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The purpose of this research was to test Bell and Daly's (1984) affinity-seeking model in free encounters among strangers and acquaintances. Two components of the model were examined: 1) preinteraction expectancies and 2) affinity-seeking competency. The effects of preinteraction expectancies were examined in relation to their behavioral outcomes as strategies of affinity-seeking.

When individuals come into an unstructured interaction with some expectancy about their targets' dispositions, the question arises of how these preinteraction expectancies affect the behaviors of individuals toward their partners. Studies of preinteraction expectancies have identified an approaching strategy which individuals use when they expect to meet with a friendly or unfriendly partner. Two approaching strategies have been identified. A reciprocity strategy is used when the individual expects to meet with a friendly partner. Thereby, s/he will increase "friendliness" behaviors hoping the partner will reciprocate. A compensation strategy is used when the individual expects to meet with an unfriendly target, whereby s/he will increase her/his friendly behavior hoping the target will match this sign of friendliness. However, none of the studies on preinteraction expectancies have examined these strategies as part of the affinity-seeking
process. This research examines the existence of these strategies in naturally occurring interaction in relation to preinteraction expectancies and their behavioral components as manifestations of affinity-seeking. Furthermore, the competency of the individual as an affinity-seeker is examined using a measure of affinity-seeking competency in order to assess its behavioral manifestations.
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ABSTRACT

This research examined the Affinity-Seeking model devised by Bell and Daly (1984). Two components of the model were considered: preinteraction expectancies constraining a social encounter and the competency of the individual as an affinity-seeker. It was hypothesized that strangers would approach a friendly target through the reciprocity strategy and an unfriendly target through the compensatory strategy by increasing behavioral cues of immediacy (e.g., eye-gaze, smiling/laughter, verbalizations, and proximity). It was hypothesized, on the other hand, that acquaintances would not increase their behavioral involvement in view of a friendly expectancy while they would compensate for an unfriendly one. The findings revealed that neither strangers nor acquaintances actively sought affinity with their partners. Rather, they adopted "passive" affinity-seeking strategies (concede control, conversational rule-keeping) as the means to ensure a pleasant and polite encounter. The behavioral components of affinity-seeking competency were addressed.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

We enter relationships with various goals in mind, whether it is to look for emotional support from friends or relatives, or to share information or activities with coworkers. Many times we encounter strangers we will never see again, or get acquainted with people with whom we do not wish to become more intimate. We generally attempt to have a smooth and pleasant interaction whatever the goals we have in mind (Goffman, 1967; Hilton & Darley, 1985; Honeycutt, 1986). We also face situations in which we need to seek actively others' approval and liking. According to Bell and Daly (1984), such affinity-seeking behavior is an ubiquitous process at all levels of relationships. Not only does it facilitate the exchange of positive feelings among individuals, but it is also a social skill which contributes to an individual's personal success and life satisfaction.

Much of the literature on communication in relational development has focused upon the understanding of the acquaintance process, initial interactions with strangers, social penetration and friendship formation (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Duck, 1976, 1977). A growing body of research has dealt with communication in deteriorating relationships (Shapiro, 1977; Hill, Rubin & Peplau, 1976; Baxter, 1979; and Baxter & Philpott, 1984).
However, little is known about the affective dimension of communication as a strategic activity in relational development and maintenance. The presence of affection has been recognized from various perspectives as an important dimension of social interaction (see Burgoon & Hale's 1984 discussion of the fundamental topoi or relational communication). Affection has been variously defined as the need for closer interpersonal relationships (Schutz, 1966), affiliation (Indvick & Fitzpatrick, 1980), and affinity (Bell & Daly, 1984).

This study is concerned with the strategies that people use to develop and maintain affinity. At various points in time, people make attempts to be liked and accepted by individuals they interact with, whether it is to establish smooth relationships with coworkers and employers, or evolve into more intimate relationships with friends.

A Traditional Perspective on the Affective Dimension in Relationships

The communication patterns identified in the literature have centered around the notion of information exchange between interactants. Whether it is to make acquaintances or form friendships, we deal with an information-based communication process. According to Duck (1976), the acquaintance process involves exchanging information with interactants depending upon the level of relationship. Various perspectives have addressed the types of information
which may enhance relational outcomes among partners.

Kelley's (1955) social cognitive approach states that in exchanging information about their personality structure and content, individuals note similarities of attitudes which are conducive to the development of positive relationships. Berger and Calabrese's (1975) uncertainty reduction theory argues that a relationship derives its affective and emotional component from communication exchanges as well. Thus, the informational and affective components of communication are most relevant in determining the level of attraction between individuals (Ajzen, 1974; Byrne, Rasche & Kelley, 1974). These perspectives are limited in their predictive power since they pertain to the motivation of attraction and omit a process explanation of how people actually activate this attraction. In that respect, Clark and Delia (1979), recalling the importance of topoi, i.e., message strategies available to communicators in accomplishing goals, emphasize the need to focus on other message strategies people use to develop relationships.

The theoretical bases of the affective component of relationships can be found in the research on attraction and liking. This research has dealt extensively with the personality characteristics of individuals, their physical appearance and attitude similarities (Byrne, 1971; Berscheid & Walster, 1974, 1978; Heider, 1958, Newcomb, 1961). However, these studies have emphasized perceived
similarities and thus, have failed to apprehend the active participation of the behaving person in his/her environment. The approach taken in these studies raises two comments. First, according to Berger and Calabrese (1975), the attraction construct across interpersonal relationships goes beyond mere perceived similarities of attitudes and focuses instead on the relational rewards of mutual understanding and liking. Second, it is difficult to explain attraction at early stages of relationships by merely ascertaining the accuracy of people's judgments in establishing another person's attitudes, values or cognitive structures. In that respect, Cappella (1984) indicates that cognitive assessments can be established only over long periods of association. Indeed, "people do not see the internal states and traits of other people; they infer them from the observable, superficial actions that people engage in" (Cappella, 1984, p. 241). He advocates the ultimate study of the meshing of communicative styles between interactants in order to explain attraction and relational development in its early stages.

Additionally, attraction has been explained in social exchange terms. Altman and Taylor (1973), Homans (1961), and Thibaut and Kelley (1959) explain how perceived rewards and costs can increase attraction between relational partners. Still further, Berger and Calabrese's (1975) state how attraction increases as uncertainty about the
relationship decreases. However, this may not always be the case. For example, it has been shown that too much disclosure could be used as a disengagement strategy in a relationship (Baxter, 1979), or that information contradicting previously held beliefs could decrease attraction between partners (Planalp & Honeycutt, 1985). In fact, uncertainty reduction theory, as a direct means to maximize relational outcomes as stated by Berger and Calabrese, (1975), has received mixed support (Clatterbuck, 1979; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1984; Gudykunst, Yang, & Nishida, 1985). Sunnafrank (1986) states that uncertainty reduction is not the primary goal of individuals in beginning relationships, but rather an important vehicle for the more important goal of achieving positive relational outcomes.

Furthermore, the studies on attraction and liking have treated the individual as a stimulus object with cognitive and physical properties and thus, have failed to apprehend the transactional nature of relationships which involves "the mutual play...between the subject's anticipations and the external properties of the object" (Gibbs, 1979, p. 134). Such a passive perspective on attraction does not take into account the communicative strategies that people use in expressing and eliciting liking from others. Thus, the study of attraction cannot be analyzed apart from the thinking individual and his/her objective world (Sampson, 1981). Therefore, it is necessary to focus on the
strategies which generate attraction, or in Bell and Daly's (1984) terms, the dynamics of affinity-seeking behaviors since "individuals often go beyond static characteristics when generating affinity; they strategize and labor to get others to like them." (Bell & Daly, 1984, p. 92).

If one is to predict naturally occurring communicative behaviors of affinity-seeking, it is necessary to integrate the various ways in which individuals interact with the external environment, how they attempt to achieve goals, and how they use various rules for appropriate behavior nuanced by their own preferences and limitations.

Situational Contexts and Constraints in Relationships

Burgoon and Hale (1984) in their comprehensive review of the fundamental topoi of relational communication, discuss the importance of focusing on the relationship as the object of analysis if one is to approximate a true definition of liking (i.e., affection, affinity). A better understanding of the degree of liking can be achieved by focusing on a message because this gives us "an index not only of the current status in a relational trajectory, but also the likely future of the relationship—toward greater intimacy, lesser intimacy, or an indefinite plateau" (Burgoon & Hale, 1984, p. 203). But it is necessary to look also at the message in view of the strategies which have generated them and the cognitive processes which have influenced their selection. In modern interactionism terms,
it is necessary to view overt behavior as
a function of the continuous feedback between the
person and the situation [where] the person is an
intentional and active agent in the interaction
process, that cognitive factors are the essential
determinants of behavior, and that the psychological
meaning assigned to the situation is a major
determinant of behavior (Cody & McLaughlin, 1985, p.
263).

The success of a relationship depends not only on the
situations in which the individual enhances affinity with
his/her partner, but on the motivations and goals of both
partners involved as well. In recent studies, the notions
of motives and goals have received some attention from
social cognition theorists. Although our initial
interactions with strangers do not guarantee further
relational development, most of our encounters take place
with the implicit expectation that they will be pleasant.
Even in impersonal situations, people tend to be polite and
warm (Goffman, 1967; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Hilton & Darley,
1985; Honeycutt, 1986). Moreover, individuals' networks of
acquaintances are maintained through some effort at having
pleasant interactions. Consequently, people tend to spend a
great deal of energy trying to appreciate and be appreciated
by others. This requires a conscious intent to be liked and
the necessary behavioral strategies to carry it out. This
intent sets interactional goals between communicators which can precede the interaction (i.e., Bell and Daly's 1984 antecedent factors) or be generated by the interaction itself. Hence, Jones and Thibaut (1958) specify that in any interaction, the context sets goals which translate into specific behavioral tactics. Hilton and Darley (1985) advocate an interaction goals analysis which emphasizes the role of the context of interaction in establishing goals, as well as the importance of antecedent factors, such as expectancies, in defining specific tactics.

Expectancies have been identified throughout the literature such as self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1948; Rosenthal, 1966) and behavioral confirmation (Snyder & Swann, 1978; Snyder, et al., 1977). According to Merton (1948), a self-fulfilling prophecy occurs to the extent that a situation falsely identified evokes a behavior which makes the originally false situation come true. The "Pygmalion" studies by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) exemplify well how one can alter reality in a way which will confirm one's original belief(s) about it. Those investigators demonstrated how elementary school teachers who expected their pupils to perform their best behaved toward them in such a way as to elicit actual growth in the children. This study demonstrates not only how people often behave in a way that will alter reality in the direction suggested by their initial hypothesis, but it also shows how the manipulation
of one's behavior elicits a behavioral confirmation on the part of the target. An individual who expects to meet with a friendly partner will display immediacy cues, such as smiling, sustaining eye gaze, and maintaining close proximity (Ickes, Patterson, Tanford, and Rajecki (1982). These affinity-seeking behaviors are direct manifestations of the individual's belief in meeting with a friendly partner.

An individual's tendency to elicit behavior from others based on their "initial hypotheses" has been called behavioral confirmation. Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid (1977); Snyder and Swann (1978b) define behavioral confirmation as the process by which the perceiver's perception of his/her target influences the former's behavior toward the latter; this behavior in turn generates the target's behavioral confirmation of the perceiver's initial perception of him/her. Yet, these investigators never actually report the target's behaviors. These studies suggest a causal influence between preinteraction expectancies, interactive behavior and interpersonal judgement of interactants. They explain how some expectancy about an interaction will trigger a behavior that is congruent with that expectancy. For example, Kelley (1950) notes how the impression of a partner (cold or warm) affects the perceiver's interaction behavior. Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, and Tanford (1982) extend these expectancies about
a target to interactional strategies of behavior from the perceiver him/herself.

Honeycutt (1986) identifies preinteraction expectancies as factors mediating interactional behavior of affinity-seeking. Taking a social cognitive perspective, this theorist observes that during initial interactions, individuals may process the observed behavior to fit the expectancy (assimilation) or they may change their expectancies in varying degree to fit the situational behavior (accommodation). The relationship between preinteraction expectancies and interactional behavior affects the selection of a particular affinity-seeking strategy. For example, an approaching strategy can be used if the target’s behavior does not fit the perceiver’s expectancy, especially if the target is expected to be unfriendly (Coutts, Schneider, & Montgomery, 1980; Honeycutt, 1986). The perceiver expecting his/her partner to be unfriendly may try to be nicer and more polite than with a friendly target, by increasing nonverbal immediacy behavior (e.g., eye-gaze, laughter, direct body orientation). These differences in strategy selection resulting from the preinteraction expectancy conditions are found to be more pronounced for the perceivers than the targets (Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, and Tanford, 1982). These observations stress the mediational role that the perceiver holds in interaction, and thus, the social control
s/he has over the transactional process.

Patterson (1983) makes a conceptual distinction between nonverbal involvement as a manifestation of intimacy, i.e., an evaluation of the experience and quality of a relationship and nonverbal involvement as the product of manipulative control over an interaction. The social control function of nonverbal involvement implies some deliberate attempt to change, impress or persuade one's interactional partner. Hence, affinity-seeking behavior, in its nonverbal manifestations, retains this manipulative quality which the individual uses in order to achieve some desired goal.

**Individual Constraints**

One cannot analyze interpersonal behavior without taking into account the individual characteristics of the communicator. Individuals differ in their communication skills, whether to persuade, gather information, or seek affinity. The affinity-seeker will succeed in his/her attempt, depending on his/her competency to select the appropriate strategies. Bell, Tremblay, and Buerkel-Rothfuss (1986) have devised a method for measuring competency, labelled the Affinity-Seeking Instrument (ASI). This instrument measures Affinity-Seeking Competence (ASC), which refers to people's competency in generating liking in others, and Social Performance (SP), which measures people's ability to play roles in order to be accepted by others.
These theorists note a conceptual similarity of the affinity-seeker to the self-monitoring individual (Snyder, 1974). This measuring instrument, however, has not yet been used to assess the behaviors of the competent (or incompetent) affinity-seeker. Hence, the present study will report the behavioral manifestations as a function of the degrees of affinity-seeking competence.

**Contextual Constraints**

Aside from individual constraints, contextual factors that affect the nature of interaction between relational partners can be identified. For example, the level of uncertainty between partners defines the behavioral repertoire appropriate in a given situation. Two strangers will adopt behaviors that are socially appropriate in first encounters, whereas more intimate relational partners have developed more idiosyncratic rules for behavior (Altman & Taylor, 1973). In this regard, Honeycutt, Knapp and Powers (1983) report a series of two studies which reveal that the partners of an interaction can predict each other's behavior based on the type of knowledge they share with one another. Furthermore, strangers need to build a knowledge base which requires a greater number of strategies than individuals who have already interacted with each other (Roloff, 1976). Considering that the level of uncertainty is high between two strangers, these individuals will experiment with various strategies to find out the ones that are predictive
of further relational development. Although acquaintances may deal with less uncertainty than strangers, uncertainty is implicit at all levels of relationships (Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Parks & Adelman, 1983). Uncertainty is also one of the major factors of relational change (Knapp, 1984; Wilmot, 1979; Planalp & Honeycutt, 1985). The interaction effect of the factors preceding the interaction and the constraints set in the interaction itself have a direct bearing on the behaving individual.

Strategies in Relational Development

Much research has identified the strategies that people use in order to make acquaintances or develop deeper relationships. Such research has primarily focused on social information acquisition strategies. Berger and Bradac (1982), for example, have been concerned with interactive strategies which involve direct face-to-face interactions between communicators whether they are strangers or acquaintances. They found that as information was gained, affinity between two individuals should increase, depending on how the information is conveyed. Therefore, if affinity-seeking is the goal of interaction, it will affect the interaction tactics themselves. These tactics will not only vary if they are meant to increase liking on the part of one's interactant, but they will also vary depending on the level of intimacy existing between relational partners. According to Patterson (1983),
individuals increase their nonverbal involvement to gain greater intimacy with another person. Sunnafrank (1986) hypothesized that an increase in intimacy was positively related with nonverbal affiliative expressiveness.

As a relationship develops, various strategies are used to enhance affinity between partners. These strategies evolve from socially prescribed behaviors ruled by etiquette to more idiosyncratic tactics of behavior. Altman and Taylor (1973) make a similar distinction between superficial and nonintimate exchanges between relational partners and more intimate knowledge of their selves. This social penetration process occurs to the extent that partners find greater satisfaction than costs in the relationship. Berger (1979) has identified verbal interactive strategies characteristic of face-to-face communication. These include question-asking, self-disclosure, and self-deception for self-enhancement. However, it should be noted that none of the theories reviewed address the nonverbal strategies of individuals who attempt to elicit liking, and thus fail to apprehend the total nature of the communicator's style.

Berger and Bradac (1982) note that people involved in a nonstranger relationship acquire information about its state in addition to acquiring individual-level information about one another. Although a direct discussion of the state of the relationship is a "taboo topic" (Baxter & Wilmot, 1984), individuals use alternative ways to express the emotional
content of a relationship. Thus, the question is, how do people express their liking for each other while avoiding talking about it? Partners may have different kinds of behavioral strategies of affinity-seeking and maintaining in order to evolve in a relationship successfully. Moreover, in liking relationships, individuals will tend to use more "prosocial" types of strategies rather than "antisocial" types, such as manipulation or pressure. Clark (1979), as well as Michener and Schwertfeger (1972) found that when the agent desired to create some positive feeling from the target, the former was more likely to show conciliation (offer assistance in solving problems) than use tactics potentially more destructive to the relationship.

Other studies have identified a few interactive strategies in relationships which contribute to their affective definition. Self-disclosure, for instance, on the part of one partner, should solicit reciprocity on the part of the other (Knapp, 1984). Also, one's degree of familiarity with the partner's idiosyncratic rule system allows one greater opportunity for deviation (Baxter & Wilmot, 1984). This is confirmed by Hollander's (1958) notion of idiosyncratic credit, which explains how a group member who contributes to the welfare of the group and conforms to its norms can acquire the freedom to deviate from it.

More specific attempts at identifying communication
strategies have been made by Baxter and Philpott (1982) who generated a typology of strategies for initiating and terminating same-sex friendships. Based on Kelley's (1967) "attribution cube" and Jones' (1964) typology of ingratiation tactics, these two theorists identified six strategies for friendship formation: other-enhancement, similarity, self-presentation, favor-rendering, information acquisition, and inclusion of others. However, Baxter and Philpott’s (1984) study pertains to the friendship level. It is necessary to pursue such research at other relational levels such as strangers and acquaintances and identify the behavioral nature of the strategies involved.

The Affinity-Seeking Function of Communication

Bell and Daly (1984) address specifically the nature of strategies that people believe they use to express liking in various relationships. The process of eliciting liking from others has been labelled affinity-seeking which is defined as "the active social communication process by which individuals attempt to get others to like them and to feel positive towards them." (Bell & Daly, 1984, p.91). They identify 25 self-reported affinity-seeking strategies used by individuals within six kinds of relationships: work supervisor, romantic partner, close friend, acquaintance, roommate, and neighbor. The strategies most frequently generated in Bell and Daly's (1984) study include: conversational rule-keeping, self-concept confirmation,
elicit other's disclosure, nonverbal immediacy, self-inclusion, listening, facilitate enjoyment, openness and altruism. The strategies reported less frequently are: concede control, influence perceptions of closeness and assume control.

This communication process is explained within a theoretical model involving four components which interact with each other to generate affinity-seeking behaviors. These are 1) the antecedent factors which precede the interaction, such as the goals and motives of the interactants and 2) the situational and individual constraints, such as prior familiarity with the target and the social skills of the individual as an affinity-seeker. These constraints determine 3) the selection, integration, sequencing and nature of the strategic activities of the affinity-seeker, and finally 4) the effects these strategies have on the target and their affective, behavioral and cognitive responses. This model raises several important issues about the affinity-seeking construct which are of concern for the present research. Considering that Bell and Daly (1984) assume that affinity-seeking is a major interactional goal in initiating interpersonal relationships, this broad assumption needs to be specified in light of the situations in which it occurs. This major issue raises a few questions: Are two strangers meeting for the first time seeking affinity or merely performing
scripted behavior of etiquette? The situation in which the interaction takes place dictates the motivations for seeking affinity. Two individuals meeting for the first time may engage in affinity-seeking behavior as way to ensure future relational outcomes, or else may counteract any event which would disturb the normal process of initial encounters. How is affinity maintained when two individuals have already achieved some level of intimacy? One may assume that, in normal conditions, the two individuals are involved in maintaining the affinity they have already established, or reestablishing it when it has been disturbed by some "incident". This issue will be addressed in this research.

A second important issue revolves around the constraints imposed in affinity-seeking situations. Studies mentioned in this chapter, pertaining to the communicative styles of individuals, demonstrate the influence of personality on affinity-seeking behavior. The competency of the individual as an affinity-seeker needs to be given consideration since not all individuals have the ability to show and generate liking in others.

Bell and Daly's model (1984) presents an integrated approach to the study of affinity-seeking behavior. However, several issues need to be addressed concerning their methodology and results. First, their typology of affinity-seeking behaviors was generated from self-reports of individuals. For example, respondents were asked to list
what they thought they and others did and said to get others to like (or dislike) them. This methodology limits the validity of the categories generated, since they are based on perceptions of behavior and therefore lack behavioral foundations (Street, in press). As Wright (1978) points out, "there is a distinction between the behaving person and the behaving person's conception of him/herself." (p. 200). Furthermore, these reports not only vary with individual perceptions, expectations and preferences (Cappella & Green, 1982; Green & Giles, 1982), but these perceived behavioral judgments are biased by a need for social desirability (Daly & Street, 1980). In addition, the reports of behaviors and actual behaviors have been shown sometimes to have little correspondence (Cushman & McPhee, 1980; Hewes & Haight, 1980.)

The second limitation of Bell and Daly's study pertains to the generalizability of its results. The researchers did not specify which strategies were used at various relational levels, nor did they determine the strategic selections of the affinity-seekers based on their individual differences. These limitations call for preliminary observations of actual behaviors of the affinity-seeker within the theoretical model proposed by Bell and Daly (1984). Hence, the purpose of this research is two-fold:

1. To identify the nonverbal tactics of affinity-seeking and/or maintaining behavior among strangers and
2. To test the affinity-seeking model posited by Bell and Daly (1984) taking into account two components of the model, antecedent factors and constraints, which affect the selection of strategies. Antecedent factors will include preinteraction expectancies, and constraints will involve situational constraints, such as prior familiarity of the affinity-seeker with the target, and individual constraints, such as the communicative competency of the individual as an affinity-seeker. The primary focus of the research reported here is to apprehend the behaving individual bringing in his/her interactional context, idiosyncracies and personal preferences for affinity-seeking behavior.

This research contributes to the newly acquired body of knowledge on affinity-seeking/maintaining behavior in several ways. First, it is the first study to test the affinity-seeking model at the first two stages of relationships, i.e., strangers and acquaintances. Second, this research specifically examines preinteraction expectancies as one antecedent factor mentioned in Bell and Daly's (1984) model which affects the subsequent behaviors of the affinity-seeker. Although previous research has demonstrated the impact of preinteraction expectancies on judgments of attractiveness and liking of a partner (Kelley, 1950; Bond, 1972; Swann Snyder, 1980; Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki & Tanford, 1982; Honeycutt, 1986), none of the
studies have focused on the behavioral outcome of these preinteraction expectancies as tactics of affinity-seeking behavior. Third, this research attempts to identify the behavioral construct of the competent (or the incompetent) affinity-seeker in the light of his/her expectancies. Finally, while previous research has identified the verbal strategies of interpersonal relationships, and more specifically those strategies expressing the affective dimension of relationships, this research focuses specifically on the nonverbal dimension of affinity-seeking behavior.

The remainder of this dissertation will be divided into six chapters. Chapter II will address the research questions and hypotheses generated by the present study. The methodology will be presented in chapter III. The findings will be described and discussed in chapters IV and V. Chapter VI will discuss the implications of the present research.
CHAPTER II
A BEHAVIORAL TEST OF THE AFFINITY-SEEKING MODEL
HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As discussed in the first chapter, Bell and Daly's (1984) model of affinity-seeking behavior takes into account the factors which precede the interaction as well as the situational and individual constraints which affect the behavioral strategy selection on the targets. A major assumption of their study was that affinity-seeking is a major interactional goal in the initiation of interpersonal relationships.

Among the various strategies identified in the study, nonverbal immediacy was identified as one of the more salient strategies of affinity-seeking behavior (Bell & Daly, 1984). In fact, immediacy behavior pervades all human interactions in various degrees. As social beings, individuals attempt to exchange harmonious messages which not only convey a content but are also loaded with affective meaning (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967). Since immediacy characterizes many messages, what makes a communicator an "affinity-seeker"? Can it be said that strangers or acquaintances actively seek affinity with one another in free interactions, or are they merely performing ritual social exchanges? An examination of the behavioral
strategies used by the two relational groups in view of their motives in interaction will reveal the nature of their communication. Thus, the following research question can be posed:

RQ1: What behavioral strategies do strangers and acquaintances use in free interactions?

Goffman (1967) wrote that behaviors consciously or unconsciously signaling involvement are eye glances, gestures, body positioning, and verbal statements. Goffman (1967) further stated that in the process of interacting, the individual presents an image of him/herself and is said to "maintain face". As s/he evolves into various situations, s/he does whatever is necessary to be consistent with face, such as counteracting "incidents" which may in their symbolic implications threaten it. These face-saving actions become habitual and standardized through time. Hence, a great deal of energy is spent reestablishing a ritual equilibrium whereby an incident is being corrected. Within this corrective process, Goffman emphasized the importance of emotions as unconscious moves in the ritual game of free interaction.

Such interchange can be said to require strategies to maintain face which are normalized in the ongoing interactional process. Goffman's view illustrates two major points. First, emotions function as moves and therefore are related to the notion of strategy; second, these moves can
either be spontaneous and subconscious or conscious and deliberate.

Similarly, Bell and Daly (1984) identified the ritualistic nature of interchange and addressed the various levels of awareness at which affinity-seeking behavior can take place. Certain situations demand a conscious and deliberate attempt at seeking affinity, such as asking for a raise or getting the attention of someone. But individuals also find themselves in social settings which implicitly require that they look for acceptance and liking in a more ritualistic manner.

Consequently, affinity-seeking strategies sometimes occur below the level of awareness as part of the social behavioral make-up of individuals. Delia, O'Keefe, and O'Keefe (1982) argue that while individuals' selection of strategies is guided by their intentions and those of their partners, behavior is not necessarily strategic, but is often tacitly employed. This implies that the level of awareness, included as a broad dimension of Bell and Daly's (1984) model, allows for a limitless number of situations conducive to seeking affinity, each with a specific set of functional behaviors.

One such situation involves maintaining face with a stranger or an acquaintance in free interactions. This study assumes that as individuals meet in free interactions with strangers and acquaintances, they will strategize to
present a pleasant image of themselves and expect that the other will do the same. Thus, people are involved in a tacit cooperation of face-saving for oneself or for others so that "they can attain their shared but differently motivated objectives." (Goffman, 1967, p. 29).

Therefore, affinity-seeking behavior encompasses many situations and is characterized by behavioral repertoires which pervade human interaction. Some of these repertoires occur at the low end of the awareness dimension, such as the tacit expectation of maintaining face with a partner and having a pleasant interaction. At the other end of the continuum are those behaviors which are deliberately strategized for the ultimate purpose of being liked. In assigning the label "affinity-seeking" to a whole area of behaviors whose purpose is to generate positive feelings from others, Bell and Daly (1984) have included global constructs which need to be specified and differentiated.

**Nonverbal Tactics of Affinity-Seeking Behaviors**

Various behaviors describe the process of affinity-seeking, whether it is initiating talk, maintaining eye gaze or sitting closer to one's partner. These various nonverbal behaviors encompass what has been traditionally labelled immediacy behaviors. The term immediacy covers all communications of warmth and intimacy, and functions in four major ways. According to Andersen (1983), immediacy behaviors are used to: (1) approach other individuals,
e.g., a hand shake or a mere wave; (2) signal availability for communication and thus express social accessibility (Goffman, 1964), e.g., eye contact, proximity and body orientation; (3) increase sensory stimulation and, (4) communicate interpersonal warmth and closeness.

All four functions have been identified within Bell and Daly's (1984) typology of affinity-seeking behaviors. More specifically, the twenty-five strategies generated were organized along three dimensions of perceived similarity and yielded activity (active-passive), aggressiveness (aggressive-nonaggressive) and focus (self-other), as the main criteria underlying the affinity-seeking construct. These criteria were recognized as well within the conversational patterns of involvement (Patterson, 1982; Cappella, 1983). Cappella (1983) defined involvement along several dimensions illustrated in the literature on verbal and nonverbal behaviors and concluded that people judge interactions as more or less affiliative, more or less active and animated, and more or less relaxed. This does not imply that people use specific behaviors of affiliation and other behaviors showing activity and animation but rather that the situation of interaction, the expectations of the participants and the intensity of their behavioral involvement will determine the level of activity and affiliation generated in the interaction.

In fact, what has been called immediacy does not always
translate into affiliative behaviors. Similar nonverbal cues can be interpreted differently depending on the situation. Two couples can be observed to be smiling at each other, gazing into each other’s eyes and to be involved in touching behaviors while conveying totally different messages. One is rejoining after a short separation while the other may be arguing. Thus, based on Cappella’s (1983) conceptual clarification of immediacy behavior, nonverbal cues in initial interactions can be interpreted as indices of involvement with the other and the situation. The indices of involvement go hand in hand with indices of liking and affinity-seeking, since there is no distinction between involvement and intensity of subjectively felt emotions (Cappella, 1983). The quality of the interaction will depend on factors such as expectancies preceding the interaction as well as the situational factors which function as constraints on the interaction, and finally, the individual differences in communication competency and personal preferences for behavior. Hence, immediacy and involvement cues will be used to assess the best predictors of affinity-seeking behavior.

Nonverbal expressions of immediacy and involvement have received a great deal of attention from theorists (see Andersen, 1983, for a review). For example, eye-gaze, distance, and positive affects (i.e., smiling and laughing) have been the focus of much empirical research and are
strong predictors of both affiliation, immediacy and involvement.

**Eye Gaze**

Eye gaze is one of the most powerful cues to communicate involvement. Ellsworth (1975) stated that gaze alone is a sign of involvement with another person and not a sign of positive attitude or threat. In unpleasant interactions, an increase of eye-gaze was found to lead to more negative evaluations (Ellsworth & Carlsmith, 1968). Kendon (1967) stated that the direction of eye-gaze plays a crucial role in the initiation and maintenance of social encounters. It could be used to monitor the level of intimacy among interactants (Argyle, 1972; Andersen, Andersen, & Jensen, 1979).

Eye-gaze has been found to achieve a subgoal of social interaction which is to fulfill one's affiliative needs'. Argyle and Dean (1965) argued that people attempt to gratify this need by increasing eye contact. Exline (1963) showed that people low in 'affiliative need' will seek more eye contact in a competitive situation than people high in 'affiliative need', while in a cooperative situation, it is reversed. Although this intimacy cue was not always perceived as affiliative (e.g., Exline, Ellyson & Long, 1979; Scherwitz & Helmreich, 1973), it usually produced positive perceptions in receivers (Andersen, 1983).

Research has also stressed the monitoring function of
eye-gaze in attraction and friendship. For example, more eye-contact was found to display liking in a role-playing situation (Mehrabian & Friar, 1969). Similarly, a liked confederate generated more mutual glance from both males and females (Exline & Winters, 1965).

Considering that listening is identified as another strategy frequently used in seeking affinity, and furthermore, that strategies are not discrete units of behavior but are overlapping, it is necessary to assess the relationship between listening and eye-gaze. Nielsen (1964), Exline (1963), and Kendon (1967) indicated that gaze duration is longer while listening than speaking.

An increase in the amount of mutual gaze in an encounter is proportional to the degree of relationship between partners. Friends engage in more mutual gaze than strangers (Coutts & Schneider, 1976), and couples who experience fewer conflicts and disagreements exchange more mutual gaze and for a longer period of time than couples who do not (Beier & Steinberg, 1977). If, indeed, eye-gaze duration and frequency identify a certain level of immediacy among interactants, it can also function to increase involvement in an attempt, conscious or unconscious, to give a new relational definition between any two individuals. However, gaze can be equivocal in an approaching behavior. For example, Ellsworth, Carlsmit, and Henson (1972) and Elman, Schulte and Buckoff (1977) found that staring at a
stranger in an elevator will increase walking away speeds from the elevator as opposed to the no-stare condition. Furthermore, when the staring is accompanied by a smile, the walking away speed is intermediate, emphasizing the interactive effect of several nonverbal cues in a given situation.

Relationships have also been established between various immediacy cues. Kendon (1967) identified association patterns of eye-gaze with laughter. He has noted that more eye-gaze accompanied attention and approaching behavior.

Hence, the literature shows evidence that the manipulation of eye-gaze has arousing consequences and therefore one can conclude that it contributes to the tactical moves of affinity-seeking behavior.

**Proximity**

Proximity or physical distance reveals also the level of immediacy between interactants. Research has shown how greater interpersonal attraction is conveyed through the manipulation of closer distance. For example, individuals interacting with liked people interact more closely than with disliked people (Mehrabian & Friar, 1969). Also, closer distances result in more positive attitudes (Mehrabian & Kionsky, 1970), while nonverbal agreement responses are associated with closer interpersonal distance (Kleck, 1970). Finally, greater friendship and liking are
reported to be linked to smaller residential distance
(Priest & Sawyer, 1967).

Proximity is also related to the degree of relationship
among interactants. Morton (1977) found that acquaintances
prefer closer interpersonal distance while strangers choose
intermediate distance. Closer distance was reported to
elicit greater compliance from rewarding communicators as
well (Burgoon, 1978; Burgoon & Aho, 1982).

Smiling

Smiling is one of the best predictors of perceived
interpersonal warmth (Bayes, 1970), of immediacy (Andersen,
Andersen, & Jensen, 1979; Mehrabian, 1971a), intimacy
(Argyle, 1972), and warmth (Reece & Whitman, 1972). It is
also recognized to be one of the major ways to express
affiliation (Mehrabian, 1971b; Mehrabian & Ferris, 1967;
Rosenfeld, 1966a, 1966b).

Paralinguistic Cues

Nonverbal immediacy cues in interpersonal communication
not only include kinesic behavior as described earlier but
involve also the vocal or paralinguistic aspects of
communication, e. g., talk-duration, talk-initiation, and
pseudo-agreements, such as "mm, uh-uh, ss, yeah". Cappella
(1983) recognized these various vocal signs as activity
variables (that is rates and frequencies as opposed to total
duration and average) and thus, concur to produce more
positive evaluation about partners' attitudes. In fact,
Davis and Perkowitz (1979) demonstrated that people whose social behaviors were more frequent or rapid were perceived as more attractive to their partners. These theorists stressed the importance of frequency and rate of behavior over duration in eliciting an increase in positive attitude from one's partner.

Andersen (1983) noted that vocalic cues are part of the general construct of various affective aspects of communication. For instance, Andersen, Andersen and Jensen (1979) found through factor analysis that vocal expressiveness had the highest factor loading on the immediacy factor. However, research on the vocalic immediacy cues are limited. Thus, this study proposes to investigate the effect of some vocal utterances as part of the affinity-seeking immediacy construct.

**Pseudo-Agreements.** Among vocalic cues of immediacy behavior, pseudo-agreements (mm-hmm) on the part of the listener play an important role in increasing interpersonal immediacy. For instance, Matarazzo, Wiens and Salslow (1965) identified pseudo-agreements as reinforcing nonverbal stimuli which increase the duration of interviewer utterances. Kendon (1967) identified pseudo-agreements as accompaniment signals which the listener produces while the speaker is speaking at length. These signals can express attention or actual agreement. Dittmann (1972) identified vocal cues such as "mm, uh-uh" as part of a listener's
responses to the speaker. Finally, Mehrabian and Ksionsky (1970) noted the high association between nonverbal agreements and closer social distance.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this brief review. First it is important to note that pseudo-agreements translate into behavioral tactics showing greater attention and agreement. Furthermore, they enhance the role of the listener in social interactions. Listening has been noted as another important affinity-seeking strategy and therefore, can be said to overlap with nonverbal immediacy cues. Therefore, it is possible to assume that pseudo-agreements are used also to create greater affinity between partners.

**Talk-Initiation.** Talk-initiation is defined as the first occurrence of verbalization at the beginning of an interaction. Talk-initiation was recorded as an approaching tactic since it was reported to be used more often by perceivers expecting an unfriendly target than a perceiver with no expectancy (Honeycutt, 1987a). This nonverbal cue contributes to the behavioral repertoire of the affinity-seeker as an attention getting device.

**Talk Duration.** Talk duration, also referred to as verbalization, has been found to be an indication of greater behavioral involvement when a perceiver expected to encounter a friendly and unfriendly other as opposed to a perceiver with no expectation (Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki,
and Tanford, 1982). In the second experiment included in Ickes and his colleagues' (1982) study, Patterson found that perceivers interacting with a dissimilar other displayed greater verbalization than with a similar other. Verbalization has been identified as a behavioral cue which tends to reciprocate perceived friendliness for a partner or compensate for a lack of perceived friendliness. Hence, an individual who desires to create a pleasant impression on his/her partner may choose to be more verbal as a dynamic approaching tactic.

Considering that this review of literature has demonstrated the importance of eye-gaze, proximity, smiling, talk-initiation, talk-duration, and pseudoagreements as important cues of immediacy and involvement, they may be assumed to be used as behavioral tactics of affinity-seeking behavior. Not only are they found to play a major part in enhancing affinity with others, but they will be used differently in various situations and with various expectations in the perceiver's mind. Swann and Snyder (1980) have suggested that different beliefs or expectancies about an interaction partner may be associated with the choice of different strategies for interaction with the partner.

**Hypotheses Reflecting Preinteraction Expectancies**

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, people enter situations with various goals in mind which affect their
subsequent interactional behaviors. The study of initial interactions with strangers has demonstrated that individuals have little or no information on which to predict each other's behavior and therefore rely on observations of their ongoing interactions. Still, in initial encounter situations, people have implicit expectations about the interaction.

A social cognitive approach to the study of preinteraction expectancies emphasizes the importance of first impressions formed when meeting a friendly person, from stereotypes, third party evaluations, direct observation, or some combination of these (e.g., Triandis, 1977; Anderson, 1974; Honeycutt, 1986). Further, this perspective focuses on the way people process information about others. In that respect, the literature recognizes the importance of the assimilation bias, whereby forthcoming information tends to be assimilated to preexisting beliefs held by the interactants (Ross, Lepper, & Hubbard, 1975); i.e., people tend to confirm their beliefs even in the face of contradictory information (Nisbett & Ross, 1980).

In the case of initial interaction between strangers, the knowledge base between interactants can be generated by the interaction itself, through various strategies. Berger's (1979) uncertainty reduction theory argues that strangers create their own data base by observing each other's behavior while interacting. Berger explains this
cognitive behavior as theory-driven uncertainty reduction, whereby the individual's interpretation of the target's behavior is going to be influenced by his/her implicit personality theory about the target (Crocker, 1981; Nisbett and Ross, 1980). This, in turn, affects the behavioral outcome in interactions, since expectancies determine the structure of the interaction (Hilton and Darley, 1984; Honeycutt, 1986). These two social situations of strangers and acquaintances imply that the two groups will behave differently with each other in a base-line situation. Thus, the following research question is posed:

RQ2: What nonverbal cues of immediacy distinguish between strangers and acquaintances in an unstructured situation?

Furthermore, differing behavioral outcomes can result from the manipulation of the knowledge base of the interactants. The literature on preinteraction expectancies reveals two basic behavioral strategies of social interaction. A reciprocity strategy, which underlies behavioral confirmation of self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1948), shows that an individual who expects to interact with a "warm" social person will behave warmly and sociably toward that person. For example, Jones and Panitch (1971) demonstrated how, when a subject was told that his/her partner in a mixed-motive Prisoner's Dilemma game was likeable or unlikable, his/her actions were consistent with his/her beliefs. Snyder, Tanker and Berscheid (1977) tested
further the influence of the self-fulfilling prophecy on social stereotypes in dyadic interactions. They found that individuals processed information about a partner based on their perceptions of social stereotypes. As a consequence, their impressions of an attractive/unattractive partner led them to behave in accordance with their impressions and, in the process, elicited confirming behavior on the part of their partner. These observations were confirmed by Snyder and Swann (1978) who found that perceivers' hypotheses about the targets' personal attributes (extroverts vs. introverts) were tested by searching for confirming behavioral evidence. The perceivers' psychological processes were in turn confirmed by the targets' actual behaviors.

A compensatory strategy occurs to the extent that a perceiver, induced to believe that s/he will interact with a "cold" partner, will not reciprocate the partner's anticipated behavior, but will display a contrasting pattern of behaviors that, if matched, would produce a more pleasant interaction. For example, Bond (1972) found that subjects who expected "cold" partners increased their positive behaviors toward them in comparison to those who expected "warm" ones. This means that subjects behaviorally compensate for an expected cold encounter, thus encouraging a more pleasant interaction. Similarly, Swann & Snyder (1980) reported the fact that teachers expecting "dull" students compensated their negative expectation with a
superior teaching strategy. This resulted in the targets in the low ability expectancy being induced to perform better than the high ability ones.

In summary, these studies have demonstrated two primary types of approaching strategies. On the one hand, a perceiver who expects to interact with a friendly target will reciprocate the target's anticipated behavior, inducing the latter to confirm the expectation. On the other hand, a perceiver who expects to interact with an unfriendly target will compensate the unfriendly expectation with an increase of positive behaviors hoping that the target will reciprocate the behaviors to a more desirable stage. While these two strategies are predominant in the literature, Jones and Panitch (1971) have noted a variation to the compensation strategy. Their results indicate that an unlikable partner was not approached.

These approaching strategies were recently confirmed by Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, and Tanford (1982) who found that a perceiver who had a "friendly" expectancy adopted a reciprocity strategy. S/he sat closer to the targets and initiated conversation more often than the perceiver in the control condition. The perceivers in the "unfriendly" expectancy condition did compensate for the target's anticipated unfriendliness. They sat closer and talked first more often than in the control condition. However, this compensatory strategy was used in order to reduce the
cost of dealing with an unsociable stranger. Other behaviors were observed in the three conditions. Among the dynamic behaviors selected for the study, the amount of talking did not differ in the two expectancy conditions, while it increased significantly more in the two expectancy conditions than in the no-expectancy condition. The means for directed gaze did not differ in the friendly and unfriendly-expectancy conditions but they were greater than in the no-expectancy condition. Finally, expressions of positive affect were recorded and displayed a contrasting pattern of behavior. The level of positive affect was found to be greater in the unfriendly-expectancy condition than in the friendly and no-expectancy conditions. The latter finding can be interpreted as strong evidence that the perceiver was deliberately trying to compensate for the unfriendly-expectancy situation and, as mentioned by Ickes and his colleagues (1982), that it was most obvious during the first few minutes of the interaction.

It is important to note that the reciprocity and compensation strategies reported in these studies were the results of perceived impressions of the target. The targets' actual behaviors were never reported and thus could not provide any evidence for the use of these strategies. Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate the two terms of reciprocity and compensation, as used by Ickes and his colleagues (1982) from Cappella's (1981) definitions.
Cappella's (1981) explanation of the two terms takes into account the target's response to these behavioral approaches. The present study selected Ickes and his colleagues' (1982) definitions since it is concerned with the influence of preinteraction expectancies on the perceiver's behaviors.

Hilton and Darley (1985) have gone beyond the standard conceptualization of the expectancy confirmation pattern to explain further the influence of preinteraction expectancies on a partner and the selective process made by interactants for a particular strategy. These two theorists offer an interactional goals analysis which emphasizes the context of interaction as a basis for selecting certain interactional goals. Expectancies about one's partner set goals for the interaction which are expressed into specific tactics of interaction. For instance, an employee is required to team up with a partner to work on a particular project while another team has been selected for a similar task, with the understanding that the best project will be selected. This should induce the employee who expects a friendly/unfriendly partner to enhance affinity with him/her for better success. From the perspective of an interactional goals analysis, the present study proposes to observe the effect of preinteraction expectancies on a perceiver who is waiting to play a number game with a target who is either friendly or unfriendly, with the understanding that both players will
later compete against another team. Given this interaction context, the major interaction goal would be to have as pleasant an interaction as possible considering that the two partners need to cooperate to be able to compete more efficiently later on. Hence, one way to secure a pleasant and cooperative interaction is for the perceiver to elicit liking from the target and enhance attraction. With the expectancy of a friendly/unfriendly partner, the perceiver will structure the interaction so as to elicit positive responses from the target. Such approaching behavior has been identified as an affinity strategy when the expectation of a pleasant encounter was not fulfilled (Honeycutt, 1986). This is further evidenced by Hilton and Darley (1985), who showed that targets who were informed that their partners expected them to be cold were motivated to overcome the negative expectancy and behaved in a friendlier manner. However, they did not report the behaviors used in the interaction. Therefore, based on this interactional goals perspective, this study makes the assumption that, with certain expectancies in mind, perceivers will seek affinity with their partners. Hence, based on the findings reviewed on the effects of perceivers' preinteraction expectancies on interactions, the following hypotheses are formulated about the "affinity-seeker" (perceiver) in the "stranger" condition.
H1: Perceivers in the friendly expectancy condition will show greater behavioral involvement, i.e., sit more closely, smile more, gaze and talk longer, initiate talk more often, and use more pseudo-agreements than in the no-expectancy condition.

H2: Perceivers in the unfriendly expectancy condition will show greater behavioral involvement, i.e., sit more closely, smile more, gaze and talk longer, initiate talk more often, and use more pseudo-agreements than in the no-expectancy condition.

H3: Perceivers in the unfriendly expectancy condition will show greater display of positive affect (smiling and/or laughing) than in the friendly-expectancy condition.

While research has emphasized the cognitive and behavioral structures of communication among strangers, and focused on communication patterns of stable relationships, such as friendship and marriage, little has been done in the area of transitory relationships such as exemplified by acquaintances. Acquaintance relationships represent a stage on the relational continuum which is ill-defined. Such a stage can be qualified in several ways. First of all, similar to strangers interacting for the first time, many acquaintanceships will never develop into deeper relationships. In our current environment, we deal with a great number of individuals who remain at the periphery of our relational world and with whom it is necessary to strategize for a pleasant encounter. Furthermore, acquaintances cannot be said to develop what Wood (1982) would call a "relational culture". Whereas friendship and marriage involve individuals who have developed privately transacted systems of definitions, rules and meanings,
acquaintances never reach the level at which they exist as a relational unit, having an identity of their own. In fact, acquaintances do not recognize each other as a pair and have no commitment to a future as a pair. However, it is possible to analyze its distinctive communications and address the cognitive and behavioral dimensions which guide the knowledge of its interactants.

As is the case for strangers, interactions among acquaintances are based on superficial similarities and attraction. Hence, attraction between participants will be based on superficial exchanges of information and first impression formations. Both partners, at this stage of the relationship, bring into the interaction superficial knowledge of each other and a reliance on observed behavior during interaction. The literature tells us that acquaintances have a knowledge base about each other which is theory-driven (Berger, 1979). Based on what we know about the behavioral outcomes of preinteraction expectancies among strangers, what predictions can be made about acquaintances in similar preinteraction expectancy situations? Hilton and Darley's (1985) interaction goals analysis can be applied as well to acquaintances. Acquaintances have already experienced situations with their partners during which they have ensured smooth and pleasant interactions. Hence, one can reasonably assume that they have had pleasant first impressions about each other.
What happens to these first impressions in the face of new information? If an individual is told by a third party that one of his/her acquaintances is friendly, this new piece of information should reinforce the preexisting belief of that acquaintance’s friendliness. As a consequence of this "friendly" preinteraction expectancy, the perceiver’s behavior should match the actual target’s behavior since s/he does not have to overcome total uncertainty about her/his partner. Hence, the perceiver is merely reciprocating behaviors of affinity-maintenance.

However, in the case when the individual is told that his/her acquaintance is unfriendly, this new piece of information will contradict the preexisting knowledge of the acquaintance’s friendliness. Consequently, the perceiver should compensate for the contradicting information by increasing his/her positive behaviors toward the target compared to friendly and no-expectancy perceivers, in the hope that the latter will match the new level of behavioral involvement. Based on this interaction goals perspective, the following hypotheses can be derived about acquaintances.

H4: There will be no behavioral differences in the use of immediacy cues between perceivers in the no-expectancy and friendly-expectancy conditions.

H5: Perceivers in the unfriendly expectancy condition will increase their behavioral involvement. i.e., sit more closely, gaze and talk longer, smile more, initiate more talk, and use more pseudo-agreements than in the friendly and no-expectancy conditions.
Research Question Reflecting Affinity-Seeking Competency

Thus far, the discussion has focused upon the influence of situational constraints such as the degree of intimacy between partners and how it affects behavioral preferences. However, other factors have been identified to influence strategic selection. As we have already seen, an approaching behavior can be selected in a given situation. Other behaviors can be preferred depending on individual skills in communicating with others. How does an individual who has few communication skills, manage to show attraction toward another and enhance interest and liking for him/herself? On the other hand, a highly skilled communicator strategizes elaborately for a similar outcome. This implies that the skilled communicator can control his/her behavior better for a desired outcome. This social control function of the communicator triggers certain behavioral tactics that will carry out the strategy selected during the interaction. Patterson (1982) recognizes a social control function of nonverbal involvement which is used to manage a change in the other person's behavior when the latter is expected to have a negative behavior. Such a negative expectancy can trigger a behavioral strategy designed to produce a favorable response from that person (Bond, 1972; Coutts, Schneider, and Montgomery, 1980; Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, and Tanford, 1982).

To the extent that each individual is equipped with
different communication skills and that each is aware of his/her ability to generate liking, it is necessary to discriminate skilled affinity-seekers from unskilled ones and identify the strategies and behaviors which characterize each group. Conceptually, the self-monitoring construct reflects the individual's tendency to use tactics of impression management with others (Snyder, 1977) and is characterized by specific behavioral components. For example, Snyder's (1974) study showed how high self-monitoring subjects were able to communicate a variety of emotional states nonverbally with greater accuracy than low self-monitoring subjects. Subsequent research has indicated that high self-monitoring subjects' behaviors were better adapted to varying situations than low self-monitoring subjects' behaviors (Lippa, 1976; Rarick, Soldow, & Geizer, 1976; Snyder & Monson, 1975). However, no studies have yet used the Affinity-Seeking Instrument to measure the behavioral involvement of individuals in dyadic interaction. Hence, for lack of research in this area, a directional hypothesis is not formulated. However, the following research question will explore the relationship between affinity-seeking competency and behavioral tactics of the communicator.

RQ3: What are the behavioral tactics which differentiate the low affinity-seekers from the high affinity-seekers?

The three research questions and five hypotheses
formulated in this chapter will be tested with the methodology presented in chapter III.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY FOR TESTING THE AFFINITY-SEEKING MODEL

Subjects

One hundred and thirty-two undergraduates were recruited as subjects from speech communication classes at a large southern university. The students were offered extra credit from their instructors for participating in the experiment. All students filled out a bogus questionnaire several weeks prior to the experiment asking them how friendly they perceived themselves to be when interacting with strangers (see Appendix A for a copy). Within this questionnaire was integrated the Affinity-Seeking Instrument (Bell, Tremblay, and Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1986). The first part of the survey was used as a device to manipulate subjects' expectancies without imposing experimenter demand characteristics. This is discussed in further detail in the section on preinteraction expectancy manipulation. Out of the hundred and thirty-two subjects recruited, sixty-six students were asked to bring an acquaintance; e.g., someone they did not consider their friend but someone they only talked to occasionally in class. This resulted in sixty-six strangers and sixty-six acquaintances, and twenty-two subjects (eleven dyads) in each individual cell. The one hundred and thirty-two subjects (M = 20.78) included 82 females and 50 males and were grouped together in same sex-
dyads in order to control for gender effects in opposite-sex interaction.

This study used the dyadic interaction paradigm employed in Ickes' work (Ickes & Barnes, 1977, 1978; Ickes, Schermer & Steeno, 1979). This paradigm allows for the study of spontaneous face-to-face interaction of two strangers who are waiting for an experiment to begin. The interest of this paradigm is that it limits situational demands on the interaction. In Ickes'(1983) terms, this "weak-situation" paradigm allows for subjects to interact in an essentially spontaneous way since they are waiting for the experiment to begin. The same paradigm was used for acquaintances in a similar waiting situation.

Relational Level Manipulation

A two step-procedure was used to classify the subjects into strangers and acquaintances. The first step in determining the 33 "stranger" dyads consisted in pairing at random subjects who did not know each other prior to the experiment. The first step in determining the 33 "acquaintance" dyads required people to select an acquaintance, i.e., someone they talked to occasionally, or did not consider as a "good friend", of the same sex. The second step for selecting dyads asked each potential partner independently to estimate their knowledge of the other person and state the extent to which they would be willing to disclose to their partner.
Honeycutt, Knapp, and Powers (1983), in a study on relational knowledge and predictability about another's communication behavior, used three groups of subjects representing low, medium, and high intimacy couples. Subject classification manipulation was done using the "Intimacy Ratio Scale" (IRS) of Strassberg and Anchor (1975). This instrument is a refinement of Altman and Taylor's (1966) "Intimacy Scaled Stimuli" and includes 35 items that have been classified into three levels of intimacy value. Fourteen items include low intimate topics (e.g., demographic interests). Eleven items refer to medium intimate topics (e.g., mild emotional states), and the ten remaining items are high intimate topics (e.g., sexual habits and preferences) [see Appendix B]. Thus, the rationale for using the IRS in this study is to control for the level of relational knowledge and intimacy among potential partners such that all the subjects are accurately classified as strangers and acquaintances.

The dyadic partners were asked independently to estimate their knowledge of the other person on a nine-point scale ranging from knowing the other person "not at all" (1) to "extremely well" (9). Partners who agreed on their knowledge of each other within the range provided for each knowledge category (1-3 low for strangers and 4-6 medium for acquaintances) were selected as subjects for the experiment. Since the "stranger" dyads were people who did
not know each other, all dyads in this condition should theoretically have had knowledge scores of one. However, since the subjects were recruited from similar speech communication classes, some of them may have known each other by sight although they had never talked to each other. The mean score for the "stranger" group was $x = 1.63$ while it was $x = 4.04$ for the "acquaintance group" $^2$ [F (1, 62) = 51.82, p. < .0001, eta = .40]. One "stranger" dyad was removed from the study because it rated in the 4-6 medium knowledge range while two "acquaintance" dyads were removed because they ranged in the 7-8 high knowledge range. The overall difference in the two groups' willingness to disclosure was not significant [F (1, 192) = 2.70, p < .10, power > .995 expecting a medium size effect] with a mean of 61.33 for strangers while acquaintances had a mean of 68.06. Still, based on these results, acquaintances displayed a tendency toward greater disclosure than strangers. However, there were significant differences between the three levels of disclosure regardless of the relational levels. The means in each level of intimacy were significantly different $^2$ [F (2, 128) = 270.35, p < .000, eta = .42]. Both groups reported 89% of self-disclosure for high intimacy topics, 69% of self-disclosure for medium intimacy topics, and 36% self-disclosure for low intimacy topics. Both strangers and acquaintances self-disclosed significantly less as topics became more intimate. However, the interaction effect
between relational levels and intimacy levels was not significant \( F (2, 64) = .36, P < .70, \) power = .88 expecting a medium size effect]. The "stranger" dyads indicated they would disclose 86.65% of the low intimacy topics compared to 91% for the "acquaintance" dyads. Disclosure for moderate topics showed 65.61% for the "strangers" while "acquaintances" indicated 72.7%. On the high intimacy topics, "strangers" indicated they would disclose 31.72% of the time while "acquaintances" would 40.46% of the time. Thus, this trend supports the conceptual distinction between stranger and acquaintance groups. Table 3.1 presents the mean differences between the three levels of topics for each relational group. The means reported in the analysis of variance were tested for significance using the Student-Newman-Keuls test. This particular analysis tests for Type I experiment wise error under the complete null hypothesis but not under partial null hypotheses.

**Procedure**

During the telephone solicitation, the subjects were instructed to meet the research assistant on the first floor of the Student Health Center. Upon separate arrival, each subject filled out the IRS questionnaire measuring their level of knowledge and intimacy. The researcher then requested the questionnaire from the student who had finished filling it out first (i.e., the target) and asked him/her to follow her to the experimental room on the second
Table 3.1
Mean Comparisons Between the Three Levels of self Disclosure
Among Strangers and Acquaintances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall SNK</th>
<th>Strangers</th>
<th>Acquaintances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>88.82</td>
<td>86.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>65.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>31.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I: Low intimacy topics
II: Medium intimacy topics
III: High intimacy topics
SNK: Means with the same letter are not significantly different

floor. As they both entered, the researcher led the target
to the chair and told him/her to wait. She then went to
collect the other student (the perceiver), and led him/her
to the experimental room, and told him/her to take a seat.
The perceiver, thus, had the choice of sitting at any
distance s/he wanted on the sofa.

The experimenter sat down and gave the subjects the
following instructions:

The first part of the study consists in playing a
number game together and immediately after you will
compete against another team. You are going to be
taped with this camera in the corner, so let me start
the camera. Do you have the instruction forms with
you?. No! Well, let me turn the camera off. They are
downstairs, so let me go and get them, I’ll be back
in a couple of minutes.

Since the subjects were put in a waiting situation,
they were free to do anything they desired. The topic of
conversation varied: strangers tended to get acquainted while acquaintances talked about third parties or the Intimacy Ratio Scale they had filled out before interacting. Some subjects looked about the room, others picked up a magazine when there was one, others still checked whether the camera was running.

The presence of the camera in the room and some subjects' awareness that they were being videotaped raises the issue of the experiment's external validity. In that respect, Wiemman (1981) assessed the potential reactivity of videotaping procedures in the study of conversation. No statistically significant differences in behavioral indices of relaxation/anxiety were found due to the presence of the video camera. Anxiety dropped significantly during the first minute and then stabilized after the third minute. The reason for the insignificant effects of videotaping procedures on conversational behavior resides in the basic assumption that behaviors in conversation are usually performed out of awareness and consequently are not susceptible to reactivity.

The behaviors usually considered out of consciousness include amount of other-directed gaze, duration of talk, and sound-silence patterns, all of which are of concern in this study. Furthermore, in the case of two strangers meeting for the first time, the level of uncertainty is at its highest and should generate some anxiety. Therefore, there
must be some degree of confounding of the uncertainty in meeting a stranger and the presence of a video camera. Acquaintances share less uncertainty about each other and thus their behaviors should be considered natural and spontaneous. The additional expectancy set in the minds of the perceivers at the beginning of the interaction should entice them to approach their targets from the beginning of the interaction. As a result, the behaviors of participants were considered genuine from the first minute even when the participants became aware that videotaping was taking place.

Setting and Equipment

The experimental room was 16 feet long and 14 feet wide. It was set up as a meeting room, furnished with a sofa, a chair, and a coffee table. Windows had curtains and there were paintings on the walls. The furniture arrangement was intended to create a relaxed atmosphere conducive to spontaneous conversation (see Figure 1, for schematic view of the room arrangement). A videotape camera was placed in one corner of the room and focused on the sofa and the chair. The coffee table was placed in the middle of the room with magazines and the university newspaper.

Experimental design

The study used a 3 x 2 factorial design. There were two independent variables: preinteraction expectancies (no-expectancy, friendly, and unfriendly) and relational levels
(strangers and acquaintances). Experimental roles were designated as subjects arrived at the location of the experiment as described in the procedure. Perceivers were given information about their partners which led them to believe that the latter would be friendly or unfriendly. A third condition of no-expectancy was created where perceivers received no information about their partners. The expectancy manipulation is discussed below.

**Power and Effect Sizes**

The Ickes, Patterson, Tanford and Rajecki's (1982) study used a total N of 96 subjects in a 3 x 2 between-within design. With only 16 dyads per expectancy cell, power to detect significant expectancy effect was .31 with a projected medium size effect at $f = .25$ and a preset alpha of .05 (see Cohen, 1969 for power estimates). Yet, the F-ratios reported in the study were significant for several measures such as verbalizations, directed gazes and displays of positive affect [$F (2, 45) = 3.51, 2.80$, and $3.87$, $p < .05, .08$, and .03 respectively]. Furthermore, postinteraction ratings yielded significant results [$F (2, 45) = 4.72$, $p < .02$]. Thus, the results of Ickes and his colleagues' (1982) study allow us to assume a slightly greater than moderate effect size of $f = .35$. The present research included 132 subjects (66 strangers and 66 acquaintances) which resulted in Ns of 33 for relational levels, 22 for expectancy, and 11 for individual cells.
Figure 3.1
Schematic View of the Videotaping Room
(Top View)
Thus, power at .05 alpha level for an effect size of .35 was .88, .71, and .39 respectively.

**Preinteraction Expectancy Manipulation**

Subjects were led independently to the experimental room. The subject designated as the target was left in the room and was not given any information about his/her partner.

In Ickes et al. (1982) study, the expectancy manipulations were created orally by the experimenter who told the perceiver the following information about the target:

> Well, he’s one of the [friendliest/unfriendliest] people I’ve talked to lately. (pause) But I guess you should not tell him that I said that. As an experimenter I’m supposed to remain neutral. You won’t mention it, will you? (p. 167)

This manipulation is questionable on the grounds that it may have created an experimenter demand for the perceiver since the former was conveying personal impressions about the target. Thus, it was necessary to create an expectancy in the mind of the perceiver in a way that would preserve the external validity of the manipulation. Honeycutt (1986, 1987) created a bogus questionnaire which asks for self-ratings of friendliness during initial interaction with a strangers. Although the seventeen items are irrelevant for statistical analyses purposes the fact that the questionnaire was administered to all the subjects a few weeks prior to the experiment should create a legitimate
expectation of a friendly or unfriendly partner without creating experimenter demand. The no-expectancy, friendly and unfriendly-expectancies were set in the minds of the perceivers as follows. On the way to the videotaping room, the perceiver in the control condition received the following comment:

Hi, you must be [perceiver's name]. Let me take you to the room where your partner is.

Similar comments were made to the perceivers in the friendly and unfriendly-expectancy conditions. In the friendly-expectancy condition, however, the researcher added the following statement:

Do you know [target's name]? Well, do you remember the questionnaire you filled out a few weeks ago? Your partner had one of the highest scores on the rating of friendliness. S/he seems to perceive her/himself as very friendly.

In the unfriendly-expectancy condition, the researcher stated:

Do you know [target's name]? Well, do you remember the questionnaire you filled out a few weeks ago? Your partner had one of the lowest scores on the rating of friendliness. S/he seems to perceive her/himself as very unfriendly.

Expectancy Manipulation Check

A check on the expectancy manipulation was performed after the two dyadic partners had interacted. According to Ickes and his colleagues (1982), this manipulation check should occur ideally right after the manipulation, but before the two subjects interacted. However, this would have elicited reactivity and suspicion in the mind of the
subjects, hence creating a bias in the manipulation itself. The preferred solution for Ickes and his associates (1982) was, therefore, to include the check in the postinteraction questionnaire, although there could be some degree of confounding of the actual preinteraction expectancy with any impressions which developed during the interaction itself.

Ickes and his colleagues (1982) used a single item to measure the expectancy effect. Honeycutt (1986) advocated a multi-item measure which apprehends more thoroughly the impression the expectancy left on the perceivers. The manipulation check consisted of a three-item expectancy measured on a fourteen point scale ranging from 1) "NOT AT ALL" to 14) "VERY MUCH" in response to the following questions: 1) Before the conversation took place, how friendly did you think your partner would be? 2) Before the conversation took place, how easy-going did you believe your partner would be? 3) Before the conversation took place, how sociable did you believe your partner would be? The correlation between 1) and 2) was .89 while it was .87 between 1) and 3) and .86 between 2) and 3). Since there were high correlations between each item, the items were summed together to form a brief manipulation scale index which had high internal consistency (Cronbach alpha = .95).

A 3 x 2 ANOVA for the sum of the three perception items revealed a significant effect for expectancy \[ F (2, 65) = 3.06, p < .05 \]. A Student-Newman-Keuls test revealed that
unfriendly expectancy perceivers believed their targets would be significantly less friendly (x = 26.27) than friendly (x = 32.31) and no-expectancy perceivers (x = 30.27). Although, the difference between the friendly-expectancy and no-expectancy perceivers was not significant, the friendly-expectancy perceivers viewed their targets to be friendlier than in the no-expectancy condition. There was no interaction effect between expectancy and relational levels. Table 3.2 presents the means between strangers and acquaintances in each expectancy condition.

A relevant result of this check is that the no-expectancy perceivers provided a high score on the measure. This result tends to confirm Hilton and Darley's (1985) argument that individuals expect to have a smooth and pleasant interaction with strangers.

### Table 3.2

**Manipulation Expectancy Check**

**Mean Comparisons for Strangers and Acquaintances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Strangers</th>
<th>Acquaintances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-E</td>
<td>30.27 A</td>
<td>28.27 A</td>
<td>32.27 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E</td>
<td>32.31 A</td>
<td>31.45 A</td>
<td>33.18 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E</td>
<td>26.27 B</td>
<td>26.00 A</td>
<td>26.54 A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N-E = No-expectancy perceiver  
F-E = Friendly-expectancy perceiver  
U-E = Unfriendly-expectancy perceiver  
SNK = Means with the same letter are not significantly different
Although the interaction effect was not significant, the means in each relational group tend to reflect the effect each expectancy had on the perceivers. In each group, the friendly-expectancy perceivers perceived their partners to be friendlier than the no-expectancy perceivers before the interaction while the unfriendly-expectancy perceivers perceived theirs to be less friendly than the friendly and no-expectancy perceivers.

Recording of the Interaction

The researcher got up and left the room, while the video camera was in fact on and taping the interaction. Five minutes later (measured with a stop watch), the researcher returned to the room, stopped the camera and told the subjects that the first part of the experiment was over. She then added that the experiment had been about the behavior of strangers/acquaintances in free interaction, and therefore, that the video recorder had been taping them while they were waiting for the researcher's return. She assured them that the data would remain confidential and be solely used for statistical and educational purposes. The subjects signed a release form to use the data (see Appendix D for a copy).

The experimenter then told the subjects that the second part of the study consisted in assessing their perceptions of their partners and the interaction. They were asked subsequently to fill out a posttest questionnaire designed
to elicit their perception of the interaction with their partner during the five-minute interaction period. The subjects were seated in different rooms to fill out the last questionnaire and were assured the responses would only be seen by the experimenter. The latter collected the posttest questionnaires from each subject as they left the room. Each subject was individually debriefed.

Instrumentation

Ickes and his colleagues's (1982) study predicted that perceivers who adopted a reciprocity strategy would evaluate their partners as likeable, whereas perceivers who adopted a compensation strategy would fail to appreciate their partners' "disconfirmatory" behaviors and thus would express less liking for their partners and rate them as unfriendly. These two strategies have been identified as approaching tactics to enhance affinity with the target. Thus, in this study, the perceivers's evaluation of their partners should reflect similar ratings.

The set of measures was provided by the subject's ratings of his/her partner on 18 bipolar personality traits. Ickes and his colleagues (1982) found that the overall ratings of interpersonal attraction were greater for perceivers who expected their partners to be friendly than in the no-expectancy condition, but no greater for the unfriendly-expectancy condition. These items measure dimensions of pleasantness, comfort, likability,
friendliness, intimacy, warmth, excitement, sincerity,
talkativeness, dominance, trustworthiness, assertiveness,
positivity, and pleasantness.

A second set of measures addressed the perceivers self-ratings and their ratings of the targets feelings and behaviors during the interaction. The questions pertained to the need for the perceivers to communicate, the extent to which they were satisfied with the target and the interaction. Other questions focused on the influence they or their partners had over each other. Other questions still addressed the extent to which they or their partners were dominant assertive, compassionate or sensitive toward one another. Finally, the last questions addressed the rapport and understanding both interactants felt toward each other (see Appendix C).

Behavioral Dependent Measures

Static Behaviors. The dependent variables included "static" behaviors which occurred only once or did not vary much over time: who talked first and seating distance (estimated on a scale from "closest," 0, to "middle," 1, to "farthest," 2). The interrater reliability coefficients for the two measures were 1.00 and 1.00 respectively. The reason for such high correlation coefficients is due to the nature of the code for seating distance and talk-initiation. These behaviors occur only once over the course of the interaction. The perceiver selects a seat on the sofa as
s/he arrives and the perceiver or the target initiates the conversation, hence the behavior is recorded only once.

**Dynamic Behaviors.** The "dynamic" behaviors included in the study were recorded from the videotapes by means of a microcomputer program called "NONVERB" (Honeycutt, 1987). This program records the frequency and duration of behaviors which are dynamic, that is those behaviors which change over time and fluctuate in terms of frequency of occurrence and duration. These included directed gaze, talk-duration, pseudo-agreements, and facial and vocal expressions of positive affect (i.e., smiling and laughing) [see Appendix D for the Coding Manual).

**Behavioral Reliabilities**

Table 3.3 presents the reliability coefficients for the dynamic behaviors. The behavioral dependent measures were selected from among those used by Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, and Tanford (1982) to ensure the comparability of their data with the data generated in this study. The behaviors were coded by two independent judges who were unaware of the subjects' relational levels and expectancy conditions. A reliability coefficient was computed for each dynamic behavior. Considering that this study is based on observational research, it was necessary to find a suitable measure of code agreement which takes into account chance agreement with the actual observed percentage agreement. Cohen (1960) has provided a statistic (Kappa) which measures
the proportion of agreement after chance agreement is removed from consideration. This is illustrated in the following formula

$$Kappa = \frac{(Po - Pc)}{(1 - Pc)}$$

where \(Po\) = observed proportion action of agreements and \(Pc\) = chance proportion action of agreements.

The advantages of this statistic is that Kappa tables show all entries where agreements occur as well as all entries where disagreement occur and thus the differences in agreement are easy to detect (Hollenbeck, 1978). In this study the raw data were organized in 10 second-windows as a means to assess more accurately the differences in agreement due to the varying reaction time of the coders. Bakeman and Gottman (1986) refer to windows as adjacent time intervals of equal length. Since the interactions were five minutes long, the second, as a segment unit of interaction is smaller than the average duration of one occurrence of gaze, talk, smile, and pseudo-agreement. Thus, a ten-second window is small enough to capture the coders' differences in agreement. Considering that the probability of chance agreement is .50, i.e., the behavior is occurring or is not, the observed agreement for gaze, talk-duration, smile, and pseudo-agreement were .84, .91, .87, and .97 respectively, with a Kappa coefficient of .68, .82, .74, and .94 respectively. As reported in Table 3.3, the estimates were relatively stable since they fall within the typical range.
of .80-.99 reported by Ickes (1983).

Multiple-Act Criterion

Past research tended to focus on single behavioral acts of immediacy or in combination with another. In fact, a person's assessment of his/her partner involvement is a composite judgement of all the behaviors displayed such that one behavioral cue may adjust and compensate for another in an attempt to maintain an acceptable level of intimacy.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Coders 1 &amp; 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.R.***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile/Laughter</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-agreement</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coefficient of reliability in terms of percentage agreement (C.R.)

**Kappa corrected for chance agreement on the basis of raw frequency of occurrence subtracted from C.R.

For instance, an individual may be very close to a stranger but avoids constant eye contact. Therefore, it is necessary to assess how behaviors reflecting immediacy, friendliness
Andersen (1983) argued for a multidimensional and multichannel construct of immediacy. Patterson (1983) described the friendliness construct as being a composite of several behaviors such as proximity, eye-gaze and positive affect. Therefore, it is necessary to use an overall measure of the behaviors which display (or not) immediacy. For example, Burgoon, Buller, Hale, and De Turck (1984) have demonstrated how eye contact, close proximity, forward body lean, and smiling conveyed greater intimacy, attraction and trust while low eye contact, greater proximity, backward body lean, and the absence of smiling and touch communicated greater detachment. More relevant still, various nonverbal cues were found to carry different weights, such that they can be rank-ordered. For instance, Burgoon and her associates (1984) found that proximity carried the greatest weight, followed by smiling, and eye contact. Consequently, relational meanings are derived from various combinations of nonverbal cues. Thus, Burgoon and her colleagues (1984) concluded that two cues expressing intimacy are relatively additive in their meaning, but that a third one does not bring any additional meaning even if it was incongruent with the first two. There is an exception to the rule, however, when one of the cues is proximity, the meaning of the message can be altered significantly. Hence, a behavioral index can be created by summing across all combinations of

of affiliation are weighted in the immediacy construct.
immediacy cues in order not to discard any data.

Contrary to Burgoon and her associates' (1984), selection of cues, the present research focuses only on those behaviors which were identified as salient for reciprocating or compensating a target's perceived behaviors in light of preinteraction expectancies. These behaviors were those used in Ickes and his colleagues' (1982) study, namely verbalizations (later mentioned as talk), directed gaze, expressions of positive affect (smiling/laughing), proximity, and talk-initiation, since they were significant in identifying various preinteraction types. Body-lean was not included, however, since it has been found to be insignificant in a study on preinteraction expectancies and their behavioral outcomes (see Honeycutt, 1987a), but a vocal cue was added for further testing. Pseudo-agreement was found to have near-significance in expressing various expectancies and therefore warrant further testing. All the behaviors reviewed in this discussion have shown to be critical in identifying the nonverbal tactics of affinity-seeking and/or maintaining strategies.

**Postinteraction Dependent Measures**

Ickes and his colleagues (1982) established an overall score of liking based on the mere summation of the attraction ratings which assumes unidimensionality of the instrument when it may reflect a multidimensional structure which can best apprehend the judgments of the partners
Therefore, a factor analysis was performed on the 18 ratings of personality traits to see whether factors emerged reflecting various perceptions of the interactants. The subjects’ratings were factor analyzed using principle component analysis with varimax rotation. A two-factor solution, accounting for 24.88%, 19.61% of the variance in the data, was retained by the N factor criterion. The first factor had a mean, standard deviation, and alpha reliability of 20.57, 21.12, and .55 respectively. The second factor had a mean, standard deviation and reliability of 26.35, 20.04, and .65 respectively. The first factor included items asking the perceivers how poised, self-assertive, independent, strong, interesting, exciting, warm, and sociable their targets were. This factor was labelled "assertiveness". The highest loading on Factor I was .82 and .51 as the lowest loading (average loading .64). The average loading on the second factor was .17. The second factor included items which rated how trustworthy, likeable, physically attractive, modest, sincere, sensitive, genuine, and kind the targets were. Factor II was labelled "likability". The highest loading was .76 and the lowest loading was .31. The average loading on Factor II was .59 and .18 on Factor I (see Table 3.4).

The Affinity-Seeking Competency Manipulation

A few weeks prior to the experiment, the subjects had filled out the Affinity-Seeking Instrument (Bell, Tremblay,
Table 3.4

Factor Analysis on Attraction-Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. poised</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. self-assertive</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. independent</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. strong</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. interesting</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. exciting</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. sexually warm</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. sociable</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. warm</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. trustworthy</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. likeable</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. attractive</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. friendly</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. modest</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. sincere</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. sensitive</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. genuine</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. kind</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigen values: 6.08 1.93
Pct of Variance 24.88 19.61
Alpha reliability .55 .65

Note: Items 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 19 have been subjected to reverse coding.

Factor loadings are based on varimax rotation.

and Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1986), as part of the bogus questionnaire on self-rating of friendliness. This instrument purports to measure peoples' ability to elicit attraction from others using a seven point scale from NO!= very strong disagreement to YES!= very strong agreement.
This instrument includes underlying factors which are Affinity-Seeking Competence (ASC) and Strategic Performance (SP) [see Appendix A]. Affinity-Seeking Competence refers to individuals' ability to say and do what is necessary to be interpersonally attractive; it includes statements such as "I seldom know what to say or do to get others to like me" or "I am good at getting others to want to hang around with me." Strategic Performance pertains to individual ability to perform a social role in order to get others to like them; it includes statements such as "I am not very good at putting on a show to impress others" or "I am very good at playing roles to draw people to me." The scale was factor analyzed using varimax rotation. The two dimensions of competency and performance emerged as reported by Bell and his colleagues (1986). The items for each of the dimensions were summed together to form an index of affinity-seeking competency with a Cronbach alpha of .86 while the index for social performance showed a Cronbach alpha of .76 (see Table 3.5).

Statistical Analyses

Four statistical techniques were used to analyze the data: ANOVA, planned contrasts, factor analysis, and partial correlations. Each statistical procedure is explained in relationship to the research questions and hypotheses formulated in the study.

The first issue seeks to establish the nonverbal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I seldom know what to say or to do to get others to like me.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I put my mind to it, I could get anyone to like me.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have trouble building rapport with others.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have difficulty getting others to want to spend time with me.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I want someone to like me, I can usually create positive feelings between us.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I just can't seem to get others to like and appreciate me.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am good at getting others to want to hang around with me.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I do not seem to know what to say and do to make myself popular with others.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When necessary, I can put on an act to get important people to approve me.</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am not very good at putting on a show to impress others.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am very good at playing roles to draw people to me.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can present myself as more likeable than I really am.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I can put on an excellent social</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eigenvalues:**

- 4.18
- 2.61

**Percent of Variance Accounted for:**

- 32.18
- 20.09

**Alpha reliability of Composite Score:**

- .85
- .76

**Notes:**

- Items 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 10 have been subjected to reverse coding.

- Factor loadings are based on varimax rotation.

- Corrected item-total correlations.
behavioral tactics among strangers and acquaintances in free interaction. The second issue concerns the testing of the Affinity-Seeking model by assessing the effects of preinteraction expectancies on strangers and acquaintances, and the third issue pertains to the nonverbal manifestations of the competent affinity-seeker.

Preinteraction expectancies

The study used a 3 x 2 factorial design in which the perceiver's preinteraction expectancy (no-expectation, friendly, unfriendly) was varied with his/her level of acquaintance with a partner (stranger versus acquaintance). The main effects for expectancy on the perceiver's behaviors at each relational level were assessed using ANOVA thus answering H1, H2, H3, H4, and H5.

Behavioral Differences among Strangers and Acquaintances

Planned comparisons were done between the "stranger" group and "acquaintance" group to test for significant behavioral differences in the no-expectancy condition, thus answering the second research question (RQ2).

Affinity-Seeking Competency

The last research question addresses the behavioral competency of the affinity-seeker. In studying for dispositional factors in individuals such as their competency in seeking affinity, first it is necessary to ensure a situation-free environment where the subjects are
not expected to perform a task which could influence the outcome of the interaction. In order to maximize individual differences, the subjects need to interact (or not) freely. Therefore, the paradigm established initially was adequate for this partial personality study. Second, past research tended to focus on measures of single acts of behaviors which yielded systematically low personality coefficients of .30 (Mischel, 1968, 1969). These low correlation coefficients could be explained by the extreme error in measurement of single behaviors. This error could be reduced with multiple-act measures of behaviors by using repeated measures that are summed or averaged to yield a single summary score (Ickes, 1983). Therefore, this research used multiple-act measures of the behaviors selected. A summation of the duration of behaviors (gaze, talk, smile, and pseudo-agreement) was computed as a single score to be correlated with individual responses on the Affinity-Seeking Instrument and its two subscales: Affinity-Seeking Competency and Strategic Performance. The results of these statistical analyses are reported in chapter IV and V.
CHAPTER IV
PREINTERACTION EXPECTANCIES AND
BEHAVIORAL MANIFESTATIONS OF AFFINITY

Bell and Daly's (1984) model posits preinteraction expectancies as a major factor determining the selection of affinity-seeking behaviors. This chapter presents the results of the expectancy effect on the behaviors of strangers and acquaintances in interaction thus answering the hypotheses and research questions formulated in the study.

Affinity-Seeking and Maintaining Behaviors

Three units of analysis were taken into consideration: 1) rate which refers to the frequency of a particular behavior, 2) duration which represents how long a behavior is enacted, and 3) average duration per start which involves a combination of the two (duration over frequency). These various units have attracted the interests of researchers (Street, in press). For instance, rates have been used to measure gestures, interruptions, and vocalizations. Duration measures have been useful to assess gazing behavior, response latency and vocalizations. The interest in using various behavioral units is that they reflect the particular verbal, vocal, and nonverbal aspects of a communicator's style. Hence, each unit of measurement
will reveal a different functional aspect of behavior and allow for a full exploration of the data.

An ANOVA was done on the behavioral measurements across expectancy conditions and relational levels to see whether there were any significant differences between the no-expectancy condition, the friendly and unfriendly expectancy conditions, and between strangers and acquaintances.

The first research question sought to identify the behavioral strategies used by strangers and acquaintances in unstructured interaction while the second research question sought to identify the nonverbal behavioral cues which distinguished strangers from acquaintances. Concerning the "stranger" group, the first three hypotheses posited greater behavioral involvement in the friendly and unfriendly-expectancy conditions compared to the no-expectancy condition. The third hypothesis posited greater display of positive affect in the unfriendly-expectancy condition compared to the friendly-expectancy condition. Hypothesis 4 posited no behavioral differences in the use of immediacy cues between acquaintances in the no-expectancy and friendly-expectancy conditions. Hypothesis 5 posited an increase in behavioral involvement in the unfriendly expectancy condition compared to the friendly and no-expectancy conditions.

Few behaviors were significantly different across expectancy conditions and relational levels depending upon
the unit of analysis and the behavior selected. However, trends could be determined in the effects of expectancies and relational levels using a priori planned comparisons. The Student Newman-Keuls test takes into account the experiment-wise error rate which reflects the probability of making at least one type I error for the set of all possible comparisons at the .05 level of significance (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs, 1979). When the comparisons were meaningful, a series of t-tests was done with the significance level set at .0034 in order to reduce the probability of making a type I error for any of the comparisons. The results for each unit of analysis are reported separately.

Rates. The expectancy effect was near significant for verbalization $F(2, 60) = 2.44, p = .09, \eta^2 = .07$. The SNK test did not reveal any meaningful differences. The expectancy manipulation was not significant for any other behavioral rates at the .05 alpha level with a power = .88 expecting a slightly higher than moderate size effect ($f = .35$ Cohen, 1969). The main effect for relational levels was not significant (power = .77, $f = .35$). However, there was a near-significant interaction effect for expectancy and relational level for smiling behavior $F(2, 60) = 2.85, p = .06, \eta^2 = .08$. The student Newman Keuls test revealed meaningful trends between expectancy conditions in each relational group and between the two groups. In the
stranger group, friendly-expectancy perceivers were liable to smile more often (x = 17.27) than no-expectancy perceivers (x = 11.27), $t_{\text{one-tailed}} (11) = -1.97$, $p = .06$. This result is in the direction of H2. Although the difference in the rate of smile was not significant between unfriendly (x = 15.27) and no-expectancy perceivers (x = 11.27), the behavior was also in the expected direction of an increase. Among acquaintances, there were no significant comparisons between the means. At the relational level, there was a meaningful trend in smiling behavior between strangers and acquaintances in the no-expectancy condition. Acquaintances tended to smile more often (x = 17.27) than strangers (x = 11.27), $t_{\text{one-tailed}} (11) = 2.51$, $p = .02$.

**Durations.** There was a significant main effect for relational levels on the duration of smile $F (1, 60) = 26.84$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$. The SNK test revealed longer smiling for acquaintances (x = 98.82) than strangers (x = 71.53) across expectancy conditions. The expectancy manipulation on gaze, talk, and pseudo-agreement was nonsignificant. However, there was a near-significant interaction effect for smile $F (2, 60) = 2.50$, $p = .09$, $\eta^2 = .06$. The SNK test revealed meaningful trends between perceiver expectancy types in the acquaintance group. No-expectancy perceivers tended to smile for a significantly longer period of time (x = 124.15) than friendly-expectancy perceivers (x = 84.80), $t_{\text{one tailed}} (11) = 2.13$, $p = .04$.
and unfriendly-expectancy perceivers (x = 87.50), t [one-tailed] (11) = 1.90, p = .07. These results did not support the direction of behaviors as formulated in H4 and H5. There were no significant comparisons between expectancy means for smile in the stranger group. However, the means for the no-expectancy, friendly-expectancy and unfriendly-expectancy conditions were in the hypothesized directions (64.62, 79.66, and 70.32 respectively). Finally, there was a significant difference between strangers and acquaintances in the no-expectancy condition. Acquaintances smiled for a significantly longer period of time (x = 124.15) than strangers (x = 64.62), t [one-tailed] (11) = 3.42, p = .002.

**Average Duration Per Start.** There was a significant main effect for relational levels on smile $F (1, 60) = 4.67$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .06$. However, there were no significant comparisons between the means. An examination of the interaction effect on the average duration per start for smile, although nonsignificant ($F (2, 60) = 1.38$, $p = .26$), revealed meaningful trends between the two relational groups in the no-expectancy condition. Acquaintances smiled more on average per start (x = 40.51) than strangers (x = 23.85), t [one-tailed] (11) = 2.49, $p = .02$. The planned comparisons also revealed that acquaintances in the no-expectancy condition smiled significantly more on average per start (x = 40.51) than friendly-expectancy perceivers (x = 25.41), t [one-tailed] (11) = 2.91, $p = .009$. Unfriendly-
expectancy perceivers were liable to smile less (x = 28.38) than no-expectancy ones, t [one-tailed] (11) = 2.05, p = .05.

**Proximity.** There was no significant difference in seating distance between strangers and acquaintances (Chi Square (2) = 2.93, p = .33). However, Table G.1 (in Appendix G) reveals that none of the acquaintances sat in the farthest position. It is interesting to note that most acquaintances and strangers selected the closest seating distance. This observation tends to support the notion that individuals want to have friendly encounters regardless of their levels of intimacy. Adjusting one's seating distance may be one way to do it.

In the stranger group, seating distance measures revealed no significant differences between perceivers in each expectancy condition (Chi Square (4) = 1.40, p = .84). Similarly, it was not significant in the acquaintance group, seating distance was not a significant indicator of expectancy differences (Chi Square (4) = 2.31, p = .71) [see Tables G.2 and G.3 in Appendix G].

**Talk-initiation.** The contingency tables are reported in Appendix H. Talk-initiation has been studied within a dyad which involves assigned roles of perceivers and targets. Its significance resides only in the relationship between the two dyadic partners. Therefore, a comparison between two independent groups such as strangers and
acquaintances is unwarranted. In the stranger group, there were no significant differences for talk-initiation across expectancy conditions (Chi Square (2) = 3.07, p = .54) nor were those differences significant for the acquaintance group (Chi Square (2) = .28, p < .99).

Summary. The results revealed that gaze and smile were the two base-line behaviors which tended to distinguish between strangers and acquaintances (see Table 4.1 for a summary of the behaviors). Acquaintances smiled for a significantly longer period of time than strangers. They also tended to smile more often and on average per start than strangers. In the stranger group, friendly-expectancy perceivers were liable to smile more often than no-expectancy perceivers while unfriendly-expectancy perceivers tended to smile more often than no-expectancy ones as posited in H2 and H3.

Contrary to H3, the unfriendly-expectancy perceivers were not liable to increase their smiling behavior compared to the friendly-expectancy perceivers. Hence, none of the behaviors were significantly different across expectancy conditions. The display of positive affect (smile/laughter) was the single behavior to discriminate between expectancy conditions in the acquaintance group. No-expectancy perceivers tended to smile for a longer period of time than friendly and unfriendly-expectancy perceivers. Perceivers in the no-expectancy condition were observed to smile
significantly more per occurrence than perceivers in the friendly and unfriendly-expectancy condition. Hence, H4 positing no behavioral differences between no-expectancy perceivers and friendly-expectancy perceivers was supported except for smiling behavior. It is worth noting that when the behaviors were not significantly different across expectancy conditions, they were decreasing in the

Table 4.1
Mean Contrasts of Behaviors
Between Strangers and Acquaintances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze-r</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile-r</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile-d</td>
<td>64.61</td>
<td>124.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile-a</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>40.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r: rate
d: duration
a: average duration per start
*: p < .05
**: p < .0034

friendly and unfriendly expectancy conditions compared to the no-expectancy condition. The results are summarized in the following tables (Tables 4.2 and 4.3).
Table 4.2

Mean Contrasts across Expectancy Conditions

For Smile/Laughter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-E &gt; F-E</td>
<td>124.14</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E &lt; U-E</td>
<td>84.80</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E &lt; N-E</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N-E: No-expectancy
F-E: Friendly-expectancy
U-E: Unfriendly-expectancy

*: p < .05

Table 4.3

Mean Contrasts across Expectancy Conditions

For Smile/Laughter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-E &gt; F-E</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E &lt; U-E</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E &lt; N-E</td>
<td>28.38</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N-E: No-expectancy
F-E: Friendly-expectancy
U-E: Unfriendly-expectancy

*: p < .05

Altogether, the behaviors displayed by both strangers and acquaintances revealed little need for perceivers to exert an influence on their partners. Both relational groups displayed a certain passivity toward their partners
and the interaction. Hence, it became necessary to identify the nature of the behaviors in view of what the perceivers felt about their partners and the interaction (see Appendix C for a review of the perception items). Thus, several partial correlations controlling for expectancy were done between individual behaviors and perception items which reflected the perceiver's desire to influence the target. If there was any intent to influence, the correlations would indicate it.

The participants' reports of their attempt to direct interaction correlated negatively with talk ($r = -0.30$, $p = 0.02$, two-tailed) while there was a significant and moderate relationship between the participants's need to communicate and smiling behavior ($r = 0.29$, $p = 0.04$, two-tailed). These results suggested that the subjects did not actively seek behaviorally their partners' liking. What is worth noting is the role of the individual behaviors of talk and smile in the interaction. The lack of verbal activity may have shown a desire not to "control" the partner while smiling established the level of immediacy necessary to maintain a certain level of affinity. Thus, further correlations were done between individual behaviors and perception items reflecting the perceivers' impressions of their targets as well as the interaction.

Considering that both groups displayed varying behavioral tactics across expectancy conditions, a series of
partial correlations controlling for expectancy was done in the stranger group and the acquaintance group. In the stranger group, there was a moderate and negative correlation between talk and the perception item measuring how nervous the perceiver felt in the presence of the target ($r = -.41, p = .01$, two-tailed) while there was a moderate correlation between talk and the perception item reflecting how smooth, relaxed, and natural, the interaction was perceived to be ($r = .30, p = .08$, two-tailed). Perceivers who met with their partners for the first time were quite comfortable with the interaction.

In the acquaintance group, a near significant correlation was found for gaze and the perception item measuring how awkward, forced, and strained the interaction was for the perceiver ($r = .30, p = .08$, two-tailed). Talking behavior correlated negatively with the perception item reflecting how compassionate and sensitive to other the perceiver thought to be during the interaction ($r = -.39, p = .02$, two-tailed). The sum of behaviors correlated near-significantly with the perception item measuring how nervous and self-conscious the perceiver felt to be during the interaction ($r = .34, p = .06$, two-tailed). Based on these results, acquaintances were somewhat uncomfortable with their partners and thus were not behaviorally involved.

These perceptual results tend to corroborate the behavioral results. Namely, strangers did not increase
their behaviors significantly in an effort to elicit liking for their partners while being comfortable with themselves and the interaction. Acquaintances, on the contrary, reported feeling a little awkward and uncomfortable, and consequently, did not participate actively in the interaction as the behavioral results showed.
NOTE

1

Talk-initiation was recorded manually by noting who addressed the other first at the beginning of the interaction.
CHAPTER V
AFFINITY-SEEKING COMPETENCY AND BEHAVIORS

Bell and Daly (1984) emphasized the importance of competence as a major individual constraint to affinity-seeking behavior. In devising a measure of competency, Bell, Tremblay, and Rothfuss (1986) identified the two levels of knowledge and performance. However, knowledge of strategic alternatives is not sufficient in itself unless it is used successfully. Furthermore, as mentioned by Bell and his colleagues (1986), motivation is a necessary factor to produce affinity-seeking behaviors. Further still, the individual's lack of adequate performance, whether it is due to communication anxiety or lack of experience with the situation, may be an impediment to displaying affinity-seeking behaviors. These concerns are addressed in view of the results obtained in the present study.

The Behavioral Components of Affinity-Seeking Competency

In order to answer the research question (RQ3) on the behavioral components of affinity-seeking competency, a series of correlations was done on the subjects' scores on the two subscales of Affinity-Seeking Competency (ASC) and strategic Performance (SP). Partial correlations were done on behaviors in each relational group, controlling for expectancy. The purpose of this statistical analysis is to
determine the coefficients of correlation between the behavioral measures and the individual scores on the affinity-seeking instrument.

The multiple-act criterion was selected in addition to individual behaviors since individuals do not manifest a disposition in similar ways (Daly, 1978). The sum of the durations of behaviors which include eye-gaze, smiling/laughing, verbalizations and pseudo-agreement was used as the unit of analysis. These behaviors have been recognized as indications of friendliness and involvement. Individual correlations were also computed on each behavioral unit in order to see their degree of prediction for the two subscales. The correlations between the behavioral criterion and the two subscales were low and nonsignificant at .025 level of significance (two-tailed test).

The strangers' behavioral measures correlated very low with the competence scale \( (r = .18, p = .30) \) and low and negative with the social performance scale \( (r = -.21, p = .24) \). Individual behaviors displayed moderate correlations reaching near-significance. Duration of talk correlated moderately on the competence scale \( (r = .36, p = .04) \) while duration of gaze correlated also moderately but negatively on the social performance scale \( (r = -.30, p = .08) \) [see Table 6.1].

Acquaintances' behavioral correlations with the affinity-seeking scales presented a different pattern. The
behavioral criterion did not correlate with the competence scale \( (r = -0.04, p = 0.81) \) and near significant on the social performance scale \( (r = -0.40, p = 0.03) \) [see Table 6.2].

Bell and his colleagues's (1986) affinity-seeking instrument measures two levels of competence. The first level concerns the knowledge the individual has of the possible behavioral alternatives that will generate affinity. The second level refers to the actual utilization of the behavioral strategies in ongoing interaction.

In view of the behavioral outcomes to preinteraction expectancies, the behavioral measures reflected low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Affinity</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summed Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < 0.05 \)
affinity-seeking activity. Furthermore, the competency of the individual in seeking affinity merely reflects his/her knowledge of the possible behavioral alternatives that will generate affinity. Hence, they were not put into effect in

Table 6.2
Behavioral Correlates of Affinity-Seeking competence and Strategic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquaintances</th>
<th>Affinity</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summed Behaviors</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05

the situation. This implies that the motivation to seek affinity is a necessary ingredient to generating liking. In neither group was it really the case. Strangers did not approach their partner in a significant fashion. Acquaintances avoided their partner in view of the new information given to them. Another possible explanation for the lack of significant results can be found in the individual's performance of the behavior. Affinity-seeking
behavior can be observed to the extent that the individual has the ability to display it. According to Bell and his colleagues (1986), communication anxiety can be an impediment to the display of affinity-seeking behavior. This anxiety can reflect an underlying disposition of the individual or can be generated by the situation itself. Hence, the ASI is not a personality assessment instrument, but measures the degree of an attitude which is generated by the situation. According to the present results, the context of interaction was not conducive to seeking affinity in a significant way. This is supported by the fact that the behaviors identified in each expectancy condition were not significantly different among strangers and acquaintances.
CHAPTER VI

PASSIVE STRATEGIES OF AFFINITY-SEEKING

In testing Bell and Daly's (1984) Affinity-Seeking model three issues were addressed concerning interpersonal attraction in free interactions: (1) To what extent do strangers and acquaintances attempt to generate liking? (2) What is the relationship of affinity-seeking/maintaining to interpersonal attraction? and (3) How do individual differences and situational contingencies constrain affinity-seeking/maintaining? These three questions were addressed in the present study.

This study created relational differences by manipulating the level of knowledge shared between partners. Hence the two relational groups of strangers and acquaintances were created. In controlling for differential knowledge between the two groups, several implications need to be acknowledged. First, the difference in knowledge established between strangers and acquaintances affects the selection from their respective behavioral repertoire of a set of alternative behaviors which are deemed appropriate to the individuals in the situation (Berger, 1979). Secondly, the varying cognitive uncertainty characterizing the two groups influences the inferences made about the possible causes of behaviors manifested in interaction. Finally, given the link between cognition and behavior in interaction
and the goal of interaction, two possible explanations of behavior can be offered for strangers and acquaintances in an unstructured situation: affinity-seeking and/or maintaining behaviors.

Although the difference in knowledge between strangers and acquaintances was significant, their patterns of self-disclosure from low to medium to high intimacy topic were not. Honeycutt, Knapp, and Powers (1983), in a study on the accuracy of message prediction, established various knowledge groups based on levels of disclosure. In administering the Intimacy Ratio Scale, they found that there were significant differences between the three levels of disclosure and the low and medium knowledge groups used in the study. The present research does not find similar results. In their study, the medium knowledge couples were required to select a friend as partner, whereas the present study used "acquaintances" as a medium knowledge group and therefore reflected a lesser degree of intimacy. Hence, the patterns of self-disclosure between strangers and acquaintances were found to be more similar. Strangers in first encounter do not foresee a compelling future with their partner, but merely want that encounter to be pleasant. Similarly, acquaintances may be brought together due to external circumstances such as a class meeting, or a laboratory experiment, i.e., the motives for the interaction are circumstantial. Neither groups have sufficient and
valid reasons to pursue the encounter and commit themselves to a prolonged relationship: the two relational groups reflect similar uncertainty and the instability of social encounters.

Behavioral Differences Among Strangers and Acquaintances

The first question was concerned with identifying the behavioral strategies of strangers and acquaintances while the second research question was concerned with establishing behavioral differences between the two relational groups. Although by nature a research question is nondirectional, the literature on relationship development and interpersonal attraction suggests that the greater the intimacy shared between individuals, the greater the behavioral involvement (Patterson, 1983). This was found to be partially the case. Acquaintances were inclined to gaze at their partners more often than strangers. This is supported by Coutts and Schneider (1976) who reported more mutual gaze between friends than strangers. Thus greater gazing behavior is an indication of greater intimacy.

Smiling behavior was found to be a differential cue between the two relational groups. Acquaintances smiled more frequently and for a longer period of time during the interaction and on average than strangers. Smiling is recognized as one of the best predictors of perceived interpersonal warmth (Bayes, 1970). It is also known to be indicative of positive sentiment (McClelland, 1971).
McAdams, Jackson, and Kirsnit (1984) demonstrated how individuals high in intimacy motivation displayed higher levels of smiling and laughter. Acquaintance motivation for intimacy is higher than that of strangers and is expressed with greater display of positive affect. The tendency for more frequent eye-gaze corroborates the nonverbal manifestations of higher intimacy motivation. Finally, Burgoon, Buller, Hale, and DeTurck (1984) found smile to communicate greater composure, nonarousal, and informality.

Verbalization was not a significant cue in distinguishing between the two relational groups. If we recall that both groups were observed while waiting for the experimenter to return, two behavioral alternatives are available in a waiting situation: to engage in a conversation or remain silent. Strangers are expected to initiate more conversation as a way to maintain a level of immediacy which is psychologically comfortable, i.e., to avoid the discomfort of total silence. Furthermore, too much verbal activity between individuals meeting for the first time may have the countering effect of creating a level of intimacy which is inappropriate in that particular context. Acquaintances, on the other hand, have dissipated some of the initial uncertainty encountered when meeting for the first time. It is not necessary for them to engage in high verbal activity. In a base-line situation such as experienced in the study, acquaintances do not have to
strive for approval. Thus, the end result may be that both strangers and acquaintances display a confounding level of verbalization.

With regard to the two static behaviors selected for the study, a few comments are in order. Talk-initiation is defined as who initiates the first speaking turn in an interaction. In a base-line situation, with no experimental manipulation involved to ensure specific behavioral outcome, who speaks first is a matter of chance. This is supported by Duck and Miell's (1986) study of personal relationship development from acquaintances to friends. These theorists found that in free interaction, there was no definite pattern for talk-initiation. In fact, acquaintances generally saw their encounters as mutually initiated. Thus a comparison of this behavior between strangers and acquaintances is irrelevant.

Proximity was not a significant behavioral cue in distinguishing between the two relational groups. Contrary to the literature on proximity and relational levels between partners, both acquaintances and strangers sat close to each other. The lack of significance for seating distance may be due in part to the setting of the experiment and the choice made available to the subjects. Honeycutt (1987) used swivel chairs which allowed the perceivers to choose a comfortable distance with much flexibility. On the other hand, the experimenter used a sofa which was located at a
close angle with the target's chair. Furthermore, the unit of analysis (closest, middle, farthest) selected for measuring seating distance may have been too broad and thus could not apprehend the more subtle differences accountable only with a smaller unit of analysis such as centimeters (Ickes, Patterson, Tanford, and Rajecki, 1982).

Effect of the Expectancy Manipulation

Ickes, Patterson, Tanford, and Rajecki's (1982) expectancy manipulation involved the experimenter's personal opinion about the target's disposition. In referring to the perceiver's friendly or unfriendly partner, the experimenter created demands on the perceiver's style of interaction and therefore the internal validity of the observations can be put into question. In order to avoid experimenter's demand effects, a bogus questionnaire on self-ratings of friendliness was created to render the expectancy effect more realistic and natural (Honeycutt, 1987; Ickes, 1983). The use of this questionnaire did not yield expectancy effects similar to those reported by Honeycutt (1987). In the present study, the manipulation was effective in creating an unfriendly-expectancy. Although friendly-expectancy perceivers tended to report a friendly perception of their partners, there was not a significant difference with no-expectancy perceivers.
Preinteraction Expectancies and Behavioral Outcomes

Strangers. Although the experimental manipulation was effective in creating an expectancy in the minds of the perceivers, the behavioral results were not as anticipated. Concerning the two static behaviors selected for this study, the results were not significant. Neither proximity nor talk-initiation revealed any differences among the three expectancy conditions.

H1 and H2 were not supported considering that none of the behaviors were significantly different across expectancy conditions. Still, a behavioral trend in the hypothesized direction could be detected between expectancy conditions. Gaze, talk and smiling/laughter tended to be greater in rate, duration, and average duration per start in the friendly and unfriendly-expectancy conditions compared to the no-expectancy condition. Thus, based on Ickes, Patterson, Rajecki, and Tanford's (1982) findings, the subjects of the present study were liable to reciprocate a perceived friendliness on the part of their partners while they tended to compensate for an expected unfriendliness.

Ickes and his colleagues (1982) found that unfriendly-expectancy perceivers would increase smiling and laughing significantly more than friendly-expectancy perceivers. However, H3 positing a similar behavioral outcome was not supported. Although the manipulation was effective in creating an unfriendly expectancy, the perceivers in that
expectancy condition did not compensate with an increase of positive affect, even though they increased their smiling behavior compared to the no-expectancy condition.

In order to account for the behaviors displayed in each expectancy condition, it is necessary to address the cognitive processes involved in attributing causes of behaviors. Ickes, et al. (1982) argued that friendly-expectancy perceivers may have taken their partners' behaviors at face value while unfriendly-expectancy perceivers did not. The present findings partially supported this cognitive explanation. On the one hand, friendly-expectancy perceivers tended to reciprocate a perceived friendliness in the targets and thus behaved in a way that was congruent with their expectancy. Furthermore, the impression created in the mind of friendly-expectancy perceivers was not significantly different from that of no-expectancy perceivers. Therefore, little effort was needed in reciprocating anticipated friendliness because this anticipation seems inherent in initial interactions.

Hilton and Darley (1984) argued that the goal of individuals meeting for the first time is to make the interaction pleasant and desirable. Friendly-expectancy perceivers were basically confirmed in the notion that they could expect a friendly encounter with a stranger, the same way no-expectancy perceivers did. Hence, perceivers in the friendly condition did not have to strategize a great deal
to ensure the truth of it. This is confirmed by the fact that the behavioral manifestations of friendly-expectancy perceivers were not significantly different than those in the no-expectancy condition.

On the other hand, although perceivers in the unfriendly-expectancy condition were liable to compensate for an "unfriendly" partner, their increase in behavior was not found to be statistically significant. What may have happened is that unfriendly-expectancy perceivers did not make a fundamental attribution error by attending to those behaviors which confirmed their unfriendly expectancy, but rather attended to those behavioral cues which led them to change their interpretation of the information and take their partners' behaviors at face value.

Jones and Davis (1965) and Berger (1979) stated that in-role behavior such as expected from a friendly partner can form a basis for "normality" or "mental health" of the actor. A perceived friendliness is a mere reflection of the actor's underlying "normal" disposition. Thus, the perceiver attends to those behaviors which confirm the perceived disposition, as expressed by the fundamental attribution error (Jones & Nisbett, 1971, Jones, 1977). This suggests that when the actor behaves out of role, the perceiver's attention may be brought to the target's actual behaviors which s/he takes at face value. This contributes to the explanation of the lack of significant increase of
behavioral involvement observed in the unfriendly-expectancy condition compared to the no-expectancy. Thus, the behaviors manifested by the targets in each expectancy condition were taken at face value.

Similar studies testing for the effect of expectancy on behavioral outcome (Honeycutt, 1987a; Ickes et al., 1982) reported an increase of behavior for friendly and unfriendly-expectancy perceivers. Additionally, Patterson's (1983) functional perspective identified an increase of nonverbal cues with the social control function of nonverbal involvement. Social control is defined as "a deliberate attempt to change, impress or otherwise influence the other person." (p. 78). In the present study, however, the statistical analyses of the perceivers' self-perceptions and behaviors, in the stranger group, suggest that they did not try to exert any influence on the target, while feeling comfortable with themselves and the interaction. Instead of trying to influence their targets in liking them through active behavioral participation, perceivers merely responded to their targets' behavior; they did not seek affinity actively.

This behavioral and affective passivity displayed by perceivers in the stranger group reflected what Bell and Daly (1984) identified as "passive strategies". Passive strategies included assume equality, comfortable self, inclusion of other, and nonverbal immediacy. The display of
nonverbal immediacy was observed across expectancy conditions. The strategy labeled assume equality is defined as having the affinity-seeker strike a posture of social equality with the target, e.g., s/he avoids one-up games while the comfortable self strategy refers to the situation in which the affinity-seeker feels comfortable and relaxed with the target. According to the self-reports and their behavioral correlates, strangers adopted the "nothing bothers me" impression underlying the comfortable self strategy. The perceiver felt at ease with the target and the interaction and made no measurable attempt to be in control, hence assuming equality with the target.

**Acquaintances.** Although it was assumed that strangers want to maximize relational outcomes as a basis for further relational contact, a different goal characterizes acquaintances in free interaction. The question is to what extent do acquaintances need to invest any effort to ensure that the interaction will be pleasant? Past experiences have resolved the cognitive uncertainty of initial interactions. Thus partners need not approach each other but maintain the level of affinity previously established. This was supported by the findings that acquaintances engaged in more smiling than strangers across expectancy conditions. Thus, it is not a question of maximizing relational outcomes with an unknown partner, but rather of assessing the extent to which acquaintances will maintain
affinity with each other while relying on preinteraction expectancy provided by a third party. In fact, the motivation to maintain "face" with one's acquaintance is questionable compared to strangers whose goal in interaction is to maximize positive outcomes (Hilton & Darley, 1984, Sunnafrank, 1986). Thus, it is necessary to address (1) the cognitive processes involved in assessing the new information with preexisting knowledge; (2) the identification of subsequent behavioral outcome used in the interaction; and (3) outcome evaluations for a final explanation of the nature of interaction between acquaintances.

H4 posited no differences in nonverbal behavioral cues between no-expectancy and friendly-expectancy perceivers. The findings supported the hypothesis, except for the display of positive affect (smiling/laughing): friendly-expectancy perceivers talked and smiled significantly less frequently and for a shorter period of time than no-expectancy perceivers. It is worth noting that although nonsignificant, a similar decrease of nonverbal cues was observed in the friendly-expectancy condition compared to the no-expectancy condition.

H5 posited greater behavioral involvement of unfriendly-expectancy perceivers compared to the friendly-expectancy and no-expectancy perceivers. This hypothesis was not supported. On the contrary, unfriendly-expectancy
perceivers were inclined to smile, talk, and gaze less than the no-expectancy perceivers. Contrary to the compensation strategy hypothesized, acquaintances seemingly "withdrew" from the interaction.

According to Berger and Calabrese (1975), various levels of uncertainty characterize different stages of relationships. Therefore, acquaintances share a certain amount of knowledge about each other. Berger, Gardner, Parks, Schulman, and Miller (1976) argued that various levels of knowledge allow for differential causal attributions for behavior. Strangers merely describe each other's current behavior and disposition. Individuals who share greater knowledge about one another can make inferences about future behavior. Finally, individuals who can explain another's behavior and disposition can be said to have acquired considerable knowledge about the other. If one considers the three levels of knowledge as indications of stages of relationships, one may assume that acquaintances "know" their partners but don't really "understand" them. Hence, acquaintances may predict future behaviors but not be able to explain them when their partners behave 'out of role'. Therefore, expectations of a friendly or unfriendly partner may provide the context for heightened awareness of oneself and the other's behavior and call for a new cognitive interpretation of the situation.

In the case of acquaintances merely interacting in an
unstructured context, the goal of interaction should be considered. Partners in the acquaintanceship stage do not share the sort of commitment implicit in friendships or in more intimate relationships. In a study dealing with dimensions of attractiveness, supportiveness was found to be the best discriminator among the various relational levels of acquaintance, friend, close friend and lover (Berger, Weber, Munley, and Dixon, 1976). Degrees of supportiveness prescribe increases in immediacy behavior. However, acquaintances in a waiting situation are not looking specifically for support. Thus, the monitoring of one's behavior, although salient, does not have to be in the direction of an increase. Further, smiling was found to be a significant cue in the avoiding behavior of acquaintances. Expanding on the findings of Burgoon, et al. (1984), the significant decrease of smile is an indication of less composure, more arousal and greater formality. This finding confirms the tenuousness of the acquaintanceship communication structure.

Attributional tendencies for partners who share a minimum of relational history assess how new information is weighted in light of preexisting knowledge. Impression formations are critical in initial interactions. They serve as a basis for developing "implicit theories of personality" which will be tested against incoming information. Information learned later can be minimized due to
impressions formed early on as explained by the primacy effect (Jones & Goethals, 1972). Acquaintances exposed to information that contradicts their expectancy of a partner known to be friendly will reject that information. This cognitive process is known as belief perseverance (Ross, Lepper, & Hubbard, 1975; Snyder & Swann, 1978). This would mean, however, that acquaintances will reciprocate a perceived friendliness and compensate for a perceived unfriendliness as hypothesized. Contrary to the predictions, acquaintances in both expectancy conditions did not increase their friendly behaviors. The notion that they "know" their partners is not supported. The acquaintances' perceptions of their partners would support this explanation. Perceivers in the acquaintance group did not report any attempt to influence their partners and felt a little uncomfortable and awkward in the interaction. These perception reports are confirmed by the lack of behavioral involvement observed among acquaintances. Based on Patterson's (1983) concept of social control, acquaintances were not only avoiding influencing their partners in any way, they were conceding control altogether.

Among the 25 strategies generated in the typology, Bell and Daly (1984) identified concede control as the strategy whereby the affinity-seeker allows the target to assume control over relational activities. By not influencing the target with an increase of behavior, the perceiver is
letting his/her partner behave in a way which s/he finds appropriate in a free interaction. One way to have a pleasant, normal interaction is to observe conversational rule-keeping (Bell & Daly, 1984). Conversational rule-keeping is defined as the affinity-seeker's adherence to cultural rules for polite cooperative interaction with the target. For instance, the affinity-seeker reciprocates the target's behaviors, e.g., s/he smiles, talks, gazes back to the target's similar behaviors. As it was identified in the discussion on the behavioral differences among strangers and acquaintances, both relational groups avoided total silence. They maintained a constant level of nonverbal immediacy across expectancy conditions. Any two individuals interacting with each other want to ensure that no "incident" will threaten the normal evolution of a brief encounter. Without approaching significantly their partners, both participants observe the appropriate rules of conversational behavior with a moderate level of behavioral involvement. In Goffman's (1967) terms, "maintaining face" may have been the appropriate thing to do as a reflection of the cultural environment of the subjects of this study.

Implications

In view of the results generated in this study, a basic behavioral pattern was identified for strangers and acquaintances in unstructured interactions. Both relational groups engaged in passive affinity-seeking strategies.
Strangers did whatever was appropriate to maintain a minimum level of affinity with their partners. This entails the use of those strategies that were at the lower end of the active-passive and aggressive-nonaggressive dimensions underlying the 25 strategy typology (Bell & Daly, 1984). It is reasonable to assume that strangers meeting for the first time are not striving for each other's liking in view of their expectancies. Assuming control over an interaction by an increase of physical activity may not always be the necessary thing to do. The goal of interaction may be to be minimally and pleasantly involved by conceding control over the interaction especially when both participants are meeting for a short period of time. While vigilant toward the situation, the perceiver can maintain a comfortable level of affinity by displaying signs of comfortable self and adhering to conversational rules. Furthermore, being "aggressive" as would characterize an active affinity-seeking behavior such as assuming control may not be the most desirable thing to do for a short interaction. Maintaining affinity may be the perceiver's preference in the interaction.

Acquaintances, waiting for an experiment to begin, do not have to engage in affinity-seeking behavior. The pleasantness of the encounter is assumed based on prior experiences. According to Sunnafrank's (1986) positive relational outcome perspective, the interaction outcomes are
predictable. However, in order to deal with preinteraction expectancies, acquaintances are called upon to question their knowledge about their partners. This new assessment may cause acquaintances to select a passive strategy such as conceding control. The preference for this particular affinity-seeking behavior cannot jeopardize the outcome of the interaction. The interaction was overall warm and pleasant. Behavioral results showed that acquaintances smiled and laughed significantly more than strangers in similar circumstances.

Behavioral Correlates of Affinity-Seeking Competency

This study raises the issue of the validity of the Affinity-Seeking Instrument as an appropriate device for measuring behavioral competency. It is necessary to assess whether perceived affinity-seeking competence is accompanied by equally competent behavioral skills. According to Bell's et al. (1986) definition of the Affinity-Seeking Instrument (ASI), the behavioral measures reflect some personal characteristics of the individual as well as his/her disposition toward the situation and the other person.

In assessing the discriminant validity of the ASI, Bell and his colleagues (1986) established that individuals reporting high affinity-seeking competence also reported themselves to be assertive, communicatively nonapprehensive, involved in interaction, nonlonely, high in self-esteem, good social actors, extraverted, nonshy, and somewhat
sociable. Individuals rating high on strategic performance viewed themselves as assertive, nonapprehensive in dyadic situations, involved in interaction, good social actors, extraverted, other-directed, and nonshy. Hence the low correlations between actual behavioral measures and the affinity-seeking ratings may reflect a lack of motivation to seek affinity as much as a lack of competence in the individual and/or some constraint on displaying affinity-seeking behavior in the situation. Further still, the discrepancy between these self-reports and actual behaviors can be explained by individuals' need for social desirability (Daly & Street, 1980). It is socially undesirable to report a lack of competence in social skills such as the ability to seek affinity nor is it personally desirable to admit to a low self-concept.

The near-significant negative correlation between the sum of behaviors and the Strategic Performance (SP) scale, in the acquaintance group, is worth noting because SP is moderately correlated with acting ability (Bell, Tremblay, & Rothfuss, 1986). Thus, individuals scoring low and negative on that dimension did not employ affinity-seeking skills. This confirms the fact that active affinity-seeking through an increase of behavior was not a major goal in the acquaintances' interaction.
Limitations of the Study

Inherent to this study are several limitations. The first limitation in this research lies with the small size of the sample. Although sufficient enough to detect main effects of expectancy and relational differences, the power for the interaction effects was too low to ensure predictable results. Thus the findings concerning the effect of expectancy in the "stranger" group and the "acquaintance" group were susceptible to error and limited in their generalizability.

The second limitation resides in the expectancy manipulation. A procedure similar to the one used by Honeycutt (1986) was selected. The friendly-expectancy effect failed to be significantly different from the no-expectancy condition.

The third limitation is the lack of significant findings about proximity and suggests further comments. For example, the units of analysis were too broad to be sensitive to any significant differences in seating distance and the seating arrangement may have had an effect on the availability of seating choices. The chair and couch were arranged in such a way as to be in focus with the camera located in one corner of the room. Therefore, the most logical seating choice may have been in the position closest to the chair to be in the angle of the camera, and in a side-by-side position with the partner. This was the
position most selected by the perceivers. The subsequent
closeness of the two partners could very well be compensated
with averted eye-gaze, or body orientation away from the
target, thus maintaining an interpersonal distance
psychologically and physically comfortable. Proximity may
have had a confounding effect on the other immediacy cues.
In fact, proximity exerts a powerful influence on relational
interpretations (Burgoon, Buller, Hale, and DeTurck, 1984).
Hence, the limited choice in seating distance may have had a
mediating effect on experimental outcomes.

The final limitation deals with the identification of
the behavioral components of affinity-seeking competency.
Considering that the subjects engaged in passive affinity-
seeking strategies, the behavioral findings did not yield
significant correlations with self-reports of affinity-
seeking competency.

Some Directions for Future Research

This study answered some questions concerning the
existence of affinity-seeking behaviors in initial
interactions among strangers and brief interactions among
acquaintances. This research revealed the importance of
passive affinity-seeking strategies as the means to insure
brief and pleasant encounters in unstructured interactions.
The implications of this study for future research are
manifold.

First, a study of affinity-seeking behaviors requires a
situation in which the motives for eliciting positive feelings generates more active affinity-seeking strategies. Bell and Daly (1984) cited assume control, personal autonomy, reward association, dynamism, present interesting self, and physical attractiveness, as the most active strategies. These strategies are characterized by physical activity and by taking control over the interaction. Two example are readily available in initial interaction situations which deserve further exploration. First, a dating situation should generate specific nonverbal behavioral tactics to please the partner. The literature on same sex dyads in interaction is rich with findings on nonverbal behavioral differences (see Thorne & Henley, 1975 for a review). Ultimately, research on mixed-sex dyads can reveal the functions of nonverbal behaviors in an affinity-seeking situation such as dating. For example, Burgoon, Buller, Hale, and DeTurck (1984) demonstrated how the combination of several nonverbal cues enhances relational messages between partners. Namely, high contact, close proximity, forward body lean, and smiling conveyed greater intimacy, attraction, and trust. Knowing how these cues can be combined to enhance intimacy, attraction, or trust, can enhance the competency of the affinity-seeker.

In specifying the types of behaviors which are successful in eliciting positive feeling from others, the literature on deception is informative. Research in this
area indicates that it is easier to manage facial behaviors than lower parts of the body, like leg movements. For example, smiling was found to be more easily monitored in a deceptive situation (Ekman & Friesen, 1974; Mehrabian, 1971) while lower body cues leaked any sign of stress. Because it is easy to monitor smiling and eye-gaze, these behaviors should be most revealing in situations in which social control patterns are necessary. In seeking affinity, one should focus on these behaviors as nonverbal tactics used to manipulate initial interactions.

Secondly, a working environment is another social situation which requires increased knowledge of the behavioral tactics of affinity-seeking strategies. The candidate for a position is concerned with creating the proper impression on the interviewer. The literature on impression management (Tedeschi, 1974; Tedeschi, Schlenker, & Bonoma, 1973) and Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgic analysis provided us with the nonverbal behaviors which enhances one’s presentation of self in various situations. An investigation of these nonverbal cues can reveal further the behavioral nature of affinity-seeking. Still further, a supervisor’s appropriate use of affinity-seeking strategies may enhance his/her managerial style over employees. For instance, Richmond, McCrockey, and Davis (1986) reported high correlations between affinity-seeking strategies and subordinate satisfaction. These strategies, however, were
not identified in their behavioral components. A description of the nonverbal tactics of affinity-seeking as provided in this study is one step further to our understanding of positive relationships between supervisors and subordinates.

The Affinity-Seeking Instrument was found to be inadequate in assessing the behavioral components of affinity-seeking competence. Thus, it is important to ask whether self-reports of affinity-seeking skills are accurate representations of those skills. In testing for the accuracy of individual perception of competence, Bell and his colleagues (1986) found that friends' ratings and self-ratings correlated moderately.

Hewes and Haight (1980) have argued that there were low correlations between self-reports of behaviors and actual behaviors. But because the correlations are even lower than expected, one might question the affinity-seeking instrument as a valid measure of behavioral competency. If strong correlations are to be expected, it is necessary to establish self-reports of behavioral intentions. Statements such as "I am good at getting others to want to hang around with me" do not specify the behaviors which consist in being "good" while statements such as "I am very good at putting on a show" may not elicit specific descriptions in the mind of the respondents. This questionnaire assesses attitudes of competency but is not a behavioral instrument.
In conclusion, the affinity-seeking instrument as it is formulated at present was not adequate enough to measure passive affinity-seeking behavior correlates. Still, the correlations were so low that the instrument can be questioned as an adequate measure of the behavioral dispositions of affinity-seeking competency.

In creating a preinteraction expectancy in the minds of the perceivers, this study used a bogus questionnaire of self-rating of friendliness (Honeycutt, 1986; see Appendix A). This questionnaire includes statements such as "I generally consider myself to be a friendly person" and "I consider myself to often be quiet when meeting new people". It would be interesting to use such a questionnaire as a manipulation check for friendliness among affinity-seekers. One would expect a friendly perceiver to approach their target more readily than unfriendly perceivers and have the behavioral competency to succeed. In fact, this may have been partially the case. During the debriefing session, several perceivers admitted that they saw themselves to be cold, unsociable, and unskilled at making friends.

Considering that preinteraction expectancies did not create the expected behaviors of active affinity-seeking among strangers and acquaintances, such findings raise some issues concerning the processing of information at various relational levels. Planalp and Hewes (1981) call for a better understanding of individual cognition in relational
development to explain how people maintain consistency in their relationships. Thus, further research needs to identify the types of expectancies which will generate affinity-seeking strategies, the situations in which they are most influential.
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APPENDIX C

EVALUATION OF INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION
PERCEPTION OF INTERACTION

In the following questions we are interested in assessing your perceptions of the interaction between you and the other subject over the five-minute period that you talked together. Indicate your answers by circling the hash mark on each scale that best describes your feelings or perceptions. Please reflect on how you felt during this interaction and try to answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible. Yours answers will not be shown to the other subject and will be used for statistical purposes only.

Sex: ___M  ___F

1. **BEFORE the conversation took place, how friendly did you think your partner would be?**
   
   / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / not at all   very much

2. **BEFORE the conversation took place, how easy-going did you believe your partner would be?**
   
   / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / not at all   very much

3. **BEFORE the conversation took place, how sociable did you believe your partner would be?**
   
   / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / not at all   very much

4. **How much did you feel a need to communicate with the other person?**
   
   / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / not at all   very much

5. **How much do you think the other person felt a need to communicate with you?**
   
   / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / not at all   very much

6. **Did the presence of the other person make you feel nervous or self-conscious?**
   
   / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / not at all   very much
7. Did you think your presence made the other person feel nervous or self-conscious?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How much did you try to direct the interaction in particular ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How much do you think the other person tried to direct the interaction in particular ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How much did you use the other person's behavior as a guide for your own behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How much do you think the other person used your behavior as a guide for his/her behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How much do you think the other person's behavior influenced the things you said and did during the interaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How much did you think your own behavior influenced what the other person said and did during the interaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. To what degree did the interaction seem awkward, forced, and strained to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. To what degree do you think the interaction seemed awkward, forced, and strained to the other person?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

16. To what degree did the interaction seemed smooth, natural, and relaxed, to you?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

17. To what degree do you think the interaction seemed smooth, natural, and relaxed to the other person?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

18. To what degree were you comfortable interacting with the other person?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

19. To what degree was the other person comfortable interacting with you?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

20. How dominant and assertive do you think you appeared to be during the interaction?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

21. How dominant and assertive did the other person to be during the interaction?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much

22. How compassionate and sensitive to others do you think you appeared to be during the interaction?

not at all / / / / / / / / / / / very much
23. How compassionate and sensitive to others did the other person appeared to be during the interaction?

- not at all
- very much

24. To what extent did you try to influence the other person during the interaction to do what you wanted him/her to do?

- not at all
- very much

25. To what extent did the other person try to influence you during the interaction to do what she/he wanted to do?

- not at all
- very much

26. To what extent did you try to accommodate the other person during the interaction by adapting your behavior to "fit in" with this/hers?

- not at all
- very much

27. To what extent did the other person try to accommodate you during the interaction by adapting his/her behavior to "fit in" with yours?

- not at all
- very much

28. How much rapport or understanding did you feel with the other person?

- not at all
- very much

29. How much rapport or understanding do you think the other person felt with you?

- not at all
- very much

30. To what extent did you try to avoid offending the other person?

- not at all
- very much
31. To what extent did the other person try to avoid offending you?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 
not at all very much

32. To what extent did you try to compensate for the other person's failure to initiate conversation, act friendly, etc.?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 
not at all very much

33. To what extent did the other person try to compensate for your failure to initiate conversation, act friendly, etc.?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 
not at all very much
On the basis of your interaction experience, please rate the other person on the following trait scales by circling the number that you consider most appropriate. Beneath each trait is a confidence scale. Use this scale to rate how confident you are in each trait assessment that you make.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Confidence Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>UNSOCIABLE</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>SOCIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>WEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>SEXUALLY COLD</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>SEX. WARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>SENSITIVE</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>INSENSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>ASSERTIVE</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>NONASSERTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>BORING</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>INTERESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>CRUEL</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>KIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>EXCITING</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>DULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>GENUINE</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>ARTIFICIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>VAIN</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>MODEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>DEPENDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>&quot;Very Confident&quot; Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>POISED</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>AWKWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>INSINCERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>COLD</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>WARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>UNFRIENDLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>PHYSICALLY</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>PHYSICALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>ATTRACTIVE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>UNATTRACTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>TRUSTWORTHY</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>UNTRUSTWORTHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>LIKABLE</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>DISLIKABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>NO CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>EXTREMELY CONFIDENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR RESEARCHER USE ONLY: Subject No.: ____
subject Role: ____
Subject Exp.: ____
APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM
Statement of consent

We want to thank you for participating and being videotaped in this research on the spontaneous interaction of two strangers/acquaintances. The result of this study will contribute to our scientific knowledge about communication behaviors which are exhibited during initial interaction.

As previously indicated, all of your responses will be confidential; in all probability there will be publications and/or other educational uses. The videotapes will be used for statistical and educational purposes only.

You are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time prior to the completion of the project. If you agree to let use your responses and the videotape, please read and sign the statement below.

I hereby release this data along with my responses to the questionnaire with the understanding that all answers are anonymous and that this information will be used for statistical/educational purposes only.

Name_____________________________Date________________
APPENDIX E

CODING MANUAL FOR STATIC AND DYNAMIC NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS
This coding manual provides instructions for coding static and dynamic variables selected for this study. The static variables are coded by hand since they only occur once within a given period of interaction. The dynamic variables are measured in terms of the frequency and duration of their occurrence since they change over time in terms of onset and offset of the behavior.

Order of Behavior Coding

The behaviors that were coded are numbered in order of their occurrence in the interaction, form low to high. The first two variables are static in that they are fairly unchanging. The next four variables are dynamic in that they change very often over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable #</th>
<th>Variable name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talk initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Talk-duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Smiling/Laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eye gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pseudo-agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each behavior is described as follows:

1. Talk Initiation. Talk initiation is recorded as the individual who initiates a conversational sequence in a given interaction.

2. Proximity. Proximity involves the seating distance between the two partners in the study. The target is in a fixed position in a chair. The perceiver has three positions made available to him/her on a couch in relation to the target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Seating position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>closest position to the target, i.e., right end corner of the couch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>middle position on the couch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Gaze.** When A looks at B, this is coded as a directed gaze by A, regardless of B returning or not returning the gaze to A. Eye gaze may be constant or shifting often.

4. **Smiling/Laughter.** Smiling and laughter are expressions of positive affect displays and are therefore coded as one category.

5. **Talk.** Talk refers to the total amount of verbalizations (including mumbles, slurs, and groans) with the exception of verbalizations such as "hum, uh-huh" which are treated as a separate category below.

6. **Pseudo-agreements.** Pseudo-agreements include vocalizations which express agreements, such as "m-mh, uh-uh", and verbalizations such as "yea, right, really, I Know" which are not followed by a full statement of agreement.
APPENDIX F

ATTRACTION

CORRELATION MATRIX
Table F.1

Correlation Matrix of Attraction Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

CONTINGENCY TABLES FOR PROXIMITY
Table G.1

Seating Distance Differences
Between Strangers and Acquaintances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Level</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Total Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.2

Seating Distance Differences
Across Expectancy Conditions
(Strangers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Total Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-E</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G.3

Seating Distance Differences
Across Expectancy Conditions
(Acquaintances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Total 23 5 1 33
APPENDIX H
CONTINGENCY TABLES FOR TALK-INITIATION
Table H.1

Talk-initiation Differences Between Strangers and Acquaintances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Perceiver</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strangers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H.2

Talk-initiation across Expectancy Conditions (Strangers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Perceiver</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Perceiver</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Total Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column Total**

| Total     | 10        | 23     | 33        |
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