

Determinants of Integration and Confrontation in Internal Dialogues¹

MAŁGORZATA M. PUCHALSKA-WASYL^{2*} *John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin*

Abstract: Interest in the distinction between integrative and confrontational internal dialogues has been growing, as research suggests numerous positive functions of the former compared to the latter. The article proposes a theoretical approach to integration and confrontation in internal dialogue and an empirical method of measuring these processes. Exploratory research is also presented that seeks to identify personality-related and situational determinants of integration and confrontation in internal dialogue simulating social relationships. Canonical correlation analysis did not establish personality determinants but it did reveal situational determinants (understood as cognitive interpretation of the enacted situation) behind integration and confrontation in internal dialogue. Perceiving the internal interlocutor as similar to the dialogue's author is associated with the author's integrative attitude. An increase in the wishfulness of the dialogue is accompanied by an increase in the author's confrontational attitude and the interlocutor's integrative attitude.

Key words: simulation of social relationships, internal/imaginary dialogues, integration-confrontation, personality, situational determinants.

James Matthew Barrie—the author of *Peter Pan*—insisted that his imaginary twin brother was the one who created inside him. Pablo Casals—a world-famous cello virtuoso—used to say that his best friend was Bach. Carl Gustav Jung openly wrote about his immensely inspiring discussions with the imaginary Philemon (cf. Watkins, 2000). It is not only eminent authors, artists or thinkers who conduct dialogues with objectively absent interlocutors. It is a fairly popular phenomenon, though probably not frequently reflected on or perhaps a social taboo (Puchalska-Wasył, 2006). Most people

are able to continue an interrupted emotional or inspiring discussion in their thoughts or, when preparing for an important conversation (even with an interlocutor not personally known), to create its mental scenarios. Such situations are popularly referred to as talking to oneself.

In the literature, this phenomenon is called internal dialogue and consists in a person alternately adopting (at least) two different perspectives; utterances formulated from these viewpoints respond to one another (Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995;

*Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to: Malgorzata M. Puchalska-Wasył, Department of Personality Psychology, Institute of Psychology, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Al. Raclawickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland. (E-mail: wasyl@kul.pl)

¹This work was supported by Grant DEC-2012/07/B/HS6/02348 from the National Science Centre, Poland.

²Special thanks go to Klaudia Kubaczyńska and Michał Zaorski for their assistance in the research.

Puchalska-Wasył, 2015, 2016). The concept of internal dialogue is part of a broader theoretical context, whose precursors were Mead (1934) and Vygotsky (1978). According to Mead (1934), dialogicality, understood as the ability to adopt different perspectives alternately, juxtapose them, and make them interact, is typically human. In the course of phylogenesis, it enabled the emergence of meaning, language as a set of symbols, and the human mind. In Vygotsky's (1978) opinion, via a mechanism of internalization, linguistically mediated social exchanges (such as those between the child and a caregiver) are transformed into "conversations" with the self. Consequently, Vygotsky (1978) claimed: "Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: ... first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological)" (p. 57).

Mead and Vygotsky prepared the ground for various concepts, such as: self-talk, private speech, inner speech, internal monologue, verbal rehearsal, egocentric speech, and internal dialogue (cf. Depape, Hakim-Larson, Voelker, Page, & Jackson, 2006).

The concept of internal dialogue is most strictly connected with dialogical self theory (DST; Hermans, 2002, 2003; Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995), whereby a person can adopt many different viewpoints (perspectives), called "I-positions." The dialogical self is conceptualized as a dynamic multiplicity of relatively autonomous I-positions. Each I-position, shaped in a particular social context, is endowed with a voice (the voice of a culture, a community, a significant other, or one's own voice) and intertwined with other I-positions resembling people in social relationships (Hermans, 2003). As a result, not only external (interpersonal) but also internal (intrapersonal) dialogues are possible.

Internal dialogues may be divided according to different criteria (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012; Puchalska-Wasył, 2006), but recently researchers have been particularly interested in the distinction (with regard to mode and outcome) between integrative and confrontational dialogues. In general terms, integrative

internal dialogues aim to take into account and integrate all the viewpoints involved; consequently, they can result in creative solutions. Confrontational inner dialogues, by contrast, emphasize differences between standpoints and aim to enhance one of them and ignore or deprecate the others (cf. Borawski, 2011; Nir, 2012).

Few studies have been done on these two types of dialogues, but some have revealed a number of positive functions of integration. Compared to confrontational dialogues, integrative dialogues enhance situational self-esteem and positive emotions (Borawski, 2011). It was also found that voicing different viewpoints on a problem and attempting to consider different arguments is conducive to well-being and better psychological functioning (Hermans, 2003; Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995). Since integrative internal dialogues simulating social interactions enable taking someone else's perspective into consideration, they can model positive social relationships and motivate to bring this model into effect (cf. Honeycutt, 2003; Puchalska-Wasył, 2006). For these reasons, it is a challenge for researchers investigating internal dialogues to explore the determinants of integration (in order to support it) and confrontation (in order to minimize it). This article seeks to identify such determinants.

At the specific level, researchers define integrative and confrontational internal dialogues differently (Borawski, 2011; Nir, 2012; for more details, see Puchalska-Wasył, 2016). To reconcile and elaborate their approaches, I propose to treat integration and confrontation as independent dimensions in describing internal dialogue. I assume that integration concerns the level of agreement between the standpoints clashing in dialogue, while confrontation is connected with perceived victory and defeat in each party to dialogue, reflecting the advantage of one of them. Integration comprises two processes: the extension and alignment of perspectives, whereas confrontation encompasses their valorization and devalorization. Each process potentially occurs in both dialoguing parties. Perspective

“extension” consists in a given perspective undergoing modification, under the influence of new contents heard in a dialogue, to take into account the arguments of the other party. “Alignment” consists in adjusting a given standpoint to the partner’s perspective in order to maintain a relationship with him/her. These two processes in a given party determine his/her integrative attitude in that particular dialogue. The stronger the integrative attitude in both parties, the more the solution reached takes into account both viewpoints and the stronger is the integration. Thus, integration involves openness to the partner’s perspective and willingness to consider his/her arguments and needs, manifested in stance modification. The stronger the integration, the greater the chance of reaching new creative solutions through the cooperation of two extended perspectives.

Confrontation in an internal dialogue involves valorization and devalorization processes. “Valorization” consists in treating a given viewpoint as the winner in a dialogue: the victory is attributed exclusively to the force of argumentation. “Devalorization”, by contrast, consists in perceiving a given standpoint as defeated in a dialogue. Confrontational attitude in a given party to dialogue is an expression of perceived advantage over the partner (it stems from evaluating oneself as the winner against the background of the partner’s defeat). The more the dialoguing parties differ in the intensity of confrontational attitude, the higher is confrontation. Thus, confrontation consists in maximizing the valorization and minimizing the devalorization of one party while minimizing the valorization and maximizing the devalorization of the other. If both parties win and/or lose to a similar degree, confrontation is weak.

This approach (and the method presented further) allows—following Borawski (2011) and Nir (2012)—to distinguish between integrative and confrontational dialogues (by comparing integration and confrontation indices in each dialogue). Moreover, the possibility of distinguishing particular processes in internal dialogues enables research on the

determinants of integrative and confrontational characteristics of these dialogues.

No such research has been conducted so far. There have been several studies on the personality determinants of engaging in internal dialogues. Moderate correlation was found between the intensity of conducting internal dialogues, measured by the Internal Dialogical Activity Scale (IDAS; Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012), and Neuroticism (.34, $p < .001$) as well as Openness (from .27, $p < .01$ in adolescents, to .54, $p < .001$ in middle-aged adults), measured using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992; Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012). In a different study, stepwise regression analysis revealed that 28% of the variance in IDAS was explained by a linear combination of Openness and Neuroticism when five personality factors (NEO PI-R) were entered as independent variables in a regressive model. An analogical regression analysis on the level of 30 facets showed that 39% of the variance in IDAS was explained by a linear combination of: Self-Consciousness (N), Aesthetics, Feelings (O), and Self-Discipline (C; negative) (Puchalska-Wasył, Chmielnicka-Kuter, & Oleś, 2008). Traits were also compared (NEO PI-R) between people engaging in internal dialogues and people conducting monologues (with only one viewpoint voiced). It was found that, compared to the latter, the former scored significantly higher on Openness and its facets: Fantasy, Aesthetics and Feelings, higher on Self-Consciousness as a component of Neuroticism and lower on Assertiveness as a component of Extroversion (Puchalska-Wasył, 2006).

Researchers have also sought relationships between internal dialogical activity (IDAS) and attachment styles measured by the Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Questionnaire (ECR-R; Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000). Internal dialogues were found to correlate negatively with attachment-related avoidance ($-.44$, $p < .001$) and positively with attachment-related anxiety (.39, $p < .001$). The postulated relationship between internal dialogue intensity (IDAS) and empathy measured by the Interpersonal Reactivity Index

(IRI; Davis, 1983) proved to be surprisingly weak (.33, $p < .001$; Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012). All these studies show that internal dialogical activity is not very strongly but significantly related to personality characteristics. Particularly well confirmed is its relationship with Neuroticism and Openness, but there are no grounds for supposing that the same traits will influence the integrative and confrontational characteristics of internal dialogues. This being an exploratory study, no hypotheses were advanced. The study seeks to answer two questions:

1. Is there a certain configuration of personality variables allowing the prediction of a specific pattern of integrative and confrontational characteristics in an internal dialogue simulating social relationships?

No studies have been conducted so far on the situational determinants of engaging in internal dialogues, let alone integration and confrontation in these dialogues. However, in the context of the famous psychological person-situation debate, started by Mischel (1968) and concluded with an appreciation of the influence of both traits and the situation on a person's behavior, another question is worth asking:

2. Is there a certain configuration of variables concerning the perception of the situation enacted in a dialogue that allows the prediction of a specific pattern of integrative and confrontational characteristics in an internal dialogue simulating social relationships?

In order to answer these questions, canonical correlation analysis was used—a multivariate statistical model allowing for the simultaneous prediction of multiple dependent variables from multiple independent variables. The nature of this analysis as a correlational method makes the declaration concerning the direction of influence ultimately arbitrary, based on the researcher's expectations about predictive causality (Sherry & Henson, 2005).

Method

Participants

A total of 122 individuals were examined. Three participants (one man) were eliminated

from analyses due to missing data. The test group consisted of 119 participants (58 men) with a mean age of 22.22 years ($SD = 1.42$; range 20–30). The participants were students of various majors (e.g., law, journalism, information technology, economics, rhetoric, mechatronics) at 16 Polish universities: 86 undergraduate and 33 graduate students.

Procedure

The study was conducted in Poland. In the study, convenience sampling was applied. The participants learned about the research project from their friends or from announcements. The study comprised two stages. In the first stage, participants were informed that the study was anonymous and voluntary and that it concerned the characteristics of imagination and their relations with personality. Next, the participants were instructed to think about a problematic issue of importance to them and then about a person who contributed to the occurrence of that problem. Finally, they were asked to write down an imaginary dialogue with that person about the problem. Afterwards, the participants completed Integration-Confrontation (ICON) and Figure's Emotional Climate Inventory (FECI). Based on ICON, integrative and confrontational characteristics of dialogue and some characteristics of the enacted situation (e.g., wishfulness) were established. FECI served to determine the imaginary interlocutor's affective pattern, which was entered in further statistical analyses as a "situational variable." In the second stage, several days later, participants completed the NEO PI-R, ECR-R and IRI.

Measures

To measure the integration and confrontation processes in dialogues and their potential situational predictors, two methods were applied.

ICON. ICON is a 13-item measure of the intensity of integrative and confrontational characteristics of internal dialogue, completed with a specific imaginary dialogue in mind. Designed by Puchalska-Wasył (2016) and

available upon request, ICON is based on the author's own understanding of integration and confrontation as independent dimensions of internal dialogue. This assumption allows for the measurement of these two dimensions separately in each dialogue. Integration refers to the degree of agreement achieved between standpoints clashing in a dialogue, while confrontation—connected with the perceived intensity of victory and defeat in each party—reflects the advantage of one of them.

Integration comprises the processes of extension and alignment of the standpoints involved in a dialogue, whereas confrontation is constituted by the processes of their valorization and devalorization. Each process potentially occurs in each party to dialogue. Thus, the first eight ICON items, rated on a 0–6 scale, concern the following, respectively: (a) first perspective extension (EXT_1), (b) second perspective extension (EXT_2), (c) first perspective alignment (ALI_1), (d) second perspective alignment (ALI_2), (e) first perspective valorization (V_1), (f) second perspective valorization (V_2), (g) first perspective devalorization (DV_1), and (h) second perspective devalorization (DV_2).

In the basic version of ICON used in this study, the first perspective corresponds to the viewpoint of the dialogue's author (the participant); the second perspective is that of his/her imaginary interlocutor.

The next five items (also rated on a 0–6 scale) are supplementary. Two of them were analyzed in the present study. They concern the participant's similarity to the interlocutor (SIM) and the wishfulness of the dialogue (WISH).

The higher the intensity of extension and alignment processes in a given party to dialogue, the stronger is that party's integrative attitude. It ranges from 0 to 12. For the dialogue's author, it is computed as follows:

$$\text{INT_aut} = \text{EXT_1} + \text{ALI_1} \quad (1)$$

The interlocutor's integrative attitude is computed analogically:

$$\text{INT_int} = \text{EXT_2} + \text{ALI_2} \quad (2)$$

The stronger the integrative attitude of both partners, the stronger is the integration resulting from viewpoint modification under the partner's influence and enabling the development of creative solutions. Integration intensity, from 0 to 24, is computed as follows:

$$\text{INT} = \text{EXT_1} + \text{ALI_1} + \text{EXT_2} + \text{ALI_2} \quad (3)$$

Confrontation consists in the polarization of partners. For each party to dialogue, it is possible to determine confrontational attitude, which is an expression of perceived advantage over the partner (it stems from regarding oneself as the winner against the background of the partner's defeat). Confrontational attitude ranges from 0 to 12. For the dialogue's author, it is computed as follows:

$$\text{CONF_aut} = \text{V_1} + \text{DV_2} \quad (4)$$

The interlocutor's confrontational attitude is computed analogically:

$$\text{CONF_int} = \text{V_2} + \text{DV_1} \quad (5)$$

The more the dialoguing parties differ in the intensity of confrontational attitude, the higher is the confrontation in a dialogue. The confrontation index ranges from 0 to 12 and is computed as follows:

$$\text{CONF} = |(\text{V_1} + \text{DV_2}) - (\text{V_2} + \text{DV_1})| \quad (6)$$

Thus, confrontation consists in maximizing the valorization and minimizing the devalorization of one party while minimizing the valorization and maximizing the devalorization of the other. If both parties win and/or lose to a similar degree, confrontation decreases. With the growth of disproportion in perceiving the discussing parties as winners and/or losers, the confrontation index increases.

In the pilot study, where 93 individuals conducted dialogues about a matter of personal importance and then completed

ICON, the correlation between integration and confrontation indices was non-significant and close to zero ($r = -.048$; $p = .648$). In the current study, analogous analyses yielded similar results ($r = -.024$; $p = .798$). This supports the theoretically postulated independence of integration and confrontation dimensions.

The reliability of ICON was established on a sample of 99 participants (49 men; $M_{\text{age}} = 22.58$ years; $SD = 1.39$; range 19–27). Cronbach's α was .75 for INT and .78 for CONF; items V_2 and DV_1 were reverse-scored.

There are no other methods measuring integration and confrontation, which makes the validation of ICON difficult. However, it is also a form of validation of a given method to confirm theory-based hypotheses using that method (Zawadzki, 2006). Based on DST and DST-inspired research on the types of internal interlocutors (Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995; Puchalska-Wasył, 2015; Puchalska-Wasył et al., 2008), it was hypothesized that two types of interlocutors were characteristic for integrative dialogues, while two others were characteristic for confrontational dialogues. The participants were 99 students (49 men; $M_{\text{age}} = 22.58$ years; $SD = 1.39$; range 19–27) of various majors at 16 Polish universities. They conducted dialogues about a matter of personal importance and then completed ICON. By means of ICON, all the dialogues were divided into integrative (higher percentage index of integration than of confrontation) and confrontational (the reverse pattern). The hypothesis was positively verified (Puchalska-Wasył, 2016), which proves the validity of ICON.

FECI. FECI, designed by Puchalska-Wasył (2006, 2015, 2016), may be treated as a modification of Hermans and Hermans-Jansen's (1995) Self-Confrontation Method (SCM). FECI is based on these authors' list of 24 affect terms and on their assumption that various types of experience result from different degrees of gratification or frustration of two affectively manifested basic motives common to all people: self-enhancement (S)

and contact with others (O). The gratification of these motives is accompanied by positive feelings (P), and frustration—by negative ones (N). The major difference between FECI and SCM is that FECI is used for investigating internal/imaginary interlocutors whereas SCM allows for the investigation of and reconstruction of the client's personal system of meanings.

FECI has the form of a table with rows corresponding to the internal interlocutors reported by a given respondent and with columns representing the following 24 affective states: Joy (P), Powerlessness (N), Self-Esteem (S), Anxiety (N), Satisfaction (P), Strength (S), Shame (N), Enjoyment (P), Care (O), Love (O), Self-Alienation (N), Tenderness (O), Guilt (N), Self-Confidence (S), Loneliness (N), Trust (P), Inferiority (N), Intimacy (O), Safety (P), Anger (N), Pride (S), Energy (P), Inner Calm (P), and Freedom (P).

Using a scale from 0 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*), participants indicate to what extent each affect describes the typical emotional attitude of their imaginary interlocutor. Consequently, four indices are calculated for each interlocutor. S and O are the sum scores of four affect terms expressing, respectively, self-enhancement and contact with others. P and N are the sum scores of eight affects: positive and negative, respectively (Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995). All four indices, calculated for a particular interlocutor, constitute his/her affective pattern, based on which the most characteristic type of experience is determined for that interlocutor (Puchalska-Wasył, 2015).

In the study by Hermans and Hermans-Jansen (1995), Cronbach's α reliability of the S, O, P, and N indices was .83, .86, .85, and .88 for students ($N = 43$) and .83, .89, .93, and .91, for clients ($N = 40$), respectively. Clients scored lower on S ($p < .001$), O ($p < .05$) and P ($p < .001$) and higher on N ($p < .001$) than students. No differences were found between men and women.

The reliability of FECI was tested on a group of 31 students assessing a figure of their choice. Cronbach's α of the S, O, P, and N was

.74, .93, .88, and .89, respectively (Puchalska-Wasył, 2006, 2015, 2016).

Potential personality predictors were measured using the three methods presented below.

NEO PI-R. The NEO PI-R, designed by Costa and McCrae (1992), consists of 240 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale, from A (*strongly disagree*) to E (*strongly agree*). It measures five general factors (Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness) and six facets for each general dimension, which makes 30 specific traits. The present study, which analyzed only the general factors, used the Polish adaptation of this method (Siuta, 2006). Cronbach's α reliability for the factors was .86, .85, .86, .81, and .85, respectively.

ECR-R. The ECR-R, designed by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000) is based on Bowlby's theory. It allows for the assessment of individual differences in attachment styles. The ECR-R contains the Attachment-Related Anxiety Scale (AX; insecurity vs. security about the availability and responsiveness of romantic partners) and the Attachment-Related Avoidance Scale (AV; discomfort when close to others vs. security depending on others). Each subscale consists of 18 assertions. Responses are rated on a 7-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). In this study, Cronbach's α was .96 for AX and .93 for AV.

IRI. The IRI, designed by Davis (1983), comprises four subscales, measuring the dimensions of dispositional empathy: Empathic Concern (EC; other-oriented feelings of sympathy and concern for unfortunate others); Perspective Taking (PT; spontaneously adopting the psychological viewpoint of others); Personal Distress (PD; self-oriented feelings of personal anxiety and unease in tense interpersonal settings); and Fantasy (FS; transposing oneself imaginatively into the feelings and actions of fictitious characters). Each subscale consists of seven items. Responses

are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, with two anchors: 0 (*Does not describe me well*) and 4 (*Describes me very well*). In the current study, Cronbach's α was .82, .79, .84, and .79, respectively.

Results

To answer Question 1, a canonical correlation analysis was conducted, testing multivariate relationships between eight personality components (as predictors) and four variables representing integrative and confrontational characteristics of internal dialogue (as criteria). Previous studies (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012; Puchalska-Wasył et al., 2008) have suggested the following choice of predictors: Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness (NEO PI-R), Attachment-Related Anxiety, Attachment-Related Avoidance (ECR-R), and Perspective Taking (IRI). The criteria were measured using ICON: author's integrative attitude (INT_aut), interlocutor's integrative attitude (INT_int), author's confrontational attitude (CONF_aut), and interlocutor's confrontational attitude (CONF_int). Unexpectedly, the analysis yielded four non-significant canonical functions, their levels of significance being, respectively: .644, .951, .916, and .878.

To answer Question 2, a canonical correlation analysis was conducted using six situational variables (as predictors) and four variables representing integrative and confrontational characteristics of internal dialogue (as criteria). The criteria were the same as in the previous analysis. The predictors were: the wishfulness of the dialogue (WISH) and the similarity of the dialoguing parties (SIM), measured by ICON, as well as the interlocutor's emotional characteristics measured by FECCI, namely self-enhancement motive (S), contact motive (O), positive affect (P) and negative affect (N). The analysis yielded two significant functions with canonical correlations of .64 ($p < .001$) and .54 ($p < .001$) and two non-significant ones (see Table 1). Given

Table 1 Canonical correlation analysis with situational predictors

Canonical function	Canonical correlation	Canonical R^2	Wilks's λ	p
1	.64	.41	.370	.001
2	.54	.29	.628	.001
3	.29	.08	.885	.090
4	.18	.03	.968	.294

Note. Function 1: "Integration based on similarity"; function 2: "Confrontation based on wishfulness." The remaining functions were not statistically significant and were given no labels.

the significance and canonical R^2 effects, only the first two functions were considered noteworthy in this study. The first one explained 41% of total variance and the second explained 29% of the remaining variance (unexplained by the first function) shared between the variable sets.

Looking at the coefficients of function 1 (see Table 2), one can state that the first canonical variable, representing the characteristics of dialogue, explains 34.2% of the variance shared by INT_aut (canonical loading = $-.83$), CONF_aut (.52), CONF_int ($-.47$) and INT_int ($-.43$). It also explains 11.2% of the variance shared by variables from the "situation perception" set. The second canonical variable is represented mostly by SIM ($-.81$), N (.59), O ($-.59$), and P ($-.44$); it explains 27.3% of their shared variance and 14.0% of the variance shared by variables from the "dialogue characteristics" set.

Because canonical loadings having the same sign indicate a positive correlation of the variables, the integrative attitude of the dialogue's author (INT_aut) may be said to increase in proportion to how similar the author perceives the interlocutor to be to himself/herself (SIM). The interlocutor's negative emotions (N) are then minimized while positive ones (P) and the contact motive (O) manifested in the dialogue are maximized. Such perception of the interlocutor is not only accompanied by a modification of the author's stance (INT_aut) and a decrease in his/her confrontational attitude (CONF_aut); it is also associated with the chance of integration on the interlocutor's part (INT_int) and the chance of the imaginary conversation being conducted in such a way that it is the internal interlocutor, not the

author, who feels more successful in the dialogue (CONF_int). Conversely, the less similar the dialogue's author perceives the interlocutor to be to himself/herself (SIM), the stronger is his/her confrontational attitude (CONF_aut) and the weaker is his/her integrative attitude (INT_aut). The interlocutor's integrative (INT_int) and confrontational attitudes (CONF_int) grow weaker, too. Consequently, the stances taken in the discussion do not change, but the author perceives himself/herself to be the winner in the dialogue. Function 1 can be labeled "integration based on similarity."

As regards function 2 (see Table 2), one can note that the first canonical variable, representing dialogue characteristics, explains 33.6% of the variance shared mainly by CONF_aut (canonical loading = $.84$) and INT_int (.78). It also explains 4.8% of the variance shared by variables from the "situation perception" set. The second canonical variable is represented mostly by WISH (.67), N (.58), and S ($-.40$); it explains 16.6% of their shared variance and 9.8% of the variance shared by variables from the "dialogue characteristics" set.

Having examined the canonical loadings of relevant predictors and criterion variables, one can conclude that the higher the wishfulness of the dialogue (WISH), the stronger is the author's confrontational attitude (CONF_aut) and the interlocutor's integrative attitude (INT_int), the interlocutor being perceived as full of negative emotions (N) and weak (S). This means that in a wishful dialogue, an interlocutor who lacks strength and exhibits a negative sentiment is persuaded by the dialogue's author to modify his/her stance. Either due to

Table 2 Canonical correlation analysis with situational predictors: Canonical functions 1 and 2

		Loadings	Cross-loadings	Variance in the set variables explained by:	
				Their own canonical variate (%)	The opposite canonical variate (%)
Canonical function 1: Integration based on similarity	Criterion set			34.2	14.0
	INT_aut	-.83	-.53		
	INT_int	-.43	-.28		
	CONF_aut	.52	.34		
	CONF_int	-.47	-.30		
	Predictor set			27.3	11.2
	SIM	-.81	-.52		
	WISH	-.29	-.18		
	S	.07	.04		
	O	-.59	-.38		
Canonical function 2: Confrontation based on wishfulness	Criterion set			33.6	9.8
	INT_aut	.15	.08		
	INT_int	.78	.42		
	CONF_aut	.84	.46		
	CONF_int	-.02	-.01		
	Predictor set			16.6	4.8
	SIM	.11	.06		
	WISH	.67	.36		
	S	-.40	-.21		
	O	.21	.11		
P	-.05	-.02			
N	.58	.31			

Note. INT_aut: author's integrative attitude; INT_int: interlocutor's integrative attitude; CONF_aut: author's confrontational attitude; CONF_int: interlocutor's confrontational attitude; SIM: similarity of the dialoguing parties; WISH: the wishfulness of the dialogue; S: interlocutor's self-enhancement motive; O: interlocutor's contact motive; P: interlocutor's positive affect; N: interlocutor's negative affect.

the force of arguments or on account of his/her own importance in the relationship, the author considers himself/herself the winner and devalorizes the partner. Function 2 can be labeled "confrontation based on wishfulness."

Discussion

In the 40 years of the person-situation debate, initiated by Mischel (1968), most personality researchers have established that both the person and the situation contribute to behavior. The presented research has revealed no personality variables directly and significantly

related to integrative and/or confrontational characteristics of internal dialogue simulating social relationships, but situational variables of this kind were found. However, one must remember that what is meant here by situational variables is not the objective situation but its cognitive interpretation, which—according to one of the approaches in the person-situation debate—is not free from the influence of personality variables (cf. Buss, 1977). In this context, it becomes necessary to verify, through replication, whether integration and confrontation in internal dialogue are indeed independent of personality. If they are, then it can be hypothesized that personality is

a mediator or moderator of the relationship between integration and confrontation in a dialogue and the perception of the situation the dialogue concerns. The presented findings thus open the way for further investigations.

It seems that several relationships described by social psychologists can be observed in the internal dialogues that simulated social relations in the presented study. The first canonical function, labeled “integration based on similarity,” showed that the more similar to himself/herself the dialogue’s author perceives the interlocutor to be, the more positively he/she feels about the interlocutor. When this is the case, the author’s integrative attitude increases and confrontational attitude decreases; the chance of integration on the interlocutor’s part and his/her experience of success in discussion increases as well.

Research proves that people tend to be egotistic, that is, they judge themselves favorably and prefer that which resembles the self (Pelham, Carvallo, & Jones, 2005). Therefore, judging someone as similar to oneself means they judge them positively. Likewise, in an internal dialogue, by treating the interlocutor as similar to himself/herself, the dialogue’s author minimizes the interlocutor’s negative feelings while stressing positive ones (e.g., energy, trust) and those connected with the contact motive (e.g., care, tenderness). Moreover, there is a connection between treating others as similar to oneself and perceiving them as attractive as well as liking them (Sprecher, 2014). In this context, it is understandable that the dialogue’s author who perceives the interlocutor as similar exhibits integrative behaviors. According to the definition adopted here, integration consists in modifying one’s position not only because of the interlocutor’s arguments but also in order to maintain a good relationship with him/her (perspective alignment). We are more willing to help those who resemble us and those we like (Karylowski, 1976), so integration on the author’s part may also be understood in terms of help directed to the interlocutor (“a hand extended in reconciliation”), especially as the dialogue concerned a matter that was

problematic for the author and, according to the instruction, the interlocutor was to be someone who had contributed to the emergence of that problem. The similarity of the dialoguing parties is accompanied by a decrease in the author’s confrontational attitude, too. Perhaps this is because confrontational attitude involves the author’s victory and the interlocutor’s simultaneous defeat, and a defeat of a person one likes (as similar to themselves) would evoke sorrow (Pietraszkiewicz & Wojciszke, 2014). By contrast, a concession to an interlocutor whom one likes that could give him/her a sense of success evokes an emphatic response in the form of joy rather than negative feelings in the one who makes the concession (Pietraszkiewicz & Wojciszke, 2014).

The second canonical function labeled “confrontation based on wishfulness,” showed that the increase in the wishfulness of the dialogue can be associated with perceiving the internal interlocutor as weak and full of negative feelings. Both the author’s confrontational attitude and the interlocutor’s integrative attitude intensify when this is the case. This configuration of dialogue characteristics and perceived situation characteristics can be explained in the light of the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). In a wishful dialogue, where egotistic tendencies are not restrained by the demands of reality, the author wants to consider himself/herself the absolute winner, which is tantamount to the interlocutor’s defeat. This is probably typical especially in people who see various social life phenomena in terms of a zero-sum game (Norton & Sommers, 2011). Still, making the internal interlocutor a loser (particularly if he/she cannot prevent it, not being the one who decides on the course of the dialogue) may be perceived by the dialogue’s author as doing harm to the partner. In order to reduce the dissonance between the high opinion of oneself and the sense of harm done, the author begins to perceive the interlocutor as deserving such treatment (Glass, 1964). He/she judges the interlocutor to be negatively disposed and devoid of inner strength, someone who finally

admits their mistake by modifying their stance due to the arguments used by the dialogue's author or to the author's importance in the relationship (interlocutor's integrative attitude). As a result, the author of the dialogue can have the satisfaction of victory and be free from the sense of guilt.

How should we interpret all of these results in the light of DST? The fact that in our internal world, relationships follow the patterns observed in the external world makes Hermans' (2002) metaphor of the "society of mind" fully comprehensible. Our thinking reflects dialogical relationships between people. It is also worth noting that the canonical functions distinguished describe two schemata of conducting internal dialogues, reflecting the two main characteristics of the dialogical self: interchange and dominance (Hermans, 2003). The former schema, in which the dialogue's author treats the interlocutor as similar to himself/herself, involves an enhancement of integrative attitudes, facilitating mutual interchange of views. The latter schema, involving an intensification of the confrontational attitude in the dialogue's author, reflects a situation of one position being dominant in the dialogical self. Dialogue following the first schema is close to what Hermans and Hermans-Konopka (2010) call innovative dialogue, whereas dialogue of the other kind is a form of uncertainty reduction by giving the lead to one powerful position. Assuming that the first schema refers to integrative dialogue and the second one to confrontational dialogue, one may also assume that the former performs the support, bond, insight, and self-guiding functions significantly more often (Puchalska-Wasył, 2016).

The fact that thinking about the interlocutor as similar to the dialogue's author is accompanied by an increase in the author's integrative attitude may be of special practical importance. Studies on internal dialogues suggest that conversations enacted in the imagination may be a kind of "prototype" of interpersonal relations (Puchalska-Wasył, 2006; cf. Honeycutt, 2003). Is it possible that real conversation concerning a difficult matter

(e.g., a serious conflict) becomes less confrontational after (at least) one of the parties has looked for similarities between themselves and their interlocutor when imagining the dialogue earlier? Answering this question requires further research that will identify the specific conditions in which internal dialogue can become a "prototype" of real conversation.

The presented results also encourage the exploration of other issues. It should be noted that before an internal dialogue becomes a potential prototype of a social relation, that relation must be internalized. DST postulates different I-positions being generated in different social contexts but fails to explain the mechanism of this phenomenon. The theorist who seems to offer the fullest explanation of this process is Vygotsky (1978), who emphasized that the human world is full of culturally constructed signs and tools. As a result of internalization, consisting in a developmental transition from social through private to inner speech, those signs and tools can be used not only externally but also internally. Thus, via internalization, linguistically mediated social exchanges are transformed into "conversation" with the self. In this sense, "All the higher functions originate as actual relations between individuals" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57). This theory explains how we internalize the general procedures of functioning in relationships. However, it does not explain how we internalize a given relationship with its entire specificity—which calls for further research. It is also worth checking whether the pattern described as "integration based on similarity" applies to internal dialogues that do not simulate social relations. Dialogues reflecting social interactions are a very important category of internal dialogues, but not the only one. Therefore, the fact that the present study is limited to such dialogues can be regarded as its weakness, just like the fact that the participants were students.

However, if it turned out that thinking about the interlocutor as similar to us promotes our integrative attitude in various types of internal dialogical activity, internal dialogue could become a simple and inexpensive

instrument for shaping more positive behaviors—both personal and social—in everyday life.

References

- Borawski, D. (2011). The influence of dialogical thinking on situational self-esteem and emotions. In P. Oleś, M. Puchalska-Wasyl & E. Brygoła (Eds.), *Dialogue with Oneself* (pp. 201–223). Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN. (In Polish.)
- Buss, A. R. (1977). The trait-situation controversy and the concept of interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 196–201.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-factor Inventory (NEO-FFI)*. Professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113–126. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113
- Depape, A. M. R., Hakim-Larson, J., Voelker, S., Page, S., & Jackson, D. L. (2006). Self-talk and emotional intelligence in university students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 38, 250–260. doi: 10.1037/cjbs2006012
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item-response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 350–365.
- Glass, D. C. (1964). Changes in liking as a means of reducing cognitive discrepancies between self-esteem and aggression. *Journal of Personality*, 32, 531–549. doi: 10.1111/1467-6494.ep8933522
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2002). The dialogical self as a society of mind. *Theory & Psychology*, 12, 147–160.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2003). The construction and reconstruction of a dialogical self. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 16, 89–130.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Hermans-Jansen, E. (1995). *Self-narratives: The construction of meaning in psychotherapy*. New York, London: Guilford Press.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Hermans-Konopka, A. (2010). *Dialogical self theory: Positioning and counter-positioning in a globalizing society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Honeycutt, J. M. (2003). *Imagined interactions: Daydreaming about communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Karylowski, J. (1976). Self-esteem, similarity, liking and helping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2, 71–74.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nir, D. (2012). Voicing inner conflict: From a dialogical to a negotiational self. In H. J. M. Hermans & T. Gieser (Eds.), *Handbook of dialogical self theory* (pp. 284–300). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 215–218.
- Oleś, P., & Puchalska-Wasyl, M. (2012). Dialogicality and personality traits. In H. J. M. Hermans & T. Gieser (Eds.), *Handbook of dialogical self theory* (pp. 241–252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pelham, B. W., Carvallo, M., & Jones, J. T. (2005). Implicit egotism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 106–110.
- Pietraszkiewicz, A., & Wojciszke, B. (2014). Joy, schadenfreude, sorrow, and resentment as responses restoring balance in cognitive units. *Social Psychology*, 45, 274–285. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000174
- Puchalska-Wasyl, M. (2006). *Our inner dialogues: On dialogicality as a way of human functioning*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. (In Polish.)
- Puchalska-Wasyl, M. (2015). Self-talk: Conversation with oneself? On the types of internal interlocutors. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 149, 443–460. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2014.896772
- Puchalska-Wasyl, M. (2016). Coalition and opposition in myself? On integrative and confrontational internal dialogs, their functions, and the types of inner interlocutors. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 29, 197–218. doi: 10.1080/10720537.2015.1084601
- Puchalska-Wasyl, M., Chmielnicka-Kuter, E., & Oleś, P. (2008). From internal interlocutors to psychological functions of dialogical activity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 21, 239–269. doi: 10.1080/10720530802071476

- Sherry, A., & Henson, R. K. (2005). Conducting and interpreting canonical correlation analysis in personality research: A user-friendly primer. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 84*, 37–48. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa8401_09
- Siuta, J. (2006). *NEO-PI-R personality inventory by Paul T. Costa and Robert R. McCrae. Polish adaptation: A handbook*. Warsaw: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP. (In Polish, translated by the author of this article.)
- Sprecher, S. (2014). Effects of actual (manipulated) and perceived similarity on liking in get-acquainted interactions: The role of communication. *Communication Monographs, 81*, 4–27.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watkins, M. (2000). *Invisible guest: The development of imaginal dialogues*. Woodstock, CT: Spring Publications.
- Zawadzki, B. (2006). *Personality questionnaires: Strategies and procedures of construction*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar. (In Polish, translated by the author of this article.)

(Received July 8, 2015; accepted January 23, 2016)