

THE INFLUENCE OF A STRONG VERSUS WEAK
SENSE OF SELF IN SAME-SEX
DYADIC INTERACTIONS

by

RONEN CUPERMAN

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN PSYCHOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2008

Copyright © by Ronen Cuperman 2008

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor, Dr. William Ickes, who has guided and supported me throughout this whole process. He has always pushed me to do my best and has taught me how to be a better researcher. To my other committee members, Dr. Lauri Jensen-Campbell and Dr. Jared Kenworthy: Thank you for always being available to answer questions and for making my defense such a stress-free experience.

A special thanks to a number of my fellow graduate students who were always there for support, encouragement, keeping me sane, and making me laugh: Shaun Culwell, Jen Knack, Colette Jacquot, Katy Sullivan, Jenny Jones, Katy Rollings, Wen Cheng, Madeline Rexlear, Melisa Holovics, Robyn Petree-schatz, Chloe Tatney, Cara Fay, Autumn Zwick, Ife Togun, and Ben Towns.

I would also like to thank my roommate and good friend, Willie Wright, for always being there to listen to me rant about everything that went wrong while running this study.

A very special thank you to all the undergraduate assistants who helped me with scheduling, coding, and recoding during the past two years: I would not have been able to get to this point without any of you.

Last but not least, I'd like to thank my family: My parents, who have always been there and for completely supporting my decision to switch programs from Computer Science to Psychology as an undergrad, my sister, Leetal, and my soon to be brother-in-law, Dan, for always being available to talk and laugh with me.

March 7, 2008

ABSTRACT

THE INFLUENCE OF A STRONG VERSUS WEAK SENSE OF SELF IN SAME-SEX DYADIC INTERACTIONS

Ronen Cuperman, M.S.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2008

Supervising Professor: William Ickes

The goal of this study was to examine the influence of the participants' sense of self (strong vs. weak) on the behaviors they displayed and the perceptions they reported in initial unstructured interactions. Participants were 82 male and 92 female students at the University of Texas at Arlington, randomly assigned into same-sex and mixed-sex dyads, corresponding with each participant's sense of self (strong-strong, strong-weak, and weak-weak). Using Ickes et al.'s (1986) unstructured dyadic interaction paradigm, the resulting interactions occurring between members of these dyads were covertly audio- and videotaped, and later coded for a wide range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Although more interactional involvement was expected to occur for participants having a strong rather than a weak sense of self, it was found that a greater number of verbal and/or nonverbal forms of acknowledgment were actually used by those dyad members possessing a weak sense of self. Further unpredicted findings related to gender, sense of self, and a measure of the global similarity of the dyad members' personalities was also discovered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The Current Study.....	3
1.2 Hypotheses.....	4
2. METHOD.....	7
2.1 Participants.....	7
2.2 Settings and Materials.....	7
2.3 Procedure.....	9
2.3.1 Behavioral Measures.....	10
2.3.2 Self-Report Measures.....	11
2.3.3 Personal-Pronoun Usage.....	12
3. RESULTS.....	13
3.1 Tests of Research Hypotheses.....	13
3.2 Other Findings.....	17
3.2.1 Correlates of Overall Personality Similarity.....	17
3.2.2 Gender Composition Effects.....	18
3.2.3 Sense of Self Effects.....	21
4. DISCUSSION.....	22
4.1 Predicted Effects.....	22
4.2 Other Effects.....	23

4.2.1 Global Personality Similarity.....	23
4.2.2 Strong versus Weak Sense of Self.....	25
4.2.3 Actor Effects Related to Gender.....	25
4.2.4 Partner Effects Related to Gender.....	26
4.2.5 Interaction Effects Related to Gender.....	26
4.3 Future Research.....	27
4.4 Concluding Comments.....	28
APPENDIX	
A. SENSE OF SELF SCALE.....	30
B. PERCEPTIONS OF INTERACTION.....	32
C. BIG FIVE INVENTORY.....	38
D. SELF-ESTEEM SCALE.....	41
REFERENCES.....	43
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	46

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.1	Descriptive Statistics for Personality Measures.....	2
2.1	Correlations between Personality Measures: Sense of Self (SOS), Extraversion (EXTRA), Agreeableness (AGREE), Conscientiousness (CONSC), Neuroticism (NEU), Openness (OPEN), and Self-Esteem (SE)	8
3.1	Factor Loadings for Partner Rapport and Partner Synchrony.....	14
3.2	Significant Effects for Correlates of Personality Similarity: Overall, Big Five Inventory (BFI), and Self-Related (Sense of Self + Self-Esteem)... ..	18
3.3	Significant Actor and Partner Effects Related to Gender.....	20
3.4	Significant Interaction Effects Related to Gender: Male Actor – Male Partner (MA–MP), Female Actor – Male Partner (FA–MP), Male Actor – Female Partner (MA–FP), Female Actor – Female Partner (FA–FP)... ..	20

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Jim walked into a party. He looked around and saw that his friends had not yet arrived. He noticed an empty spot on a couch nearby and decided that sitting down and starting a conversation might help pass the time. Although the guy sitting next to him acknowledged his presence, Jim noticed how tentative and unassertive he seemed to be. When Jim tried to talk to him, he not only avoided making eye contact but seemed to have relatively little to say about himself. Later on, while Jim was at the refreshment table, he had another interaction that was almost completely the opposite of the one he had just experienced. His new interaction partner not only initiated the conversation and kept it going, but he made frequent eye contact, conveyed a strong impression of who he was, and generally seemed very confident and comfortable with himself.

Why were the two interaction styles of Jim's new acquaintances so different? Although there are many personality characteristics that can account for a particular interaction style, the characteristic that was examined in this study was one of having either a strong or a weak sense of self.

According to Flury and Ickes (2006) and Kernis (2005), people with a weak sense of self can be characterized as feeling uncertain about who they are, relying on others to help them form opinions and make decisions, and displaying more situation-based identities. Although the details of this psychological portrait have yet to be validated empirically, the existing theoretical conceptualizations agree in suggesting that people with a weak sense of self should be less likely than those with a strong sense of self to present themselves confidently and assertively during social interactions. In addition, people with a weak sense of self should be less self-disclosing, and therefore less likely to convey a strong and coherent impression of

what they are like. On the other hand, people with a strong sense of self should be more assertive and self-disclosing as interaction partners, and should also differ in being more self-directed than other-directed (Kernis, 2005).

In an attempt to quantify this personality characteristic, which has also been shown to be one of the attributes associated with Borderline Personality Disorder (for reviews of BPD, see APA, 1994; Lieb et al., 2004; Tryon et al., 1988), Flury and Ickes (2007) designed a 12-item scale, the Sense of Self Scale (SOSS) to measure the strength of one's sense of self (see Table 1.1 for descriptive statistics). People with high scores on this measure are presumed to have a weak sense of self, whereas people with low scores are presumed to have a strong sense of self (Flury & Ickes, 2007).

Table 1.1 Descriptive Statistics for Personality Measures

Personality measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness
Sense of Self	32.30	12.08	0.43
Extraversion	27.78	6.51	-0.21
Agreeableness	35.61	5.05	-0.69
Conscientiousness	33.08	5.36	-0.24
Neuroticism	22.94	6.42	0.10
Openness	37.53	6.03	-0.25
Self-Esteem	41.12	7.94	-0.92

The question that inspired the current study was to wonder how people with a strong versus weak sense of self might differ in their behaviors, thoughts and feelings, and the impressions they create in an initial unstructured interaction. Although several methods exist for measuring interpersonal behaviors, the observational method was chosen for the current study because it relies on the perspective of objective raters with no prior relationship to the individuals involved in a particular interaction (Ickes, 1994). In the current study, I relied primary on the observational method known as the unstructured dyadic interaction paradigm (Ickes,

Robertson, Tooke, & Teng, 1986; Ickes et al., 1990), and supplemented this method with self-report and peer-report measures (Ickes, 1994).

Because many laboratory observational studies involve the presence of confederate-interactants, the ability to study naturally occurring interactions is often compromised in such research (Markey et al., 2003). A better alternative is to use the unstructured dyadic interaction paradigm (Ickes, Robertson, Tooke, & Teng 1986; Ickes et al., 1990), which requires the experimenter to leave the room on an “errand” while the participants’ interaction is covertly audio- and videotaped (Ickes, Robertson, Tooke, & Teng 1986; Ickes, 1994). Because the participants aren’t instructed to interact and are not informed until later that their interaction was the major focus of the study, they tend to interact in a relatively spontaneous way that allows the impact of their respective personalities to emerge.

From the videotapes of these unstructured interactions, it is possible to code a wide range of verbal and non-verbal behaviors. The verbal behaviors that can be assessed include the number of questions and/or comments made by each participant, the number of conversation sequences that each initiated, and the number of verbal reinforcements (“yeah”, “right”, “uh huh”) each expressed. The nonverbal behaviors that can be measured include the participants’ body posture, body orientation, directed gazes, mutual gazes, smiles/laughs, and the interpersonal distance between them. These nonverbal behaviors help to provide a more complete view of the recorded interaction, particularly when no verbal communication takes place.

1.1 The Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to explore how a strong versus a weak sense of self influenced people’s behavior, thought/feeling content, and the impression they make in an initial interaction with a partner of the same gender. In the current study, I systematically matched participants with either a strong or weak sense of self to create three dyad types: (1) strong-strong, (2) strong-weak, and (3) weak-weak. I then recorded the initial interactions of the

dyads, and coded the resulting behavioral, self-report, and peer-report data to assess how the dyad members' sense of self affected their interaction behavior, the thoughts and feelings they reported, and how they perceived their interaction partners.

1.2 Hypotheses

The following predictions were based on the previously described conceptual profiles of individuals who have a strong versus a weak sense of self. People with a strong sense of self should have a clear and stable sense of their own identities, should express who they are through their self-disclosure and other means, and should present themselves in a relatively confident and assertive manner. In contrast, people with a weak sense of self should feel uncertain about themselves, reveal less about themselves in conversation with a stranger, and conduct themselves in a more tentative and unassertive manner.

Hypothesis 1a. Participants in strong-strong dyads, who both have a strong sense of self, should perceive their interaction as being smooth, natural, and relaxed, whereas participants in weak-weak dyads, who both have a weak sense of self, should perceive their interaction as being more forced, awkward, and strained. Because participants with a strong sense of self feel comfortable expressing who they are, it is reasonable to expect that any interaction between them will be relatively smooth and unforced. In contrast, because people with a weak sense of self are more uncertain about their identities and less comfortable expressing themselves, their initial interactions are likely to be experienced as awkward, forced, and strained.

Hypothesis 1b. Both of the participants in the strong-weak dyads should also perceive their interaction as being relatively smooth, relaxed, and unforced, when compared to participants in weak-weak dyads. Because the participants with a weak sense of self are unsure about how to present themselves, they should look to their partners with strong senses of self for guidance. And they should find it: their strong sense-of-self partners should quite feel

comfortable leading the interaction, thereby creating an interaction context that both dyad members should rate as smooth, natural, and relaxed.

In contrast to Hypothesis 1, a hypothesis that concerns the *between-dyads* difference between the strong-strong, strong-weak, and weak-weak dyads, the remaining hypotheses concern the *within-dyads differences* between the members of the strong-weak dyads, i.e., the dyads in which one participant has a weak sense of self and the other participant has a strong sense of self.

Hypothesis 2. Because they are presumed to have a stronger and more certain sense of self, participants with a strong sense of self are expected to be more self-disclosing than those with a weak sense of self. This difference should be evident both in the between-dyads comparison of the strong-strong versus weak-weak dyads and in the within-dyads comparison of the strong versus weak members of the strong-weak dyads.

Hypothesis 3. Because they are presumed to be more secure in their identity and more assertive than their weak sense-of-self counterparts, the strong sense-of-self members of strong-weak dyads members are expected to initiate more conversation sequences than the weak sense-of-self members are.

Hypothesis 4. Because they are presumably more assertive and secure in their own identity, the strong sense-of-self members of strong-weak dyads members should initiate a greater number of the mutual gazes than their weaker sense-of-self interaction partners. On the other hand, the weak sense-of-self dyad members should terminate a greater number of the mutual gazes, because of their greater insecurity and lack of assertiveness.

Hypothesis 5. For the same reason, the weak sense-of-self dyad members in the strong-weak dyads are expected to produce more verbal reinforcements (“yeah”, “right”, “uh huh”) and head nods than their partners who have a strong sense of self. Given my earlier prediction that the members with a strong sense of identity will take the lead during the

interaction, their weaker sense-of-self partners should spend more of their time acknowledging their more directive partners' comments with verbal reinforcements and head nods.

Hypothesis 6. In both the between-dyads comparison of the strong-strong versus the weak-weak dyads and the within-dyads comparison of the strong versus weak members of the strong-weak dyads, participants with a strong sense of self are expected to use more first-person singular pronouns in their conversation, whereas participants with a weak sense of self are expected to use more second- and/or third-person pronouns. This prediction is based on the notion that a strong versus weak sense of self is embodied in a strong versus weak self-schema (Von Bergen et al., 1996) that should make first-person singular pronouns more cognitively available to the dyad members who have a strong sense of self.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

Fifty male and 60 female students of mixed age and ethnicity, were randomly assigned, with constraints, into same-sex dyads. An additional 32 male and 32 female students were randomly assigned into mixed-sex dyads for the purposes of future studies. All participants were enrolled in psychology courses at the University of Texas at Arlington. They were selected based on their responses to the Sense of Self Scale (SOSS), which was included in the departmental pretest taken at the beginning of the semester. Students who scored either high or low (i.e., one-half of a standard deviation above or below the mean on the SOSS) were eligible to participate. On the other hand, students who scored within one-half of the standard deviation above or below the mean were considered to have a moderate sense of self and were therefore not be eligible to participate. Eligible participants were recruited by an undergraduate research assistant over the phone as well as through e-mail using the Experiment Management System (Sona Systems; Fidler, 1997). Participants were compensated with either one experimental participation credit required for their introductory psychology course, or extra credit in their other psychology courses.

2.2 Settings and Materials

The study was conducted in the UTA Social Interaction Lab, which consisted of an observation room, control room, storage closet, and two adjacent cubicles. The interaction between the participants took place in the observation room. This room contained a couch, which concealed a transmitting microphone, a coffee table, and bookcase. The storage closet, which was located right across the hall from the observation room, contained a video camera that was hidden in one of several boxes that appeared to be stored in the room. The control room was directly adjacent to the observation room and contained all the video and audio

equipment used to record the interactions. Finally, the two cubicles were adjacent to the control room, and were used as private areas for the completion of various forms prior to and following each interaction.

To obtain baseline measures of the participants' personality traits, they were given a 44-item Big Five Personality Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991), along with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, prior to their dyadic interaction (see Table 2.1 for correlations between personality measures). The Big Five Personality Inventory was used to measure the five broad dimensions of extraversion, openness, agreeableness, neuroticism, and conscientiousness (Paunonen & Ashton, 2001), whereas the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale was used to measure the participants' self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965).

Table 2.1 Correlations between Personality Measures: Sense of Self (SOS), Extraversion (EXTRA), Agreeableness (AGREE), Conscientiousness (CONSC), Neuroticism (NEU), Openness (OPEN), and Self-Esteem (SE)

	SOS	EXTRA	AGREE	CONSC	NEU	OPEN	SE
SOS	-	-.36 < .0001	-.10 ns	-.32 < .0001	.48 < .0001	-.05 ns	-.67 < .0001
EXTRA		-	.26 < .001	.31 < .0001	.28 < .001	.17 < .05	.44 < .0001
AGREE			-	.25 < .01	-.38 < .0001	.12 ns	.19 < .05
CONSC				-	-.33 < .0001	.10 ns	.49 < .0001
NEU					-	-.12 ns	-.55 < .0001
OPEN						-	.05 ns

Once the interactions were recorded, the participants were asked to complete a post-interaction questionnaire (see Appendix B), which was intended to measure the dyad members' perceptions of the interaction and their interaction partner. The post-interaction questionnaire

included items such as “How much did you use the other person’s behavior as a guide for your own behavior?” and “To what degree did the interaction seem *smooth*, *natural*, and *relaxed* to you?”

2.3 Procedure

Once each participant arrived at his or her respective waiting area, the experimenter separately met and escorted each of them into one of the two cubicles used for the experiment. Each participant was then asked to complete the 40-item Big Five Personality Inventory and the Self-Esteem questionnaire. While the participants were completing these measures in their respective cubicles, the experimenter initiated the VCR recording in the observation room in preparation for the upcoming interaction. (By starting the VCR before the participants entered the observation room, I was able to capture all of their interaction while in the room.) After the two participants completed the personality measures, they were brought together for the first time and then escorted into the observation room.

After being instructed to place their belongings on one of the empty shelves in the bookcase, the participants were asked to take a seat on the couch. The experimenter then began shuffling through a folder of papers, appearing to have misplaced some forms intended for the participants. While appearing to be very frustrated, the experimenter then “remembered” that some copies could quickly be made in his office. After apologizing for the mix-up, the experimenter informed the participants that he would return in a few minutes with the forms. The experimenter then left the room. During the time the participants were left alone, their behavior was recorded by the microphone concealed behind the couch and by the hidden video camera across the hall.

When the experimenter returned precisely six minutes later, the participants were probed for any suspicion of being recorded. If either participant showed substantial suspicion of being videotaped by having attempted to identify the location of a video camera, the data obtained from that particular dyad was excluded from my data analyses. Because the goal of

this study was to record the participants' naturally occurring behavior, it would have not been appropriate to use the data from dyads in which one or both member had an active suspicion that their interaction was being recorded—a suspicion that would cause them to behave in a more guarded and less spontaneous way.

If neither of the participants showed any signs of targeted suspicion, the experimenter then debriefed the participants on the need for the deception and informed them that their recorded interaction would not be viewed by anyone without the participants' written consent. Each participant was then given a videotape consent form, giving them the option to release the use of their recorded interaction for purposes of data analysis, or to have the videotape erased and discontinue further participation in the study. The experimenter also informed the participants that they would receive credit for their participation no matter how they chose to proceed. If at least one of the participants felt uncomfortable and chose not to consent to the use of their recorded interaction, the experimenter brought them into the control room and allowed them to watch as their videotape was erased.

Once the participants gave their written consent to use their tape as a source of data, they were separately escorted to one of the two adjacent cubicles to complete the last part of the experiment. In this part, each participant filled out the perception of interaction questionnaire. After completing this measure, the participants were fully debriefed and given full credit for their participation in the study. They were also asked not to discuss the study with other students in their psychology class, in order to help ensure that any future participants would have no prior knowledge about the actual purpose of the study.

2.3.1 Behavioral Measures

A number of verbal as well as nonverbal behavioral measures were coded from the recorded interactions by a team of undergraduate research assistants who were divided into pairs to code different interaction behaviors. The verbal behavior measures included the number of questions asked by each participant, who spoke first during the interaction, the

number of subsequent conversation sequences initiated by each participant, the number of verbal reinforcements, such as “yeah”, “uh huh”, or “right”, that were used by each subject, and the number of times each participant disclosed intimate or non-intimate information about themselves. The research assistants also coded for the total frequency and duration of each dyad member’s verbalizations (speaking turns) during the interaction.

The nonverbal behaviors measured for each participant included their body posture (open, closed, or intermediate), their body orientation (toward, away, or parallel) relative to their partner, and the total frequency and duration of their directed gazes, mutual gazes, head nods, and smiles/laughs. The interpersonal distance between the participants was also measured by placing a flexible, transparent ruler on the TV screen, and using it to measure the distance in centimeters from the left participant’s shoulder to the right participant’s proximal shoulder. (This measure was taken twice during the interaction, once near the start of the interaction and again near the end.)

2.3.2 Self-Report Measures

The self-report measures that were collected and coded included Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale, the 44-item Big Five Inventory, and the perception of interaction questionnaire. The perception of interaction questionnaire intended to measure three general factors, which included the participants’ *level of comfort and/or self-consciousness during the interaction*, the *perceived quality of the interaction*, and their *liking for the interaction partner*. Examples of items that are respectively representative of these general factors are: “How comfortable did you feel around the other person?”, “To what degree did the interaction seem *smooth, natural, and relaxed* to you?”, and “How much did you like the other person?” The post-interaction questionnaire also asked participants to respond to parallel questions about how they thought their interaction partner may have perceived the interaction in relation to the same three general factors.

2.3.3 Personal-Pronoun Usage

Each participant's personal pronoun usage during the conversation was coded by undergraduate assistants using tally marks on a special coding form. The coding form organized the pronouns by person (first-, second-, or third-person), number (singular, plural), and case (nominative, objective, possessive, reflexive). Whenever a participant used a particular pronoun, their research assistant placed a tally mark on the coding form next to the appropriate pronoun. The percentage of personal pronouns used in each category was calculated for each participant by dividing the raw number of pronouns they used per category by the total number of pronouns they used during the entire interaction.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The results are organized into two main sections. In the first section, I review the results of the analyses used to test the specific research hypotheses proposed above. In the second section, I review the various unexpected and unpredicted findings that emerged in the data analyses. Although the research hypotheses were all tested using the data for the same-sex dyads only, as originally proposed, the unexpected findings were tested using the data from both the same-sex and the mixed-sex dyads, in an attempt to maximize the statistical power available for these post-hoc comparisons.

3.1 Tests of the Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 predicted that participants in strong-strong and strong-weak dyads should perceive the interaction to be relatively smooth, unforced, and relaxed, whereas participants in weak-weak dyads should perceive the interaction to be relatively forced, awkward, and strained. To determine which items formed the general factor of perceived interaction quality, a Varimax factor analysis was conducted on all of the items in the post-interaction questionnaire. The two factors extracted were labeled “partner sync” and “partner rapport” (see Table 3.1 for factor loadings). The first factor, “partner sync,” contained items such as “how much did you use the other person’s behavior as a guide for your own behavior?” and “to what extent did you try to accommodate the other person by adapting your behavior to “fit in” with his/hers?” It represents the extent to which participants felt that they actively worked to “get in sync” with their partners. The second factor, “partner rapport,” contained items such as “to what degree did the interaction seem smooth, natural, and relaxed to you?” and “to what extent would you like to

interact more with the other person in the future?” It represents the extent to which the dyad members felt that they had developed a rapport with each other.

Table 3.1 Factor Loadings for Partner Rapport and Partner Synchrony

	Partner Rapport	Partner Synchrony
To what degree did the interaction seem smooth, natural, and relaxed to you?	.73	-
How involving did you find the interaction?	.85	-
To what extent did you feel accepted and respected by the other person?	.83	-
To what extent would you like to interact more with the other person in the future?	.82	-
How much did you enjoy your interaction with the other person?	.91	-
How comfortable did you feel around the other person?	.69	-
How much did you like the other person?	.83	-
How much did you use the other person’s behavior as a guide for your own behavior?	-	.63
How self-conscious did you feel when you were with the other person?	-	.63
To what degree did the interaction seem awkward, forced, and strained to you?	-	.67
To what extent did you try to accommodate the other person by adapting your behavior to “fit in” with his/hers?	-	.64

Based on the content of its constituent items, “partner rapport” was deemed to be the most appropriate factor to use to measure the participants’ perceived interaction quality. Hypothesis 1 was tested using an APIM analysis (APIM; Campbell & Kashy, 2002; Kashy & Kenny, 2000) in which both dyad type (SS, SW, and WW) and gender composition (MM and FF) were treated as between-dyad predictors, while the perceived interaction quality score for each dyad (averaged across the two dyad members) was treated as a within-dyad dependent

measure. Contrary to Hypothesis 1, neither dyad type nor gender composition were found to be significant predictors of perceived interaction quality (i.e., perceived rapport). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants with a strong sense of self would engage in more personal self-disclosure than would participants with a weak sense of self. This prediction was tested using a different APIM analysis, in which gender composition (MM and FF) was treated as a between-dyad predictor, while the actor's and the partner's sense of self scores, as well as the interaction between these two predictors, were treated as within-dyad predictors. This analysis tested whether the actor's sense of self score would predict the actor's level of intimate or non-intimate self-disclosure. In addition to using both intimate and non-intimate self-disclosure as separate dependent measures in different models, a self-disclosure composite score, which was calculated by summing the total number of intimate and non-intimate disclosures offered by each member, was used as a third criterion in another model. This analysis revealed that none of the effects involving sense of self were found to be significant. Hypothesis 2 was, therefore, not supported.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that participants with a strong sense of self would initiate more conversation sequences than participants with a weak sense of self. As before, an APIM analysis was employed using gender composition (MM and FF) as a between dyad predictor, and the actor's and the partner's sense of self scores, as well as the interaction between these two predictors, as within-dyad predictors. This analysis was performed in order to test for a significant effect of the actor's sense of self score on the number of conversation sequences initiated across all three dyad types (SS, SW, and WW). The results of this analysis revealed that none of the effects tested was significant, indicating that the number of conversation sequences initiated within each dyad was not related to its gender composition or to the actor's or partner's sense of self. Hypothesis 3 was, therefore, not supported.

Hypothesis 4 concerned the extent to which each partner in the strong-weak dyad type would initiate or terminate mutual gazes. I predicted that the stronger sense-of-self dyad members would initiate a greater percentage of the mutual gazes than their weaker sense-of-self partners, but that the weaker sense-of-self dyad members would terminate a greater percentage of the mutual gazes than their stronger sense-of-self partners. To test these predictions, two dependent matched-pairs *t*-tests were conducted. Each test compared either the percentage of initiated or terminated mutual gazes between the members of the strong-weak dyads. Both *t*-tests revealed no significant differences for the number of initiated and terminated mutual gazes between those members possessing a strong and weak sense of self. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Hypothesis 5 concerned the extent to which strong versus weak dyad members used verbal reinforcements and head nods when interacting in strong-weak dyads. A dependent matched-pairs *t*-test was used to test the prediction that the dyad members with a weaker sense of self would display more head nods and verbal reinforcements than their stronger sense of self partners. In addition to using each behavior as a separate dependent measure in different models, head nods and verbal reinforcements were summed to create a third criterion intended to represent a combined version of the verbal and non-verbal forms of acknowledgment. Significant differences were found between members of strong-weak dyads for the number of verbal reinforcements, $t(18) = -3.48, p < .01$, and the combined sum of head nods and verbal reinforcements, $t(19) = -2.84, p < .01$. The means revealed that the weaker sense of self members not only used more verbal reinforcements ($M = 13.63, SD = 8.09$) than their stronger sense of self partners ($M = 8.95, SD = 5.50$), but used more overall forms of verbal and non-verbal acknowledgments ($M = 21.68, SD = 13.45$) than their partners ($M = 16.30, SD = 8.88$). Hypothesis 5 therefore received fairly clear and consistent support.

Finally, Hypothesis 6 concerned the patterns of personal pronoun usage by participants with a strong versus weak sense of self across all three dyad types (SS, SW, and WW). I

predicted that participants with a strong sense of self would use a greater percentage of first-person singular pronouns, whereas participants with a weak sense of self would use a greater percentage of second-, and/or third-person pronouns. I tested this prediction in an APIM analysis that included as predictors the between-dyad variable of gender composition (MM and FF), the within-dyad variables of the actor's and partner's sense of self scores, and the interaction between the last two variables. This analysis was applied to all three dependent measures: the percentage of first-person singular pronouns, the percentage of second-person pronouns, and the percentage of third-person pronouns. This analysis revealed that none of the sense of self predictors were found to correlate significantly with any of the three dependent measures. In other words, the use of pronouns was not dependent on participants' sense of self, thereby disconfirming Hypothesis 7.

3.2 Other Findings

The following sets of unexpected findings are based on a 4-covariate APIM analysis that tested the effects of both actors' and partners' sense of self, as well as the actor-partner interaction, on all of the behavioral and self-report measures that were obtained by both same-sex and mixed-sex dyads. The four covariates included the actor's gender, the partner's gender, the interaction of both member's gender, and a measure of the overall personality similarity of the two dyad members (described below). In these post hoc analyses, a more conservative alpha level of .025 was used to identify significant effects. This was done in order to control for the family-wise error that would accumulate with each dependent measure tested. According to this criterion, any reported effect with a p -value greater than .025 but less than .05 should be considered marginal.

3.2.1 Correlates of Overall Personality Similarity

The measure of overall personality similarity was calculated by correlating the dyad members' individual item scores across the 44-item Big Five Inventory, Sense of Self Scale, and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. The resulting profile correlations (or Q-correlations) were

then transformed to z-scores using Fisher *r*-to-*z* transformations and were subsequently used as the first covariate in my 4-covariate APIM model.

Across both same- and mixed-sex dyads, this partner similarity variable significantly predicted the duration of directed gazes, $F(1,84) = 4.46, p < .05$, the percentage of second-person pronouns used, $F(1,75) = 4.22, p < .05$, and the extent to which dyad members developed a rapport with each other, $F(1,81) = 8.81, p < .01$. The presence of a positive beta weight for this covariate in each model indicated that, as the dyad members' personalities' became more similar, they looked at each other longer, used a greater percentage of second-person pronouns, and reported feeling a greater sense of mutual rapport. Similar effects were found when using profile correlations that were based on items from the Big Five Inventory, as well as ones that were based on both the Sense of Self Scale and Self-Esteem Scale (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2 Significant Effects for Correlates of Personality Similarity: Overall, Big Five Inventory (BFI), and Self-Related (Sense of Self + Self-Esteem)

Overall	Duration of directed gazes	$F(1,84) = 4.46, p < .05$
	% Second-person pronouns	$F(1,75) = 4.22, p < .05$
	Partner rapport	$F(1,81) = 8.81, p < .01$
BFI	% Second-person pronouns	$F(1,73) = 4.08, p < .05$
	Partner rapport	$F(1,79) = 8.19, p < .01$
Self-Related	Partner rapport	$F(1,80) = 4.33, p < .05$

3.2.2 Gender Composition Effects

The 4-covariate model revealed a number of significant actor and partner main effects for gender (see Table 3.3), as well as significant actor's gender X partner's gender interaction effects (see Table 3.4). Significant differences between male and female actors across both same- and mixed-sex dyads were found in their posture, $F(1,166) = 95.50, p < .0001$, the number of initiated, $F(1,140) = 4.48, p < .05$, and terminated mutual gazes, $F(1,150) = 4.71, p <$

.05, average number of smiles, $F(1,145) = 5.08, p < .05$, average number of head nods, $F(1,35) = 4.31, p < .05$, and the average duration of speaking turns, $F(1,166) = 4.51, p < .05$.

Female actors displayed a greater degree of interactional involvement than their male counterparts. Female actors not only initiated a greater number of mutual gazes ($M = 9.18, SD = 7.25$) than males ($M = 6.88, SD = 5.36$), they also terminated a greater number ($M = 9.26, SD = 7.34$) of those mutual gazes than their male counterparts ($M = 6.85, SD = 5.75$). Furthermore, a greater average number of smiles was recorded for female actors ($M = 12.95, SD = 8.21$) than for male actors ($M = 9.96, SD = 7.52$). The females also tended to speak for longer periods of time ($M = 122.11, SD = 76.68$) than did the males ($M = 102.03, SD = 66.19$), and used more head nods ($M = 8.61, SD = 6.64$) than male actors ($M = 6.60, SD = 5.10$). On the other hand, and also consistent with previous findings, the male actors displayed more “open” and relaxed body postures ($M = 1.09, SD = 0.44$) than the female actors did ($M = 0.45, SD = .39$).

Significant partners effects for each gender were also found with respect to the duration of directed gazes, $F(1,154) = 10.75, p < .01$, the number of verbal reinforcements, $F(1,137) = 8.80, p < .01$, and the percentage of third-person pronouns used in the conversation, $F(1,153) = 5.38, p = .02$. Actors tended to look at their partners for longer periods of time when their partner was female ($M = 124.17, SD = 95.21$) rather than male ($M = 81.07, SD = 63.27$). In addition, more verbal reinforcements were used with female ($M = 12.63, SD = 9.01$) than with male ($M = 8.45, SD = 6.56$) partners, and a greater percentage of third-person pronouns were used when interacting with a male ($M = 0.22, SD = 0.14$) rather than a female ($M = 0.19, SD = 0.11$) partner (suggesting less personal conversations than ones in which there was a higher combined percentage of first-person and second-person pronouns).

Table 3.3 Significant Actor and Partner Effects Related to Gender

Actor Effects		Females	Males
Duration of speaking turns	$F(1,166) = 4.32, p < .05$	122.11	102.03
Number of smiles	$F(1,145) = 5.08, p < .05$	12.95	9.96
Initiated mutual gazes	$F(1,140) = 4.48, p < .05$	9.18	6.88
Terminated mutual gazes	$F(1,150) = 4.71, p < .05$	9.96	6.85
Number of head nods	$F(1,35) = 4.31, p < .05$	8.61	6.60
Posture	$F(1,166) = 95.50, p < .0001$	0.45	1.09
Partner Effects		Females	Males
Duration of directed gazes	$F(1,154) = 10.75, p < .01$	124.07	81.07
Verbal Reinforcements	$F(1,137) = 8.80, p < .01$	12.63	8.45
% Third-person pronouns	$F(1,153) = 5.38, p = .02$	0.19	0.22

The two significant actor's gender X partner's gender interaction effects were for the total number of conversation sequences initiated, $F(1,81) = 4.53, p < .05$, and the percentage of second-person pronouns used in the conversation, $F(1,75) = 6.09, p = .02$. The greatest number of conversation sequences were initiated by male actors when interacting with male partners ($M = 0.87, SD = .94$), while the greatest percentage of second-person pronouns were used by male actors while in the presence of female partners ($M = 0.25, SD = 0.19$). The first of these findings is indicative of interactions that started up, stalled out, and had to be re-started repeatedly. The second of these findings is indicative of male dyad members having a stronger personal interest in female partners than in male partners.

Table 3.4 Significant Interaction Effects Related to Gender: Male Actor – Male Partner (MA–MP), Female Actor – Male Partner (FA–MP), Male Actor – Female Partner (MA–FP), Female Actor – Female Partner (FA–FP)

	MA – MP	FA – MP	MA – FP	FA – FP
Conversation Sequences	.87	.38	.50	.75
% Second-person pronouns	.18	.21	.25	.16

3.2.3 Sense of Self Effects

The only significant but non-predicted effect involving sense of self showed that actors tended to develop more of a rapport with partners having a strong ($M = 50.67$, $SD = 11.76$) rather than weak ($M = 48.18$, $SD = 13.35$) sense of self, $F(1,132) = 4.14$, $p < .05$. This finding suggests that participants were more comfortable interacting with partners who had a clear sense of who they were (i.e. strong sense of self) and therefore, made more of an effort to develop a rapport with them.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to examine the influence of the participants' sense of self on the behaviors they displayed and the perceptions they reported in unstructured dyadic interactions. Although the predictions I originally proposed suggest that sense of self would be a reliable predictor of greater interactional involvement (i.e. initiating more mutual gazes, increased number of smiles, engaging in more personal self-disclosure), the data supported only one of the original six predictions and instead shifted the focus of interest to a measure of the global similarity of the dyad members' personality.

4.1 Predicted Effects

Of the six hypotheses involving how the strength of the participants' sense of self might be related to various aspects of their behavior and perceptions in initial, unstructured dyadic interactions, only one hypothesis was supported. Specifically, the data confirmed that participants with a weak sense of self, when interacting with a partner possessing a stronger sense of self, tended to use a greater number of verbal and/or nonverbal forms of acknowledgment, such as head nods. This finding may indicate that participants with a weaker sense of self are unsure about how to relate to an unfamiliar interaction partner, and therefore allow the partner to "take the lead" in the conversation so that they can look to the partner for guidance. As a result of taking a more passive and reactive role, the weaker sense of self members might therefore use more verbal reinforcements as a way of acknowledging their partner's comments and attempting to keep the conversation going, all the while allowing the focus to remain on their partners.

With regard to the five remaining hypotheses, the greater interactional involvement that was expected from participants with a strong sense of self was not supported. More specifically, not only did participants with a strong sense of self not disclose more personal information about themselves, they did not initiate more conversation sequences or a greater number of mutual gazes, and they also did not use a greater percentage of first-person pronouns. Participants with a strong sense of self also did not terminate a greater number of mutual gazes, and did not use a greater percentage of second- and/or third-person pronouns. Finally, the expected difference in mutual rapport between the dyad compositions (SS, SW, and WW) was also not evident. Participants in strong-strong and strong-weak dyads did not develop a greater rapport with each other than those in weak-weak dyads.

Why was only one of the six original hypotheses supported in this study? One explanation is that having a strong sense of self does not necessarily ensure that one will display greater interactional involvement. People who have a good sense of their own identity may express that awareness in different and more subtle ways. As the present results have shown, the effects related to sense of self were primarily associated with one's sense of comfort during the interaction, as opposed to one's level of interactional involvement *per se*. More specifically, individuals with a weak sense of self seemed more uncomfortable, as evidenced by their using more forms of acknowledgment (e.g. head nods) when expressing themselves, and by their report of greater feelings of rapport and comfort when they interacted with someone who had a strong, versus weak, sense of self.

4.2 Other Effects

4.2.1 Global Personality Similarity

With regard to effects that emerged in the data analyses not predicted in advance, some of the more interesting findings were ones that involved the profile correlation measure of the global similarity in the dyad members' personalities. These results revealed that, as dyad members' personalities become more similar, they not only looked at each other for longer

periods of time, but also used a greater percentage of second-person pronouns, and reported experiencing greater feelings of mutual rapport. All of these findings are consistent with the interpretation that personality similarity is “recognized” (even unconsciously) fairly early in a developing relationship, and that it promotes a greater sense of rapport between the partners.

The idea that personality similarity can facilitate greater liking and rapport between strangers can be traced back to George Kelly’s (1955) personal construct theory, and evidence consistent with this idea has been found in number of studies over the years. For example, Izard (1960) had the members of a college freshman class complete a personality measure and then rate each other on likeability after getting to know one another for an entire semester. The results showed that the classmates who were rated as “most likeable” had similar personalities to those rating them, whereas participants who were rated as “least likeable” had personalities different from their raters.

Other relevant studies required the participants to rate how well they liked a particular stranger after reading “self-report” responses intended to gauge the particular stranger’s personality (e.g., Byrne, Griffitt, & Stefaniak, 1967; Griffitt, 1969). Although the stranger’s “self-report” responses in these studies were actually prepared in advance by the experimenters, the results again showed that participants gave higher liker ratings to strangers whose personalities were presumably similar to their own.

With regard to the current study, research has shown that interpersonal perception between strangers is surprisingly reliable at “zero-acquaintance,” particularly for the traits that are more observable (Marcus & Leatherwood, 1998; Marcus & Lehman, 2002). In other words, strangers are fairly accurate in perceiving each other’s observable personality traits (related to extraversion and agreeableness), even when no prior interaction has taken place (i.e., zero acquaintance). Because the participants in the current study had an opportunity to interact over a 6-min observation period, it is reasonable to assume that their perceptions of each other’s

personalities were relatively accurate, even though such accuracy was not assessed in the present study.

Although previous studies have examined only the relation between perceived similarity and liking, the results of the current study revealed that the actual similarity in strangers' personalities was related to the strength of their perceived rapport after only six minutes of interaction. This is an impressive finding when one considers that the length of the relationship of the participants in Izard's (1960) study was an entire academic semester. Indeed, if it were not for previous findings on the accuracy of personality judgments made at "zero acquaintance," one might be skeptical that the relationship I found could develop so quickly. Even still, the present finding may be unprecedented given the fact that the predictor in the present case is global personality similarity rather than similarity on a single highly observable personality dimension.

4.2.2 Strong versus Weak Sense of Self

Interestingly, the present findings also revealed that, independent of the role of global personality similarity, perceptions of rapport were generally greater for dyad members whose partners had a strong, rather than weak, sense of self. This finding suggests that participants were more comfortable interacting with someone who had a strong sense of his or her identity, as opposed to someone whose sense of identity was weaker and more tenuous. A possible interpretation of this effect is that participants with a strong sense of self are more consistent and predictable in the way they present and express themselves, making it easier for their partners to develop a sense of rapport with them.

4.2.3 Actor Effects Related to Gender

Further evidencing their greater involvement when interacting in same-sex dyads, it was found that, when compared to male actors, female actors spoke for longer periods of time, smiled more often, initiated and terminated a greater number of mutual gazes, and acknowledged their partners more often through the use of head nods. These effects are again

consistent with previous findings (e.g. Ickes & Barnes, 1977; Ickes et al., 1986; Ickes et al., 1988; Schermer, & Steeno, 1979), which show that women tend to display more of an intimate and open interaction style when interacting with strangers.

Interestingly, although female actors displayed greater interactional involvement than male actors did, males displayed more “open” and relaxed body postures. This effect has also been found in previous dyadic interaction studies (Ickes & Barnes, 1977; Ickes et al., 1988; Schermer, & Steeno, 1979), indicating that although males do not feel the need for an involving interaction, they do tend to exhibit more open and expansive body postures by stretching out their legs and extending their arms out from their bodies.

4.2.4 Partner Effects Related to Gender

In addition to the specific behaviors attributed to female actors, females were also found to influence the behaviors their partners displayed. Actors of both genders used more verbal reinforcements and made more eye contact when interacting with female rather than with male partners. It seems reasonable to conclude that most actors—even those who were not expressive and comfortable in leading the conversation—enjoyed the company of a female partner.

On the other hand, interactions with male partners were found to elicit the use of more third-person pronouns. Actors in both genders may have sensed their male partner’s hesitancy in being expressive, and may therefore have kept the conversational focus on third parties through a greater use of third-person pronouns in order to reduce of the conversational pressure experienced by many males during initial interactions

4.2.5 Interaction Effects Related to Gender

Finally, male actors were found to initiate the greatest number of conversation sequences when interacting with male rather than female partners. Although males are apparently not as concerned as female with having an “involving” initial interaction (Ickes, Schermer, & Steeno, 1979) and have little desire to talk about themselves or learn about each

other, they may still feel the need to “fill the silence.” As a result, they may attempt to initiate a number of conversation sequences without putting forth the effort needed to sustain them.

In cases involving mixed-sex dyads, however, male actors were found to use a greater percentage of second-person pronouns, indicating a desire to focus their attention on their female interaction partners. This effect can either reflect the men’s genuine interest in their female partner or the men’s desire to keep the focus off themselves.

4.3 Future Research

The current results suggest that sense of self may have a more subtle and indirect, rather than a more obvious and direct, influence on social interactions. As noted previously, sense of self might affect one’s sense of comfort and rapport during an interaction, rather than directly influencing one’s interactional involvement behavior. Given the subtlety of these effects, future research on the sense of self might be more profitably directed toward other domains, such as politics (i.e. leadership roles) and compliance.

The act of choosing a political candidate in any capacity typically requires a great deal of consideration. Although most leaders may hold different beliefs and opinions, they all seem to possess a set of influential qualities that make them desirable candidates; in addition to being assertive, confident, and charismatic (Levine & Moreland, 1998), being an effective leader has also been associated with the ability to make difficult decisions (Simon, 2006). Given their ability to present themselves in a confident and assertive manner, and making decisions without relying on the opinions of others, one would expect those with a strong sense of self to be better equipped at taking on a leadership role.

Future research may, therefore, wish to investigate the degree to which sense of self influences one’s leadership ability, and whether those with a strong sense of self are more likely to acquire such a role. Moreover, because leaders who have a strong sense of self should be more likely to have, and to express, consistency in their core values, future research should address the complementary question of whether voters are more likely to rate leaders with a

strong sense of self as being more consistent in this regard—and to actually vote for them in political elections.

The influence of sense of self on one's susceptibility to compliance is another promising area for future research. Because people with a weak sense of self tend to use others as a guide for their own behavior, future research may be interested in determining whether they would be more willing to comply with requests made by an authority figure (Milgram, 1963) or be more susceptible to compliance techniques using others as a source of comparison (i.e. social validation; Cialdini & Trost, 1998) than those with a strong sense of identity. On the other hand, influence techniques such as "foot-in-the-door" (Cialdini & Trost, 1998), which depend on the influence target's need to act consistently over time, may have more of an influence on people with a strong sense of self. Because this technique typically begins with a reasonably small request and ends with a much larger one, those with a strong sense of self may be more inclined to comply with the unreasonably larger request in order to maintain a consistent view of their well-defined self-concept. One can therefore make nuanced, differentiated predictions about which particular influence techniques will be most effective for individuals with a weak versus strong sense of self.

4.4 Concluding Comments

The current study has shown that the influence of sense of self on the behaviors displayed in initial unstructured dyadic interactions was more subtle than the hypotheses originally suggested. Those with a weak sense of self were found to use more forms of acknowledgment, and reported that they could develop a sense of rapport most easily with partners who had a clear and stable identity. These findings indicate that sense of self was, therefore, more closely associated with participants' sense of comfort and rapport, as opposed to their interactional involvement. Interestingly, I also found an unpredicted but theoretically intriguing relationship between dyad members' actual similarity and their mutual liking for each other that warrants exploration in future research. Although the current study has only provided

a glimpse of the relationship between sense of self and its impact on social interactions, the additional research directions that have been suggested may greatly enrich our understanding of the sense of self construct.

APPENDIX A

SENSE OF SELF SCALE

Below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and characteristics. Please read each statement and consider the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Then respond to the statement as accurately as possible by using the following scale to indicate how much you agree with it.

- 1 – strongly disagree
- 2 – disagree somewhat
- 3 – neither agree nor disagree
- 4 – agree somewhat
- 5 – strongly agree

1. I wish I were more consistent in my feelings.
2. It's hard for me to figure out my own personality, interests, and opinions.
3. I often confuse my own thoughts and feelings with those of others.
4. I often think how fragile my existence is.
5. I have a pretty good sense of what my long-term goals are in life.
6. I sometimes wonder if people can actually see me.
7. Other people's thoughts and feelings seem to carry greater weight than my own.
8. I have a clear and definite sense of who I am and what I'm all about.
9. My opinions and values can change almost as quickly as my moods.
10. It bothers me that my personality doesn't seem to be well-defined.
11. I'm not sure that I can understand or put much trust in my thoughts and feelings.
12. I find it difficult to distinguish my beliefs and perspectives from other people's beliefs and perspectives.
13. Who am I? is a question that I ask myself a lot.
14. I need other people to help me understand what I think or how I feel.
15. My beliefs and values can change from day to day.
16. I tend to be very sure of myself and stick to my own preferences even when the group I am with expresses different preferences.

APPENDIX B

PERCEPTIONS OF INTERACTION

In the following questions we are interested in assessing your perceptions of the interaction between you and the other subject over the six-minute period that you waited together. Indicate your answers by circling the point on each scale that best describes your feelings or perceptions. Please reflect on how you felt during the interaction and try to answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible. Your answers will *not* be shown to the other subject and will be used for statistical purposes *only*. You may skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering.

1. How much did you feel a need to communicate with the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very much

2. How much do you think the other person felt a need to communicate with you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very much

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

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very much

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

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very much

5. To what degree did you attempt to take the lead in the conversation?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very much

6. To what degree did the other person attempt to take the lead in the conversation?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

7. How self-conscious did you feel when you were with the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

8. How self-conscious do you think the other person felt when he or she was with you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

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

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

10. To what degree do you think the interaction seemed *awkward*, *forced*, and *strained* to the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

11. To what degree did the interaction seem *smooth*, *natural*, and *relaxed* to you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

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

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

13. How involving did you find the interaction?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

14. How involving do you think the other person found the interaction?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

15. To what extent did you feel *put down, patronized, or rejected* by the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

16. To what extent do you think the other person felt *put down, patronized, or rejected* by you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

17. To what extent did you feel *accepted and respected* by the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

18. To what extent do you think the other person felt *accepted and respected* by you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

19. To what extent would you like to interact more with the other person in the future?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

20. To what extent do you think the other person would like to interact more with you in the future?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

21. How much did you enjoy your interaction with the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all

very much

22. To what extent did you try to accommodate the other person by adapting your behavior to “fit in” with his/hers?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

23. To what extent did the other person try to accommodate you by adapting his/her behavior to “fit in” with yours?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

24. How comfortable did you feel around the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

25. How comfortable do *you* think the other person felt around you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

26. How much did you like the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

27. How much do *you* think the other person liked you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very much

APPENDIX C

BIG FIVE INVENTORY

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who ***likes to spend time with others***? Please choose a number for each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. -

Disagree Strongly 1	Disagree a little 2	Neither Agree nor Disagree 3	Agree a little 4	Agree Strongly 5
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

I see myself as *someone who*

- 1. is talkative
- 2. tends to find fault with others
- 3. Does a thorough job
- 4. is depressed, blue
- 5. is original, comes up with new ideas
- 6. is reserved
- 7. is helpful and unselfish with others
- 8. can be somewhat careless
- 9. is relaxed, handles stress well
- 10. is curious about many different things
- 11. is full of energy
- 12. starts quarrels with others
- 13. is a reliable worker
- 14. can be tense
- 15. Is a creative problem solver, a deep thinker
- 16. generates a lot of enthusiasm
- 17. has a forgiving nature
- 18. tends to be disorganized
- 19. worries a lot
- 20. has an active imagination
- 21. tends to be quiet
- 22. is generally trusting
- 23. tends to be lazy
- 24. is emotionally stable, not easily upset
- 25. is inventive

- ___ 26. has an assertive personality
- ___ 27. is cold and aloof , reserved
- ___ 28. perseveres until the task is finished
- ___ 29. can be moody
- ___ 30. values artistic, aesthetic experiences
- ___ 31. is sometimes shy, inhibited
- ___ 32. is considerate and kind to almost everyone
- ___ 33. does things efficiently
- ___ 34. remains calm in tense situations
- ___ 35. prefers work that is routine
- ___ 36. is outgoing sociable
- ___ 37. is sometimes rude to others
- ___ 38. makes plans and follows through with them
- ___ 39. gets nervous easily
- ___ 40. likes to reflect, play with ideas
- ___ 41. has few artistic interests
- ___ 42. likes to cooperate with others
- ___ 43. is easily distracted
- ___ 44. is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

APPENDIX D

SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and characteristics. Please read each statement and consider the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Then respond to the statement as accurately as possible by using the following scale to indicate how much you agree with it.

- 1 – strongly disagree
- 2 – disagree somewhat
- 3 – neither agree nor disagree
- 4 – agree somewhat
- 5 – strongly agree

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
2. I feel like a person who has a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel like a failure.
4. I feel as if I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel as if I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I have a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish that I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think that I am no good at all.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Byrne, D., Griffitt, W., & Stefaniak, D. (1967). Attraction and similarity of personality characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*(1), 82-90.
- Campbell, L., & Kashy, D.A. (2002). Estimating actor, partner, and interaction effects for dyadic data using PROC MIXED and HLM: A user-friendly guide. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 327-342.
- Cialdini, R.B., Trost, M.R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity, and compliance. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed, Vol. 2, pp. 151-192). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fidler, J. (1997). The Experiment Management System. Washington, DC: Sona Systems Ltd.
- Flury, J.M. & Ickes W. (2007). Having a weak versus strong sense of self: The Sense of Self Scale (SOSS). *Self and Identity, 6*, 281-303.
- Griffitt, W. (1969). Attitude evoked anticipatory responses and attraction. *Psychonomic Science, 14*(4), 153-155.
- Ickes, W. & Barnes, R.D. (1977). The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(5), 315-330.
- Ickes, W., Schermer, B., Steeno, J. (1979). Sex and sex-role influences in same-sex dyads. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 42*(4), 373-385.
- Ickes, W., Robertson, E., Tooke, W., & Teng, G. (1986). Naturalistic social cognition: Methodology, assessment, and validation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(1), 66-82.
- Ickes, W., Tooke, W., Stinson, L., Baker, V.L., & Bissonnette, V. (1988). Naturalistic

- social cognition: Intersubjectivity in same-sex dyads. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 12(1), 58-84.
- Ickes, W., Bissonnette, V., Garcia, S., & Stinson, L. (1990) Implementing and using the dyadic interaction paradigm. In C. Hendrick & M.S. Clark (Eds.), *Research methods in personality and social psychology* (pp. 16-44). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ickes, W. (1994). Methods of studying close relationships. In A.L. Weber & J.H. Harvey (Eds.) *Perspectives on close relationships* (pp. 18-44). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. [Reprinted in W. Ickes & S.W. Duck (Eds.), *The social psychology of personal relationships*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.]
- Izard, C.E. (1960). Personality similarity, positive affect, and interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61(3), 484-485.
- John, O.P., Donahue, E.M., & Kentle, R.L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory- Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Kashy, D.A., & Kenny, D.A. (2000). The analysis of data from dyads and groups. In H.T. Reis & Co. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social psychology* (pp. 451-477). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*, New York: Norton
- Kenny, D. (1994). *Interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis*. New York: Guilford.
- Kernis, M.H. (2005). Measuring self-esteem in context: The importance of stability of self-esteem in psychological functioning. *Journal of Personality*, 73(6), 1-37.
- Levine, J., & Moreland, R.M. (1998). Small groups. In D.T. Gilbert et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, pp. 415-469. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Lieb, K., Zannarini, M.C., Schmahl, C., Linehan, M.M., & Bohus, M. (2004). Borderline

- personality disorder. *Lancet*, 364, 453-461.
- Markey, P.M., Funder, D.C., Ozer, D.J. (2003). Complementarity of interpersonal behaviors in dyadic interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(9), 1082-1090.
- Marcus, D.K., & Leatherwood, J.C. (1998). The interpersonal circle at zero acquaintance: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 32, 297-313.
- Marcus, D.K., & Lehman, S.J. (2002). Are there sex differences in interpersonal perception at zero acquaintance? A social relations analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 190-207.
- Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 371-378.
- Paunonen, S.V., & Ashton, M.C. (2001). Big Five factors and facets and the prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 524-539.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simon, A.F. (2006). Leadership and managing ambivalence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58(2), 91-105.
- Tryon, G.S., Devito, A.J., Halligan, F.R., Kane, A.S., & Shea, J.J. (1988). Borderline personality disorder and development: counseling university students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67, 178-181.
- Von Bergen, C. W., Soper, Barlow, Balloun, Joseph L., Crawford, Karen U. (1996). Self-esteem and self-concept confusion in males and females. *College Student Journal*, 30(4), 418-424.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Ronen Cuperman graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2004. He received a Master of Science in Experimental Psychology from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2008 under the supervision of Dr. William Ickes. He is planning on continuing to get his PhD in Experimental Psychology at the University of Texas at Arlington.