

Communication Studies 2004 article:

Supplementary Material

The tables below are referenced in:

Meyer, J. R. (2004). Effect of verbal aggressiveness on the perceived importance of secondary goals in messages. *Communication Studies*, 54.

Table 1

Zero-order Correlations Between VA, Frequency of Reasons for Rejection, and Chronic Goal Importance (Study 1)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. VA		.05	-.22	-.22	.00	-.15	.27	.35	-.21	-.11	.01	-.29
2. Make me look bad			.29	.03	.56	.04	-.34	-.02	.12	.17	-.17	.16
3. Offend/hurt the hearer				.17	.39	.04	-.59	-.09	.07	.05	.04	.21
4. Conflict w/values/principles					.11	.10	-.38	-.18	-.14	-.06	.04	.11
5. Damage relationship						.16	-.39	-.02	.06	.12	-.10	.01
6. Wouldn't work							-.34	.11	.04	-.09	.09	.07
7. Message is acceptable								.02	-.01	.06	-.02	-.14
8. Chronic dominate goal									-.05	.18	.25	-.05
9. Chronic support goal										.30	.03	.41
10. Chronic impression goal											-.06	.49
11. Chronic identity goal												-.03
12. Chronic relationship goal												
<i>M</i>	50.90	5.57	8.77	6.65	4.34	3.30	12.30	4.78	6.38	6.69	6.59	7.00
<i>SD</i>	10.31	3.85	3.35	4.46	2.81	2.98	3.72	1.74	1.47	1.46	1.53	1.43

Note. $N = 145$. Means for goals are on a 9-point scale (higher mean = greater goal importance).

Pearson r s $\geq .17$ and $\geq .22$ are significant at $p < .05$ and $p < .01$ respectively (two-tailed).

Table 2

Zero-order Correlations Between VA and Situated Goal Importance Across Situations (Study 2)

	Impression goal	Not offend goal	Ethics/values goal	Relationship goal	VA
Impression goal		.57***	.45***	.59***	-.03
Not offend goal			.21**	.83***	-.15*
Ethics/values goal				.22**	-.01
Relationship goal					-.15
<i>M</i>	4.71	5.08	5.42	4.99	50.78
<i>SD</i>	1.43	1.61	1.42	1.54	9.60

Note. $N = 119$. Means are on a 7-point scale (higher mean = greater goal importance).

*** $p < .01$. ** $p < .05$. * $p < .10$.

Table 3

Zero-order Correlations between VA and the Importance of Situated Goals (Study 2)

Situation	Situated secondary goal			
	Impression goal	Not offend goal	Values/identity goal	Relationship goal
Computer paper	-.12	-.21**	-.07	-.24***
T-shirt gift	.02	-.20**	.03	-.17*
Friend w/problems	.08	-.04	-.04	-.01
New suit	.00	-.37***	.10	-.22**
Computer use	-.14	-.18*	-.04	-.24***
Newspaper	-.16*	-.32***	-.05	-.31***
Tennis racket	.06	-.13	-.05	-.14
Store clerk	.09	.02	.04	-.01

Note. $N = 119$. *** $p < .01$. ** $p < .05$. * $p < .10$.

Table 4

Point-Biserial Correlations between VA and Rejection of Messages Due to Conflict With Secondary Goals (Study 2)

Situation	Reason for message rejection			
	Make me look bad	Offend/hurt hearer	Conflict with values/identity	Damage relationship
Computer paper	-.25***	-.32***	-.17*	-.25***
T-shirt gift	-.05	-.20**	-.17*	-.22**
Friend w/problems	-.07	-.03	.06	-.08
New suit	-.18**	-.26***	-.14	-.21**
Computer use	-.07	-.26***	-.23**	-.17*
Newspaper	-.21**	-.17*	-.19**	-.21**
Tennis racket	-.08	-.23**	-.14	-.11
Store clerk	-.13	-.07	-.21**	-.10

Note. $N = 119$. Figures represent the point-biserial correlation between verbal aggressiveness and whether the participant rejected the message for the reason indicated in the column. *** $p < .01$. ** $p < .05$. * $p < .10$.