

Task Interaction Scale NLS

POSITIVE BEHAVIOR

This scale reflects the degree to which the participant shows positive behavior and positive affect in interactions with peers.

The positive behaviors and affect may be directed spontaneously to the peers, but also as a response to the peers' behavior or affective expressions.

Examples of positive behaviors and affect are: complimenting ideas, empathizing, helping, laughing/smiling (directed at or in response to a peer) or other messages offered with explicitly positive affect, and kind requests.

Note that the content, as well as the form of expression, should be considered. For example, a seemingly positive remark made in a sarcastic way is not scored as a positive behavior.

A participant scoring high on this scale shows a lot of positive behavior and affect toward peers. Spontaneous helping, enthusiasm, and empathy should receive a high score.

A participant scoring low on this scale shows no or very little positive behavior and affect.

In the 'land of' tasks think of behaviors such as: giving compliments in response to others' ideas or suggestions, helping peers out with recalling the list, smiling/laughing with others, giving positive feedback, and spontaneously making positive comments toward peers.

In the discussions think of behaviors such as: expressions of positive affect and giving compliments when describing examples for the discussion task.

In the post-interaction survey, participants were asked to score each other on positive behaviors; friendliness, positive responses, and enthusiasm (... gedroeg zich positief (vriendelijk, reageerde positief op anderen, enthousiast)).

Note that low scores do not necessarily imply *negative* behavior or affect, they only indicate the absence of positive behavior.

1. Low

The participant shows an absence of positive behavior and affect toward peers. They do not initiate positive behavior nor react positively to behaviors or remarks of peers.

2. Moderately low

The participant shows some positive behavior toward peers, but most of the time does not. They may react in a (weak) positive manner to others (e.g. nonverbal/smile), but they rarely initiate positive behavior toward peers.

3. Moderate

The participant shows an average amount of positive behavior and/or affect toward peers. They show some periods of positive behavior, but also periods of no positive behavior.

4. Moderately high

The participant shows a good amount of positive behavior and affect toward peers. The participant generally responds positive to peers and also initiates positive behavior.

5. High

The participant shows a lot of positive behavior and affect toward peers. They are constantly enthusiastic and interactive, both spontaneously and in response to their peers.

SKILLFUL LEADERSHIP

This scale measures the degree to which a participant displays diplomatic leadership. A skillful leader uses sophisticated and flexible strategies or tactics in the pursuit of their goals, taking into account the goals and feelings of the other.

Examples might include suggesting a procedure to tackle the assignment, suggesting to proceed to the next step of the procedure, assigning roles, providing the group with one's conclusion of what has been discussed, asking a group member who has been quiet about their opinion, asking whether everyone is on board regarding a decision, compromising own ideas to benefit the group goal.

A participant scoring high on this scale leads interactions in a skillful, diplomatic way. In their attempts to control the situation the participant also takes their peers' suggestions, feelings and desires into account.

A low score on this scale only means that the participant does not show skillful leadership, not necessarily that the participant is submissive or a dominant leader.

Note: this scale does not measure social dominance (e.g. talking time or engagement), but it is about the initiative to guide and lead the conversation in a skillful manner.

In the 'land of' tasks think of behaviors such as: suggesting ways to form the list (e.g. proposing someone to fill in the list), asking others which item they placed in a certain position, compromising the list slightly to satisfy the group and prevent conflict, making sure everyone has a say in the decision-making process, asking peers if they agree/are okay with the order.

In the discussions think of behaviors such as: making sure everyone gets a chance to share their opinion/asking others about their opinion on the topic.

In the post-interaction survey, participants were asked to score each other on leadership skills; taking the lead, listening to others when making decisions (... was een goede leider (nam de leiding, nam de mening van anderen mee in zijn/haar beslissingen)).

1. Low

The participant is not a skillful leader. The participant does not try to use social skills or strategies to come to decisions that benefit the group.

2. Moderately low

The participant shows one or two attempts to engage in skillful leadership. They may propose an idea to tackle a situation (e.g. making a list or talking order) but are not successful in getting these ideas accepted by the others.

3. Moderate

The participant shows some attempts at being a skillful leader. They use some social skills and strategies to influence the situation, with few successes. They listen to others and ask about their opinions.

4. Moderately high

The participant regularly uses social skills to control the group dynamic. Many attempts are successful. They compromise their own ideas and get others to compromise their ideas in order to benefit the group.

5. High

The participant is a skillful leader. They regulate situations skillfully (e.g. preventing conflicts by compromising, listening to others' wishes, taking and giving constructive feedback, problem-solving, involve others in decision-making), and are in control. The participant successfully uses social skills to influence the situation to benefit all peers.

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOR

This scale reflects the degree to which the participant shows negative behavior and negative affect toward their peers.

The negative behaviors and affect may be directed spontaneously to peers and as a response to the peers' behavior or affective expressions.

Examples of negative behaviors and affect are: intrusiveness (rudely taking over the conversation, interrupting the peer); angry, unfriendly, irritated or impatient behaviors or statements; refusing or actively ignoring ideas offered by peers.

Non-verbal expressions (facial expressions, body language, and tone of voice) of negativity (e.g. anger, irritation, impatience, bored sighting, or sarcasm) must also be considered.

A participant scoring high on this scale shows a lot of negative behavior and affect to peers. A participant scoring low on this scale shows no or very little negative behavior and affect to peers.

In the 'land of' tasks think of behaviors such as: making mocking or sarcastic comments toward others' ideas, being intrusive, talking down on others' plans, and making negative facial expressions in response to peers.

In the discussions think of behaviors such as: disagreeing with others in a rude manner, calling their peers' views and opinions stupid and making fun of them.

In the post-interaction survey, participants were asked to score each other on negative behaviors; unfriendly, angry, impatient (... gedroeg zich negatief (onvriendelijk, bozig, ongeduldig)).

Note that low scores do not necessarily imply the expression of *positive* behavior or affect, low scores only indicate the absence of negative behavior.

1. Low

The participant shows an absence of negative behavior or affect in their interactions with peers. No initiation of negative interactions or negative responses toward peers' behaviors or remarks.

2. Moderately low

The participant shows a couple of weak signs of negativity when interacting with peers. Might show negative facial expressions, or speak in a monotone voice. No overt/explicit signs of negativity, but more subtle.

3. Moderate

The participant shows some negative behavior or affect in interactions with peers. They may show some overt signs of negativity (e.g. interrupting others and speaking negatively about others' decisions or ideas) or several weaker signs (e.g. negative facial expressions). They switch between periods of clear negative behavior and periods of no negative behavior.

4. Moderately high

The participant repeatedly shows negativity toward peers. They show some strong negative behaviors (e.g. disapproval of others' ideas and input, being pessimistic, impatient) and some repeated weaker signs of negative behavior toward peers.

5. High

The participant constantly and overtly/explicitly shows negative behavior or affect toward peers. They use intense negative behavior (e.g. mean comments, cursing at others, actively ignoring someone).

DOMINANT BEHAVIOR

This scale reflects the degree to which the participant is dominant or takes the role of "the one in charge" (i.e. "the boss") in the dyad, such as influencing or controlling the decision-making process in a forceful manner to benefit themselves.

Dominance refers to the extent to which the participant tries to exert disproportionate control over what is happening during the session.

This definition is based on the Dominance-Prestige Scale, which describes dominance negatively and as behavior experienced as unpleasant by others.

Examples of dominant behavior are: giving directives, being forceful, acting like a "know-it-all", and being controlling toward peers. Dominant behaviors may be explicit or more subjective and subtle, such as ignoring others' input and defining/initiating ideas and controlling the dyad's agenda to accomplish their own goals.

A participant scoring high on this scale is (or actively tries to be) in control in the dyad or group. They may attempt to undermine someone who is taking the lead, to gain control and make decisions in their favor. They will take up a lot of the talking time.

A low score indicates that the participant doesn't show dominant behavior. The participant can be submissive, control the situation in a way that is pleasant for the peers, or have no influence on the task outcome.

These three types of behavior are measured in three other scales ("Submissive behavior", "Skillful leadership" and "Influence on task outcome").

In the 'land of' tasks think of behaviors such as: actively pushing their ideas, and disregarding others' input. Acting like a know-it-all, and wanting to be in control of the decisions being made.

In the discussions think of behaviors such as: acting like a know-it-all, taking up most of the talking time, and interrupting others in a forceful/controlling manner to get their point across.

In the post-interaction survey, participants were asked to score each other on dominant behaviors; tried to push their opinion, forceful, bossy (... was dominant (zette zichzelf op de voorgrond, probeerde zijn/haar zin door te drukken, bezig)).

Note that this scale merely measures the *amount* of dominant behavior that is displayed by the participant, not the result of the attempts to dominate the other.

1. Low

The participant shows an absence of dominant behavior.

2. Moderately low

The participant acts in a dominant way a few times. They may try to have their ideas get the most attention.

3. Moderate

The participant is dominant for a moderate amount of time. They may show bossy behavior (e.g. They want to push their opinion and tend to disregard the input of others)

4. Moderately high

The participant shows dominant behaviors repeatedly. They act like a know-it-all and want to determine most decisions in a forceful manner.

5. High

The participant is very dominant. They want to make all decisions and are actively occupied with this goal in a controlling/forceful way.

BEHAVIORAL INFLUENCE

This scale measures the degree to which a participant actually influences the outcome of the task.

A participant whose ideas are chosen or forced into the plan has much influence. Influence cannot only be exerted by proposing plans, influence can also be exerted by adjusting the plans of peers.

Examples are: the ideas of the participant being chosen, ideas being chosen but slightly adapted by the others, and the participant adopting a plan of the peers to make it match their own preferences.

A participant scoring high on this scale gets their ideas into the final outcome of the task. This is regardless of the way in which the participant exerts influence (e.g. by skillfull leadership or dominance).

A low score on this scale only means that the participant's ideas are not included in the outcome, it does not mean that the participant is uninvolved or submissive.

In the 'land of' tasks, think of behaviors such as: many ideas are adopted by others, and the order of items of the final list is very similar to that of the participant.

In the discussions think of behaviors such as: impacting others' opinions, changing someone's opinion, and having more influence on the course of the conversations.

In the post-interaction survey, participants were asked to score each other on their influence on the course and outcome of the task (... was invloedrijk (had meer invloed op het verloop en de uitkomst van het spel)).

- 1. Low**
The participant has no influence on the task outcome. Hardly any ideas or suggestions of the participant seem to be included in the task outcome.
- 2. Moderately low**
The participant has little influence on the task outcome. A couple of ideas and suggestions for adjustment of the participant are included, although they might be adjusted by peers.
- 3. Moderate**
The participant has some influence on the task outcome. Half the ideas and comments of the participant are taken into account and may be included in the final decision.
- 4. Moderately high**
The participant has a good amount of influence on the task outcome. More than half of the ideas and suggestions for adjustment of the participant are included in the task outcome, although a few ideas might be adjusted slightly by peers. Some things mentioned by the participant, influence the course of the conversation.
- 5. High**
The participant has a lot of influence on the task outcome. (Nearly) all ideas and suggestions of the participant are included in the task outcome. They are not adjusted by their peers. Things mentioned by the participant guide or influence the course of the conversation.