inventory	BIC	TSBI	DAS
BIC	---	.30*	.02
TSBI		---	-.45**
DAS			---

*p < .05 **p < .01

Chapter Four

Conclusions

The present data support the prediction that interpersonal flexibility and self-esteem would be positively related. It is noteworthy that this relationship was shown by both men and women.

The positive relationship between self-esteem and interpersonal flexibility leads one to draw several possible conclusions. For instance, those individuals high in self-esteem feel confident about themselves and this confidence could perseverate into the domain of interpersonal flexibility. Furthermore, one could postulate that the presence of high self-esteem is antagonistic to the presence of low interpersonal flexibility.

The negative relationship between death anxiety and level of self-esteem was also significant for both men and women and corroborates previous data reported by Davis et al. (1978). Those individuals having high self-esteem may feel they have more to live for in life. Thus, these high self-esteem individuals may be more secure in their lives; and therefore, they may be less anxious about death. Conversely, those

individuals having low self-esteem may feel they have less to live for. Thus, these low self-esteem individuals may be less secure in their lives; and therefore, they may be more anxious about death.

The finding that women reported higher levels of death anxiety than men corroborates a number of previous reports (e.g., Buzzanga et al., 1989; Davis et al., 1983; Davis et al., 1978). One explanation for this effect (Buzzanga et al., 1989) concerns the fact that the DAS measures expressed fear of death.

Perhaps, women are more willing to overtly acknowledge fear of death than are men. Such an explanation is in keeping with the macho image that our society attributes to men. Such an image is antithetical to confessing that one has a fear of death.

Further research is needed to investigate various other personality constructs that could possibly be conducive to, or hinder, interpersonal activities. For example, it would be interesting to examine the impact of other types of anxiety, such as manifest anxiety (Hicks, Ostle, & Pellegrini, 1980) on interpersonal flexibility. The predicted relationship would be that those individuals who experience high

levels of manifest anxiety would reflect low levels of interpersonal flexibility.

References

- Ames, C., & Felker, D. W. (1979). Effects of self-concept on children's causal attributions and self-reinforcement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 613-619.
- Bohrnstedt, G. W., & Felson, R. B. (1983). Explaining the relations among children's self-esteem: A comparison of several causal models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 43-56.
- Buzzanga, V. L., Miller, H. R., Perne, S. E., Sander, J. A., & Davis, S. F. (1989). The relationship between death anxiety and level of self-esteem: A reassessment. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 27, 570-72.
- Crocker, J., Thompson, L. L., McGraw, K. M., & Ingerman, C. (1987). Downward comparison, prejudice, and evaluations of others: Effects of self-esteem and threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 907-916.

- Davis, S. F., Bremer, S. A., Anderson, B. J., & Tramill, J. L. (1983). The interrelationships of ego strength, self-esteem, death anxiety, and gender in undergraduate college students. The Journal of General Psychology, 108, 55-59.
- Davis, S. F., Martin, D. A., Wilee, C. T., & Voorhees, J. W. (1978). Relationship of fear of death and level of self-esteem in college students. Psychological Reports, 42, 419-422.
- Freeman, B., & Lanning, W. (1989). A multivariate analysis of the relationship between social power motivation and personality characteristics in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 522-527.
- Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). Short form of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory: An objective measure of self-esteem. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 4, 473-475.
- Hicks, R. A., Ostle, J. R., & Pellegrini, R. J. (1980). A unidimensional short form of the TMAS. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 16, 447-448.

- Joubert, C. E. (1991). Self-esteem and social desirability in relation to college students' retrospective perceptions of parental fairness and disciplinary practices. Psychological Reports, 69, 115-120.
- Lorr, M., Youniss, R. P., & Stefic, E. C. (1991). An inventory of social skills. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57, 506-520.
- Marron, J. A., & Kayson, W. A. (1984). Effects of living status, gender, and year in college on college students' self-esteem and life-change experiences. Psychological Reports, 55, 811-814.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1987). The structure of personality capabilities. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 354-365.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1988). Functional flexibility: A new conception of interpersonal flexibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 88-101.
- Sadowski, C. J., Davis, S. F., & Loftus-Vergari, M. C. (1979-80). Locus of control and death anxiety: A reexamination. Omega, 10, 203-209.

- Schlenker, B. R., Weigold, M. F., & Hallam, J. R. (1990). Self-serving attributions in social context: Effects of self-esteem and social pressure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 855-863.
- Stake, J. E. (1985). Predicting reactions to everyday events from measures of self-esteem. Journal of Personality, 53, 530-542.
- Templer, D. I. (1970). The construction and validation of a death anxiety scale. Journal of General Psychology, 82, 165-177.
- Thorson, J. A. (1991). Afterlife constructs, death anxiety, and life reviewing: The importance of religion as a moderating variable. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19, 278- 284.
- Wheeler, L., & Miyake, K. (1992). Social comparison in everyday life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 760-773.

Appendix A
Informed Consent Form

The Department of Psychology supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research and related activities. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time, and that if you do withdraw at any time, and that if you do withdraw from the study, you will not be subjected to reprimand or any other form of reproach.

In order to investigate certain personality characteristics in college students, you are asked to complete a series of questionnaires. As these questionnaires will be completed anonymously, your identity will not be known.

"I have read the above statement and have been fully advised of the procedures to be used in this project. I have been given sufficient opportunity to ask any questions I had concerning the procedures and possible risks involved. I understand the potential risks involved and I assume them voluntarily. I likewise understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without being subjected to reproach."

Subject and/or authorized
representative

Date

Appendix B
Demographic Sheet

QUESTIONNAIRE BOOKLET

Answer all questions as they pertain to you. Thank you.

Male _____ Female _____

Age _____

Classification: Fr So Jr Sr

Major: _____

Appendix C
Battery of Interpersonal Capability

ARROGANT (conceited, boastful, cocky)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be arrogant if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be arrogant if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being arrogant in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be arrogant?
5. ___ How capable are you of being arrogant in situations that require it?

AMBITIOUS (success-oriented, industrious, persistent)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be ambitious if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be ambitious if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being ambitious in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be ambitious?
5. ___ How capable are you of being ambitious in situations that require it?

WARM (tender, kind, sympathetic)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be warm if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be warm if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being warm in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be warm?
5. ___ How capable are you of being warm in situations that require it?

LAZY (unproductive, not industrious, laid back)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be lazy if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be lazy if the situation requires it?

3. ___ How anxious would you feel being lazy in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be lazy?
5. ___ How capable are you of being lazy in situations that require it?

COLD (uncharitable, hardhearted, unsympathetic)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be cold if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be cold if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being cold in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be cold?
5. ___ How capable are you of being cold in situations that require it?

EXTROVERTED (outgoing, vivacious, enthusiastic)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be extroverted if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be extroverted if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being extroverted in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be extroverted?
5. ___ How capable are you of being extroverted in situations that require it?

TRUSTING (naive, gullible, not crafty)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would trusting if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be trusting if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being trusting in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be trusting?
5. ___ How capable are you of being trusting in situations that require it?

INTROVERTED (withdrawn, shy, unsparkling)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be introverted if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be introverted if the situation requires it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being introverted in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be introverted?
5. ___ How capable are you of being introverted in situations that require it?

CALCULATING (cunning, sly, crafty)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be calculating if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be calculating if the situation required it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being calculating in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be calculating?
5. ___ How capable are you of being calculating in situations that require it?

DOMINANT (assertive, forceful, firm)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be dominant if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be dominating if the situation required it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being dominant in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be dominant?
5. ___ How capable are you of being dominant in situations that require it?

AGREEABLE (forgiving, well-mannered, cooperative)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be agreeable if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be agreeable if the situation required it?

3. ___ How anxious would you feel being agreeable in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be agreeable?
5. ___ How capable are you of being agreeable in situations that require it?

SUBMISSIVE (timid, meek, unaggressive)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be submissive if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be submissive if the situation required it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being submissive in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be submissive?
5. ___ How capable are you of being submissive in situations that require it?

HOSTILE (quarrelsome, impolite, uncooperative)

1. ___ How likely is it that you would be hostile if the situation required it?
2. ___ How difficult is it for you to be hostile if the situation required it?
3. ___ How anxious would you feel being hostile in a situation that required it?
4. ___ How often do you avoid situations where you need to be hostile?
5. ___ How capable are you of being hostile in situations that require it?

Appendix D
Death Anxiety Scale

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING ITEMS AS TRUE (T) OR FALSE (F)
AS THEY APPLY TO YOU.

- ___1. I am very much afraid to die.
- ___2. The thought of death seldom enters my mind.
- ___3. It doesn't make me nervous when people talk about death.
- ___4. I dread to think about having an operation.
- ___5. I am not at all afraid to die.
- ___6. I am not particularly afraid of getting cancer.
- ___7. The thought of death never bothers me.
- ___8. I am often distressed by the way time flies so very rapidly.
- ___9. I fear dying a painful death.
- ___10. The subject of life after death troubles me greatly.
- ___11. I am really scared of having a heart attack.
- ___12. I often think about how short life really is.
- ___13. I shudder when I hear people talking about a World War III.
- ___14. The sight of a dead body is horrifying to me.
- ___15. I feel that the future holds nothing for me to fear.

Appendix E
Texas Social Behavior Inventory

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS THEY PERTAIN TO YOU

1. I am not likely to speak to people until they speak to me.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

2. I would describe myself as self-confident.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

3. I feel confident of my appearance.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

4. I am a good mixer.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

5. When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right things to say.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

6. When in a group of people, I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

7. When I am in disagreement with other people, my opinion usually prevails.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

8. I would describe myself as one who attempts to master situations.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

9. Other people look up to me.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

10. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

11. I make a point of looking other people in the eye.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

12. I cannot seem to get others to notice me.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

13. I would rather not have very much responsibility for other people.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

14. I feel comfortable being approached by someone in a position of authority.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

15. I would describe myself as indecisive.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of
				me

16. I have no doubts about my social competence.

a.	b.	c.	d.	e.
Not at all	Not Very	Slightly	Fairly	Very much
characteristic				character-
of me				istic of

I, Holly R. Miller, hereby submit this thesis to Emporia State University as partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree. I agree that the Library of the University may make it available for use in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I further agree that quoting, photocopying, or other reproduction of this document is allowed for private study, scholarship (including teaching) and research purposes of a nonprofit nature. No copying which involves potential financial gain will be allowed without written permission of the author.

Holly R. Miller

Signature of Author

5/14/93

Date

The Examination of Interpersonal Flexibility, Self Esteem, and Death Anxiety

Title of Thesis

Doug Cooper

Signature of Graduate
Office Staff Member

May 14, 1993

Date Received