

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7916980

BERG, CARL

AN OBSERVATIONAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ANXIETY IN
DYADIC INTERACTIONS.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, PH.D., 1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106



COPYRIGHT BY

CARL BERG

1979

AN OBSERVATIONAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ANXIETY IN DYADIC INTERACTIONS

BY

Carl Berg

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Clinical Psychology in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

1979

APPROVAL PAGE

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty
in Clinical Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/11/79
date

Paul Wachtel
Chairman of Examining Committee

April 12, 1979
date

Martin L. Hoffman
Executive Officer

Paul Wachtel
Paul Wachtel, Ph.D.

Herbert Nechin, Ph.D.

Harold Wilensky, Ph.D.
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

AN OBSERVATIONAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ANXIETY IN DYADIC INTERACTIONS

by

Carl Berg

Adviser: Professor Paul Wachtel, Ph.D.

The present study constitutes an intensive inquiry into the nature of social anxiety in dyadic interpersonal situations, in order to gain some understanding of the process by which anxiety is communicated and manifested and to observe the precise effects of this anxiety on the course of social interactions. Results indicate that reactions to and sources of interpersonal anxiety vary greatly from subject to subject, however, each individual subject appears to maintain a consistent individualized behavioral response pattern to interpersonal anxiety. The focus of attention of anxious subjects in social interaction seems directed primarily on their own anxious performance and additionally on the anxious features of the interaction itself. The anxious subjects also tend to catastrophize the anxious aspects of their own performance and tend to evaluate their own behavior more negatively than their conversational partners. The high anxious subjects seem to retain an evaluative set that appears resistant to modification and revision. While the general quality of an interaction is accurately perceived, the anxious subjects tend to misinterpret or fail to register subtle changes in attitude or interest on the part of their conversational

partners. Finally, high anxious subjects exhibit some adaptive responses in the course of several successive social trials and begin to exhibit skills that were not readily observable during their initial exchanges. This suggestive finding argues against a social skills deficit formulation as the etiology of social anxiety.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I	1
Introduction	
History	
Chapter II	23
Method Section	
Subject Pool	
Questionnaire	
Questionnaire Scoring	
Subject Pool Description	
Subject Selection	
Rooms	
Procedure	
Chapter III	39
Descriptive Analysis	
Chapter IV	149
Discussion	
Appendix	165
Bibliography.....	177

CHAPTER I

Social anxiety in interpersonal dyadic interactions is a topic of considerable relevance, not only for the clinical practitioner, but also for a comprehensive understanding of human interpersonal situations. Anxiety is probably the greatest debilitating factor in human interpersonal relationships, and consequently a target for many approaches to therapeutic intervention. The present study constitutes an intensive inquiry into the nature of social anxiety in dyadic interpersonal situations, in order to gain some understanding of the process by which anxiety is manifested and communicated, and to observe the precise effects of this anxiety on the course of social interaction. Sullivan (1953) maintained that "to the extent that one can retrospectively observe the exact situation in which one's anxiety was called out, one may be able to infer the corresponding pattern of difficulty in dealing with others." It is within this spirit of retrospective observation, that our present investigation will be carried out.

To understand the specific debilitating effects of social anxiety, it seems necessary to first present a basic conception of the course of social dyadic interaction from which we may then trace the debilitating and interfering consequences. Turner(1968) presents such a basic

conception of the course of "normal" dyadic social interactions that will be reviewed and utilized for this purpose.

In his view, "an interaction episode begins with a gesture made by one party," with a subsequent interpretation of that gesture by another party, which serves as the criterion and standard for future responses in that interaction. The party in the interaction receiving the gesture, quickly places an interpretation on it and responds upon the basis of that interpretation. In making his response gesture, the responding party has in mind an interpretation of his own response gesture and this subsequently prepares him for a range of consequential responses. Turner labels the forgoing simple sequence of gesture and response "stage I" of the interaction process. Turner comments on this first stage of social interaction,

...each person is acting without preconceptions derived from the current interaction sequence. At the close of this stage, each has developed preconceptions. Each now anticipates and measures the gesture of the other against this anticipation or preparedness...Stage I can only exist in degrees since the total absence of preconceptions is unimaginable. (p.95)

It should be mentioned, at this point, before continuing to Turner's conception of Stage II, that these all important initial interpretations that shape any subsequent interactional response and gesture, are derived from a preconceived self-conception that an individual brings with him to this novel interactional situation. In more concrete terms, if an individual perceives himself as being socially anxious, this self-conception will undoubtedly influence and shape the nature of his personal interpretations in the initial phase of the social interaction. This

self-conception that the individual carries with him is derived from the history of previous social encounters that he has personally experienced.

Tiryakian (1968) addresses this development of a sense of social self in his statement,

...the becoming of a person is always a social becoming: I become a person as I progress through social situations...The encounter with others is vital in achieving authentic selfhood, for it is in social participation that one achieves consciousness of the self as a person...The person may be viewed as the realization of the self in history. (p.85)

Therefore, we begin to see a cyclical pattern for the socially anxious individual. He brings with him a self-conception based on previous social encounters that greatly influence and shape his interpretations of present social situations. Of interest in the present study will be to observe and elaborate on the unfolding of this process.

Stage II of the interaction process, as characterized by Turner, is viewed as a "testing and revision" phase of social exchange. As we have seen, the individual establishes a set of expectancies on the basis of his initial interpretation of his conversational partner's gestures and responses. In the second stage, Turner states,

...his initially tentative conceptions (of his partner) are modified and replaced until a conception is formed which adequately prepares him to cope with most of (his partner's) gestures without constant disruption and revision in attitude. (p.95)

We may briefly speculate, from the results of pilot data, that this stage of social interaction is most vulnerable to a high degree of

social anxiety in the participants of that interaction. The apparent interpretational rigidity of the socially anxious individual seems to leave him unable to adequately modify and revise this initial conception and consequently leaves him inadequately prepared to cope with his conversational partner's subsequent gestures and responses. This would, seem to engender a greater degree of social anxiety, which, in turn, would foster additional perceptual and interpretational distortions. This rigidity is tangentially referred to in an empirical study (Nevill, 1977) in which the results support the hypothesis that the availability of multiple roles to an individual in social interaction is related to that person's skill in his subsequent social behavior.

Turner also addresses the interpretational tendencies of an individual in social interactions by stating,

...the most general tendency is to place on the gesture some interpretation for which one is prepared. If (one) is fully prepared for a gesture of sympathy, he may miss the faint note of sarcasm. If he expects a slight, even a sincere compliment is likely to appear sarcastic. (p.95)

He concludes that "validation of a particular self-conception becomes the guiding consideration" in certain interactional exchanges. Turner proposes that when a response gesture falls within the range of preparedness, which he terms a "congruent" gesture, the subsequent course of interaction will continue uninterrupted in the pre-established direction. On the other hand, a "non-congruent" response gesture, outside the range of preparedness, will interrupt the smooth flow of the interaction and the individual "may abandon his effort to communicate." It will, again, be interesting to carefully observe the state and nature

of this "preparedness" in the subjects of the present study, while tracing its subsequent effect on the interactional discourse.

Having now presented this very basic conception of dyadic social interaction from which we may observe the direct consequences of social anxiety, it seems appropriate at this point to present some literature on the characteristics of the socially anxious individual.

As a result of three years of clinical observations, Nichols (1974) developed a comprehensive list of the twelve most frequently recurring features in people experiencing anxiety and fear in social situations. He views socially anxious people as having an increased "sensitivity to and fearfulness of disapproval and criticism," along with "a strong tendency to project disapproval and criticism." Not only does the individual expect to be critically regarded, but he often responds to a perceived critical appraisal that is often non-existent in the actual interpersonal situation. Similarly, Ludwig and Lazarus (1972) report that the four most irrational cognitive patterns encountered in socially inhibited and anxious individuals are self-criticism and perfectionism, unrealistic approval needs, unrealistic labeling of aggressive and assertive behavior and, finally, excessive criticism of others.

The socially anxious individual maintains a "low self-evaluation" and a sense of not being as capable and powerful as others. Nichols states: "This is often accompanied by or originates from a feeling of oddness and inadequacy provoked by the continual anxiety reactions in ordinary circumstances." Therefore, the socially anxious individual's low self-evaluations are continually reinforced by the repeated difficulties he experiences in interpersonal situations. This also serves to

increase his expectancy that further interpersonal problems will develop when faced with similar social situations. This may also increase the possibility of the development of behavioral patterns that attempt to avoid the source of this apprehension. Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975) and Arkowitz et al. (1975) report that the major factor in socially inhibited minimal dating college students seems to be the avoidance of social situations in response to the excessive anxiety they experience.

Another feature seen by Nichols as characteristic of the socially anxious individual is the maintenance of very "rigid concepts of appropriate social behavior." This tends to manifest itself in the inability to vary one's behavior in accordance with the difficulties one is experiencing. "The expectation of being required to behave in a certain way and the anticipation that departure from this brings disapproval" prevents the individual from making corrective and adaptive responses in order to deal with his interpersonal difficulties.

"Negative fantasy producing anticipatory anxiety" is the fifth feature characteristic of the socially anxious individual (Nichols, 1974). This feature consists of the individual's consistent negative fantasy that approaching social situations will ultimately result in a confirmation of their fears. "This creates growing tension and anticipatory anxiety." Nichols (1974) continues, "Certain cues or features related to the situation may acquire special significance as a result of these fantasies and become triggers to anxiety when the real situation is finally faced." (p.304)

Several other factors characteristic of the socially anxious individual deal with the person's idea that the experienced anxiety will

be communicated to others. These include: "an increased awareness and fear of scrutiny from others...an exaggerated interpretation of the sensory feedback related to tension or embarrassment" and "a fear of being seen to be 'ill' or losing control." All these characteristics seem to contain the belief that the experience of anxiety is shameful and, if noticed by others, the result would be immediate rejection. Consequently, the individual attempts to hide his anxiety, which ultimately results in further anxiety. "Detections of the sensations of anxiety may then provoke alarm and build-up of that response. The person thus becomes anxious about being anxious." (p.304)

Finally, Nichols (1974) reports that the anxiety response in socially fearful individuals is unpredictable. He states: "A situation expected to produce violent anxiety may pass easily whilst another normally dealt with successfully may unexpectedly produce panic." This feature points to the fact that the anxious response cannot be viewed as a reliable reaction to external stimuli, but rather as an interaction of many intervening factors. Nichols (1974) views the time available for preceding fantasy and the mood of the day as two important factors in this reaction.

Having delineated some salient characteristics of the socially anxious individual, we will now turn our attention to some theoretical perspectives regarding the interpersonal basis of social anxiety which has long been recognized in psychological theory. Sullivan (1953), Fromm (1941), and Horney (1937) have all proposed theories based upon interpersonal relations.

In tracing the beginnings of the self-system, Sullivan (1953)

views the specific responses to anxiety as being largely responsible for the development of future interpersonal relations. He states:

This is the great way of learning in infancy, and later in childhood -- by the grading of anxiety....in charting a selection of behavioral units which are not attended by an increase in anxiety. (p.171)

He continues:

...this business of whether one is getting more or less anxious is in a large sense the basic influence which determines interpersonal relations -- that is, it is not the motor, it does not call interpersonal relations into being, but it more or less directs the course of their development. (p.172)

He also points to the terribly disorganizing effect of anxiety on the individual. He emphatically points out that:

...it is necessary to appreciate that it is anxiety which is responsible for a great part of the inadequate, inefficient, unduly rigid or otherwise unfortunate performances of people. (p.172)

According to Sullivan, anxiety can be characterized by an always unpleasant feeling that "all is not going well, or a noticing of some disturbance in the activity or postural tone in one of the zones of interaction -- a change in one's facial expression or one's voice, as examples -- a feeling of tightening up in some skeletal muscles, a disturbance of the action of one's belly, a realization that one has begun to sweat." (p.378) He claims that this sense of a diminished well-being signals the individual in the interpersonal field to protect his self-esteem. This will have definite "complicating" consequences on the interpersonal action.

Sullivan describes a process underlying the interpersonal

communication of anxiety in terms of "empathy." (p.41) While he considered empathy to be most applicable to describe the arousal of anxiety in the infant by the mother, he also assumed that this means of emotional communication can last throughout life. In the adult, Sullivan maintained that anxiety is a "complex" emotion and suggested as its components "embarrassment, shame, humiliation, guilt and chagrin." He believed that these emotions were "elaborated" (from anxiety) by specific early training.

Several empirical studies have emerged which lend support to Sullivan's notion of the empathic communication of anxiety. For instance, Reusch and Prestwood (1949) found that listening to voice and speech recordings of anxious people in psychotherapy induced anxiety in the listeners. In addition, several animal studies have approached the problem of the communication of anxiety. Masserman (1943), Liddell (1950), Davitz and Mason (1955) and Lirzman (1955) have all demonstrated that the presence of a nonfearful animal had a calming effect on a fearful one.

One human study, in particular, dealt specifically with the question of interpersonal communication of anxiety in dyadic interactions. Mattsson (1960) experimentally investigated whether a person who interacts with a less anxious person will himself become less anxious and whether a person who interacts with a more anxious person will become anxious. The experimental procedure involved interactions of pairs of subjects in a cooperative structured work task with a low current electric shock utilized as the experimental induction of anxiety in the situation. The extent to which anxiety was communicated was measured

by changes in blood pressure, finger sweat indices and scores on a behavioral rating scale. The results of this study indicated that a person who interacts with a more anxious person will himself become more anxious on all three measures of anxiety employed in this study. The second hypothesis, however, was not supported. In attempting to account for the phenomenon of empathic communication of anxiety, the author suggests that previous conditioning to observable peripheral cues of an anxiety response may increase anxiety in the observer.

One area of investigation utilizing a cognitive approach in attempting to understand the sources of interpersonal anxiety is the study of dating anxiety. Clark and Arkowitz (1975) found in their observational study of high and low socially anxious men interacting with a female confederate, that high anxious subjects consistently underestimate the positive aspects of their social performance and overestimate the negative aspects more than the low-anxious subjects. In a comparison of the self-ratings of each group to those of the judges, they found that high anxious subjects attributed more social anxiety and less social skill to their performance than the judges did. Interestingly, the low anxious subjects rated themselves more socially skillful than the judges did. The major difference between high and low socially anxious males, they conclude, seems to be in the way they evaluate their own behavior and not in terms of their respective repertoire of social skills. These findings are further supported by a number of other studies (Borkovec, Stone, O'Brien & Kaloupek, 1974; Rehm & Martin, 1968). Clark and Arkowitz (1975) also report an unpublished study by Mischel, et al. in which they demonstrated that subjects correctly remembered their

personal assets more, only when they expected to succeed. Clark and Arkowitz conclude:

"To the extent that high and low socially anxious subjects do not differ markedly in their overt social performance and use similar criteria for successful performance, the obtained differences in self-evaluations may be a function of the high anxious subjects selectively attending to/or remembering negative aspects of their performance more than socially non-anxious subjects who would attend to and remember more of the positive aspects of their performance." (p.220-221)

In addition, Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975) and Arkowitz et al. (1975) report that socially inhibited minimal dating college students are characterized by excessive anxiety and as a result, the avoidance of social situations; not so much by a social skills deficit. Once in an interaction, they observe, the low frequency daters seem to handle the situation well and their overt behavior does not appear discriminably different from that of the high frequency daters. Similarly, Beatty and Beatty (1976) also address this avoidance phenomenon and claim that a high degree of anxiety leads to withdrawal from and avoidance of these situations that engender the anxiety response, which ultimately leads to a characteristic reticence in the individual. It appears, therefore, that the more an individual avoids these social situations that engender an anxiety response, the more anxious the individual will become when ultimately faced with a future social encounter.

However, it appears that the converse is true as well. Goldfried and Goldfried (1977) suggest that exposure to social situations alone, particularly if prolonged, is an effective means of reducing anxiety. In addition, Wilson and Davison (1971) conclude, from a thorough review

of the literature on the process of fear reduction, that exposure to a fearful stimulus is a crucial component in anxiety reduction and that systematic desensitization and relaxation techniques provide the means of assisting fearful individuals in exposing themselves to fearful stimuli long enough for this extinction to take place. Consequently, we can observe that not only does social anxiety cause an avoidance of social situations which exacerbates the anxiety response in future exposures, but also that repeated and prolonged exposure to social situations reduces the anxiety response of the socially anxious individual.

In contrast to the views of Glasgow and Arkowitz (1975), Clark and Arkowitz (1975) and Arkowitz et al. (1975), other perspectives concerning the problem of dating anxiety have emerged stressing a deficit in personal social skills as the etiology of anxiety. For example, Curran and Gilbert (1975) and Curran et al. (in press), through the use of simulated videotaped dating interactions, studied this phenomenon. The simulated dating interactions were evaluated by judges for the subjects' performance and degree of interpersonal skill, as well as for the subjects' level of anxiety. They concluded that the anxiety elicited by dating is partly the result of anticipating negative consequences caused by a deficit in their personal social skills. This skills deficit view gains further support from a number of other empirical studies. For instance, Fischetti, et al. (1977) suggest that "timing of responses" is an important social skill that appears to be deficient in the heterosexual-socially anxious subject. In addition, Justice and McBee (1977) suggest that impairment of social skills as well as certain personality disturbances, is strongly associated with high levels of anxiety.

With regard to the etiology of anxiety in social situations, two potentially competing points of view have emerged. One view, proposed by Arkowitz et al. (1975), maintains that the major difference between high and low socially anxious individuals seems to be in the way they evaluate their own behavior and not in terms of their respective repertoire of social skills. Furthering this view, Smith and Sarason (1975) conducted a study evaluating the effects of social anxiety on perceptions of and responses to negatively toned interpersonal feedback. After separating male and female subjects into low, moderate and high anxiety groups, they were asked to role play a situation in which they interacted with another person, who in turn, rated them on a bi-polar adjective scale. Subjects were then deliberately presented with a negatively toned evaluation and it was found that a significant anxiety effect was obtained. The high and moderate anxiety groups rated their evaluations as being significantly more unfavorable than did the low anxiety group. The high anxiety group not only saw themselves as being more deserving of such an evaluation, but they also, together with the moderate anxiety subjects, indicated they would feel worse about the negative evaluation.

Another study by Schwartz and Gottman (in press), adds additional support to the negative self-evaluation formulation. In analyzing the components of assertive behavior, they reported that low-assertive subjects as compared to moderate and high-assertive subjects had significantly higher self-perceived tension and anxiety; however, they did not differ from the moderate and high-assertive groups on their knowledge of a competent response or on hypothetical delivery situations.

The major difference reported seems to be in self-evaluation. The low-assertive subjects had significantly fewer positive and more negative self-statements than the high-assertive subjects. This effect was most dramatic for the negative self-statements. They also reported that the high and moderate assertive groups exhibited "little doubt" regarding the appropriateness of their actions. In contrast, the low-assertive group was characterized by "an internal dialogue of conflict" in which "positive and negative self-statements compete against one another", thereby impairing their behavior and consequently, generating an increased level of tension and anxiety. Further support is given to this formulation by another study by Royce and Arkowitz (1978). In their evaluative study of practice interactions as a treatment for social isolation, they suggest that the practice interaction treatment may function as "in vivo desensitization" thereby reducing social anxiety and leading to increased social activity. Their results further imply that the socially anxious subjects were not deficient in social skills to begin with, and this was viewed as the reason why their two treatment groups (one receiving twelve practice interactions, the other, twelve practice interactions in addition to nine hours of social skills training) did not differ significantly from each other after their respective treatments.

In contrast to the position presented above, Curran et al. (1975) maintain that the anxiety elicited in interpersonal dating situations is the result of anticipating negative consequences caused primarily by a personal social skills deficit. In a similar vein, Goldfried and Davison (1976) state, "a person may be anxious in interpersonal situations...because he lacks the basic skills necessary to interact with

others." (p.231-232)

It appears that these conflicting opinions regarding the source of interpersonal anxiety cannot be fully resolved through a search of the literature. Both views gain additional support from a large body of literature, although there appears to be increasingly more empirical support for the Arkowitz et al. formulation. However, it seems highly unlikely that an individual who experiences a great deal of anxiety in interpersonal situations and consequently responds with social avoidance is fully equipped with the adequate social skills necessary to carry on successful social interactions. Similarly, it seems just as unlikely that an individual experiencing repeated failures in social situations due to excessive anxiety would not have difficulty with a negative self-appraisal. Perhaps the proposed study will shed some light on this current controversy.

One additional point needs to be made in regard to the social skills formulation presented above. The question arises as to whether a real deficit in social skills generates anxiety in social situations or whether the presence of high social anxiety causes social skills potentially in the person's repertory not to be manifested. Many empirical studies have demonstrated the debilitating effects of anxiety, and the results of these studies suggest that high anxiety reduces the effectiveness of the skills necessary for successful interpersonal relations. For instance, Sharma (1970) reports that increased anxiety lowers the adjustment ability of an individual. Milne (1971) reports that anxiety has a detrimental effect upon motor performance. Musumeci (1975) demonstrated that anxiety is positively correlated with the number of

nonlexical speech disturbances and Bush et al. (1974) demonstrated that "Trait anxiety" (Spielberger, 1966) was found to be associated with impaired selective attention. Whether any skill deficits that are found are better understood as due to having missed opportunities for learning and improving skills as a result of avoidance, or to interruption of potentially available skills by anxiety at that moment, is an important matter for future research in this area to address.

In concluding our section on certain theoretical perspectives regarding the possible sources of anxiety in interpersonal situations, we will report a number of theories that deal tangentially with interpersonal situations. These theories of anxiety are primarily focused on symbol construction and follow the premise that when the symbols that man uses to construct the world and invest it with meaning, no longer fit reality or are facing impending danger (as may readily occur in social interactions), extreme anxiety results. Goldstein (1939), observing brain injured soldiers, noted that they responded with considerable anxiety and defensiveness to even small departures from expectancy and familiarity. He concluded from his observations that anxiety will result if people's basic need to comprehend and cope with their environment is threatened or disrupted. Similarly, Rogers (1951) views anxiety as an awareness of a discrepancy between self-concept and reality in any given situation. Since social interaction increases the possibility of such an awareness, the individual may respond with social avoidance. Finally, May (1950) defines anxiety as "the apprehension cued off by a threat to some value which the individual holds essential to his existence as a personality". (p.191)

In many formulations, the threatening stimulus is symbolic and remains vague and non-specific. If one cannot adequately assess a stimulus, one is generally not able to make a corrective response. Consequently, this "cognitive incongruity will tend to produce response unavailability" (Epstein, 1972).

Having delineated several theoretical perspectives regarding the possible sources of anxiety in interpersonal situations, we will now briefly turn our attention to the literature regarding body movement and nonverbal communication. This body of literature will provide a general background in relation to the systematic descriptive analysis to be conducted in the present study.

The interest in the analysis of dyadic and small group interactions has grown in recent years partially due to the work of Goffman (1959, 1967). He proposes a model of human interaction whereby actors achieve goals by manipulating various aspects of their performances on verbal and nonverbal levels, to control the outcome of the social interaction. Goffman (1959) using this model of role playing from the theater, is able to speak specifically about the significance of setting, appearance and manner in social situations as being crucial variables in one's "presentation of self." In general, Goffman has made significant contributions to the analysis of the "focused interaction" and the behaviors that initiate, regulate and terminate engagements among acquainted and unacquainted individuals.

During the 1960's Birdwhistell (1963) initiated a shift in non-verbal research from the intrapsychic-individual meaning of movement behavior to a focus on its holistic role in group interaction and

communication. He argued that body movement is one "channel" of communication which is patterned in ways similar to that of language and serves in the maintenance, regulation and definition of face-to-face interactions.

Within the "kinesic" tradition of Birdwhistell, Condon (1966) studied the phenomena of synchrony between articulated speech and the movement of both speaker and listener. He contrasted the observations of thirty films of normals with that of selected clinical populations. For instance, he reports that observations showed marked dyssynchrony within the speech and body motion of an aphasic patient. Similarly, a minute analysis of a schizophrenic patient's speech and movement indicated self-dyssynchrony and a lack of variation and rhythmic mobility.

Following Condon's observations of interactional synchrony, Kendon (1970) presents examples with diagrams of how people move with each other in interactions and coordinate their postural shifts and actions apparently according to the degree of their involvement with each other. The general observation is that the greater the involvement, the greater the synchrony of the participants.

Furthering the investigation of interactional nonverbal communication, Exline and Merrick (1967) studies how gaze behavior relates to liking, dominance, anxiety and dependency. They found that dependent subjects given low verbal reinforcement, significantly returned looks more than those given high reinforcement. Similarly, on the assumption that visual avoidance helps to conceal affective information, Exline, Gray & Schuette (1965) showed that subjects exchange glances less with an interviewer who asks embarrassing questions, than with one who asks

innocuous questions.

Argyle and Dean (1975) studied the interrelation between distance and eye contact of dyads in conversation and found that the length of glance or eye contact decreases with proximity. In addition, avoidance behavior, such as covering the eyes, occurs when two people are unusually close. Since proximity or closeness seems to be a subjective experience of the participants of an interaction, it will be interesting to observe this phenomenon of proximal distancing and eye contact as it relates to the subjective experiences of the participants in the present study.

Mehrabian (1967,1968,1969) studied how postures, facial expression and visual behavior indicate status, responsiveness and attitudes towards the one addressed. He found that variations in eye contact, distance and body orientation indicate certain subjective impressions of the participants of an interaction. For instance, he found that a "head on" orientation of the shoulders, as well as an upright seated position, rather than a leaning position, significantly indicated liking (1968). In another paper, Mehrabian (1969) summarizes the findings of nonverbal research in regard to reflections of attitude and status. He reports that positive attitudes may be reflected in the closeness of the interactants, leaning forward, indirect body orientation, a medium amount of eye contact and a moderate sideways leaning position. In contrast, he reports that negative attitudes may be reflected in an "arms-akimbo" position, minimal eye contact between the participants, and a broad reclining position. We shall see how these various body positionings, observed in this present study,

relate to the subjectively reported experiences of the participants of the interactions.

Not all nonverbal signs are necessarily manifestations of emotional states. Some may be seen as related to cognitive processes as well. (Dittman, 1974; Wiener, Devoe, Rubinow & Geller, 1972). For instance, Dittman (1974) concerns himself with nonverbal evidence of the verbal encoding process. In addition, Freedman et al. (1972) have researched aspects of the cognitive style of field-dependence-independence and how it relates to nonverbal variables of communication.

Finally, we will complete our chapter by focusing on relevant literature that lends support to the observational method, the chosen method of investigation in the present study. While a search of the literature did not reveal a single study that utilizes or replicates the design of the present study, relevant features of the observational method have been reported on and will be briefly mentioned below.

An important feature of the observational method which appears to be a crucial factor in an understanding of any clinical phenomenon is that the behavior under observation is naturally instigated. Observational methods, particularly those utilizing relatively unstructured situations, are often valued because they accumulate a particular type of data: data with a wide range of detail and immediacy and with "whole" events preserved (Riley, 1963). Bogdan & Taylor (1975) state in support of the observational method, that the qualitative research approach enables us to gain phenomenological understanding by directing itself at settings holistically and not reducing individuals to isolated variables or hypotheses. They state, "the method by which we study people of

necessity affects how we view them. When we reduce people to statistical aggregates, we lose sight of the subjective nature of human behavior." (p.4-5).

The use of the observational method can enable one to see things that those involved in the interaction cannot see. Richardson, et.al. (1965) note that when overinvolved in a particular activity, the subject "cannot be aware of dimensions of the event that would be apparent to the detached observer." In addition, with the utilization of video-tape recording devices, subjects can be recalled to view and analyze their own behavior from this greatly improved vantage point.

A particular problem in the observational method is the potential interfering or disruptive effect that the observer's presence has on the naturally instigated behavior being studied. The disruptive effect of a non-participant observer has been empirically supported by Smith (1957) and Barker & Wright (1955). Numerous other investigators have studied the interference problem of recording devices in the psychotherapy situation. (Sternberg, Chapman & Shakow, 1958). However, the assessment of interference problems in non-therapy settings generally indicate that interference is not extensive and when it occurs, its effects are usually localized in the period when the observation begins. (Purcell & Brady, 1965). It also appears that these interfering effects can be methodologically assessed. With specific reference to the present study, the implementation of two observation conditions will be utilized; one in which the interactants have knowledge of the observation recording devices and one in which it is concealed. By looking for whether there tend to be differences between the overt and covert

observational formats, we can gain at least some perspective on this issue.

One final note before turning to the next chapter and a detailed description of the method used in this current study. A consideration in the systematic observational approach utilizing video-taped records is the difficult task of transforming these complex records into explicit data. Many systems of encoding these records have been developed (Birdwhistell, 1963; Scheflen, 1973; Ekman & Friesen, 1968). However, for the purposes of this study, a straight descriptive analysis of the video-tapes seems to be of most value and interest, and with the fewest methodological problems.

CHAPTER II

I. METHOD SECTION

The purpose of this study will be to conduct an intensive clinical inquiry into social anxiety in dyadic interpersonal situations in order to gain some understanding of the process by which this anxiety is manifested and communicated and to study the effects of this anxiety on the self-perceived social competency of the participants of that interaction. By means of a detailed descriptive analysis the specific components of anxious behavior will be examined.

A. Subject Pool

A subject pool of 187 City College undergraduate students was obtained for the purpose of ultimate subject selection for the actual taping sessions. All 187 students were administered a revised form of Endler & Okada's (1975) S-R Inventory of General Trait Anxiety (see Appendix A). The students were read the following passage before the distribution of the questionnaire:

You are being asked to participate in a doctoral dissertation project studying people's reactions to and attitudes towards various types of general situations. The questionnaire that will soon be distributed represents the first part of the above mentioned study. Represented in the questionnaire are nine general kinds of situations which most people have encountered. For each of these general situations, certain common types of personal reactions and feelings are listed. Indicate in the alternatives representing the five points on the scale shown in the questionnaire, the degree to which you would experience these reactions and feelings for each of the nine situations listed.

The students were then directed to the cover page of the questionnaire, once distributed, where there was space provided for their name, address and telephone number. They were asked to fill

in the appropriate information only if they would like to participate in the follow-up study. They were informed that the follow-up study will consist of a study of people in interaction with each other and will involve the use of video-tape equipment. Those wishing to participate in the follow-up study had to make a firm commitment to approximately one and a half hours for the taping sessions and one and a half hours for the interview and tape viewing sessions on a subsequent day. Perspective subjects were informed that they will be paid five dollars per hour for their participation in this study. Approximately 66% of the questionnaire respondents volunteered for the follow-up study. Although there were several highly anxious people who did not volunteer for the follow-up study, there was no consistent trend, with regard to anxiety level, in terms of who volunteered for the follow-up study and who did not.

B. Questionnaire

The respondents circled the appropriate number on a five point scale assessing various reactions or attitudes for each of the nine situations presented. The situations included:

1. You are in situations involving interactions with another person;
2. You are in situations involving interaction with a friend;
3. You are in situations involving interaction with an acquaintance;
4. You are in situations involving interaction with a member of the opposite sex;

5. You are in situations involving interaction with a stranger;
6. You are in situations involving interaction with a member of your immediate family;
7. You are in situations where you are about to or may encounter physical danger;
8. You are in a new or strange situation;
9. You are involved in your daily routines.

For each situation there are nine reactions or attitudes in which the respondent indicates on a five point scale how true this is of him/her in that situation. The nine reactions or attitudes are as follows: seek experiences like this, perspire, have an uneasy feeling, feel exhilarated and thrilled, get fluttering feeling in stomach, feel tense, enjoy these situations, heart beats faster, and feel anxious. Included in the questionnaire are several background variables including sex, age, religion, major field of study, race, marital status, schooling, country of birth, family income, work status, family size and the respondent's position in his/her family (birth-order).

An analysis will be performed on the questionnaire data to see if the self-reported levels of anxiety in different interpersonal interactions relate in any regular way to relevant background variables such as sex, race, religion and position in family.

C. Questionnaire Scoring

For each situation a total "anxiety score" was derived by

summing each of the nine reactions and attitudes towards the given situation. Each respondent therefore obtained nine "anxiety scores" responding to each of the nine general interpersonal situations. A high score would therefore indicate the experience of a great deal of anxiety in the given situation, while a low score would indicate the converse.

D. Subject Pool Description

A description of the subject pool according to relevant background variables can be found below in Table 1.

E. Subject Selection

The purpose of the questionnaire administration was to select four individuals to participate in the taped interactions and to establish appropriate norms of anxiety reactions to various situations on which to base this selection process. Selection was based upon the respondents' self-evaluation of their reactions in various types of interpersonal situations. Care was taken to select as the anxious subjects, only those individuals who saw themselves as experiencing an increased amount of anxiety while interacting in particular interpersonal situations, as opposed to those individuals who experience a great deal of anxiety in general, throughout their daily routines. Since the actual taped interactions will be between two individuals who are essentially strangers, or at best only acquaintances, particular attention was paid to those items on the questionnaire. The perspective participants' scores on those

Table 1. Background Variables of Subject Pool

Sex: Male - 84	Age: Mean = 20.5	Religious Preference:
Female - 103	S.D. = 3.37	Protestant 44 (24)
		Catholic 64 (34)
		Jewish 25 (13)
		Other 22 (12)
		None 32 (17)
Race: White 55 (29)		
Black 85 (45)		
Spanish 34 (18)		
Oriental 11 (6)		
Other 2 (1)		
	How many years of schooling completed:	
	12 yrs (H.S. grad)	23 (12)
Country of Birth:	13 yrs (1st yr college)	68 (36)
	14 yrs (2nd yr college)	60 (32)
U.S. 114 (62)	15 yrs (3rd yr college)	26 (14)
Other 69 (37)	16 yrs (college grad)	10 (5)
Marital Status:	Family Income:	
Single 166 (90)	under \$5,000	33 (19)
Married 13 (7)	5,001-7,000	27 (16)
Divorced/	7,001-9,000	18 (10)
Separated 5 (3)	9,001-11,000	21 (12)
Widowed 1 (1)	11,001-13,000	13 (8)
	13,001-15,000	16 (9)
	15,001-20,000	18 (10)
	20,000 +	26 (15)
Family Size:	Position in Family:	
One child 15 (8)	Oldest or first born	58 (32)
Two children 42 (22)	Second born	57 (31)
Three children 45 (24)	Third born	41 (22)
Four children 19 (10)	Fourth born	14 (8)
Five children 25 (13)	Fifth born	5 (3)
Six or over 41 (22)	Sixth or later	9 (5)

* Numbers in parenthesis represent percentages

items were compared to responses regarding threat of physical danger and anxiety felt during their daily routines, the former seen as the peak anxiety response and the latter seen as the general baseline anxiety score for that individual. In this way the respondents' anxiety score for the two situations of interaction with stranger and acquaintance could be adequately gauged as to where it lies in their general anxiety response range.

Therefore, high anxiety was operationally defined in this study as being any "anxiety score" that fell above one standard deviation from the mean anxiety score of the total subject pool of City College students sampled. Also, because of the wide variances reported in the literature regarding communicational behavior and anxiety reactions as a function of socio-economic and racial factors, it was decided that final subject selection be a homogeneous group matched on these variables.

Final selection consisted of one male as our high anxious subject and one reporting little interpersonal anxiety; a high anxious female and another female reporting only a little. A description of the four subjects selected can be found under a separate heading below. Subjects were individually notified of their selection by telephone so that each participant would be unaware of the other participants.

F. Rooms

There were two rooms utilized in this study. One room, which we will refer to as the "video-room", was set up as a recording

studio. One camera was mounted on a tripod approximately six feet from the subjects and was set to tape a full bodied seated pose. Two chairs were positioned facing the camera at approximately 45 degree angles and there was a microphone mounted on a stand between the two interactant's chairs. A video T.V. monitor was present across the room and positioned so that neither subject could see their recorded image. The equipment placement and operation was such that the taping could occur unattended while the interaction was in progress.

The second room in the study, which we shall refer to as the "waiting room" was located down the hall and was set up to appear to be the investigator's office. It contained the usual office equipment (e.g., a desk with papers, a long table with a row of books, several boxes of books, a picture on the wall) as well as other paraphernalia. The camera to be taping the "waiting room" interaction was positioned behind a one-way mirror in an adjacent office. A microphone was hidden in a speaker mounted on the wall in the office and the wire was run through the wall where the recording devices were situated. The focus setting on this camera was set on infinity to allow for movements without constant re-focusing adjustments.

Pilot data utilizing this procedure indicated that even when subjects got up and looked closely at the mirror, the camera could not be seen. The participants in the waiting room felt suspicious about the mirror, but their suspicions were never confirmed and all reported being unaware that they were being video-taped when

informed. They all reported less conscious performance anxiety in the "waiting room" situation, though some anxious subjects (only) reported that the lack of structure made them less comfortable than they were when they knew they were being taped. Reports of the present subjects also indicated that although some felt suspicious about the mirror in the waiting room, all subjects were unaware that they were being video-taped when informed. Although there was some expression of annoyance on the part of some subjects about being deceived, all were eager to observe the tapes and discuss their performance with the examiner from this greatly improved vantage point.

G. Procedure

Subjects were met outside the Psychological Center at the prescribed time. The cameraman was already positioned behind the one-way mirror adjacent to the waiting room. There was nobody else present within the Center. All four subjects were escorted into the video-room and it was explained that it is in this room that the taping will take place and that the taping would be of dyadic interactions. The two subjects that were to begin were asked to remain in the room while the other two subjects were taken to my "office" and asked to kindly wait until their turn. No further instructions of any kind was given. The taping for the waiting room interaction now began. The investigator returned to the video-room and the following instructions were read:

There are many situations during the course of the day in which you have to interact with people you don't know well.

What I'd like you to do here is simply to go about conversing with each other, in any way you like with only one restriction and that is not to discuss the experiment itself.

At this point the recording system was switched on and they were left alone with the door closed.

After ten minutes the interaction in both rooms was interrupted and the interactants in the video-room only were asked to fill out a nine-item checklist describing their immediately preceding experience. The checklist contained nine items which each participant ranked on a scale of one to five. The items are identical to the reactions and attitudes described in the screening questionnaire. The next dyadic pair was then directed to the appropriate room and simultaneous taping followed as described above. This process continued until each individual had the opportunity to interact with every other person in both the video-room and the waiting room for a total of twelve taped ten-minute social interactions for each subject.

On subsequent days the participants were individually asked to return to the Psychological Center for the purpose of viewing the recorded video-tapes of themselves in both the waiting room and the video-room. A tape recorder was present in the room to record the subjects' reactions to their observations. Each subject was asked to comment on their subjective experience of the interaction as it occurred, describing their feelings, impressions and thoughts about what they were viewing. The tape viewing sessions occurred within a week of the taping session. Participants were asked to

focus on the interaction with particular attention to their own subjective interpretations of the behavior and verbal exchange.

The participants' personal analysis of their own behavior will be utilized and integrated into the video-tape analysis described under a subsequent heading below.

H. Video-Tape Analysis

The method of analysis will take the form of four individual case studies of anxious behavior and/or social interaction. Each individual will be followed through each of the six different ten-minute interactions (three in the video-room and three in the waiting room). The behavior of the individual participant will be described in detail, noting the consistencies in his or her behavioral style and anxiety responses, as well as the differences in behavior as a function of the nature of each dyadic interpersonal situation. Certain behavioral indicators of anxiety which interfere with the "flow" of the interaction will be detailed. Specific attention will be paid to the content of the verbal interaction and the simultaneous body posture correlates. Active and passive role assumptions, dominant and non-dominant behavioral patterns as well as synchronous and dysynchronous movements of the participants as a function of the verbal content and dyadic pair will be noted and described. The participants' self-report on the subjective checklist, filled out directly after each dyadic interaction will be compared to the observed social performance and exhibited social skills. Information obtained from the subjects' video-tape viewing

will be integrated into the ongoing analysis and their impressions and interpretations of their own behavior will be used to highlight the effect of anxiety on their self-evaluations of social competence.

The analysis described above will be structured according to the following outline:

Description of Each Ten-Minute Interaction

A. Video Room

B. Waiting Room

1. Verbal Content

a. Assumption of roles (e.g. active-passive, etc.)

1. Specific exceptions to assumption of roles

b. Distribution of power in the interaction

1. Specific exceptions

c. Rhythm of the dialogue

1. Specific exceptions

d. Flow of speaking turns in the conversation

1. Specific exceptions

e. Topics of conversation

1. Manifest content

2. Latent or implicit themes

3. Affect

2. Body Movement and Spatial Behavior

a. Amount of movement

- b. Fluidity
 - 1. Smooth vs. jerky
 - 2. Relaxed vs. tight
- c. Body movement and speech rhythm
- d. Synchrony of movement between interactants and its relation to verbal content
- e. Proximal distance of the interactants and relationship to quality of interaction
- f. Amount of body exposed or presented
- 3. Three-Way Comparison of Interaction
 - a. Investigator's observations
 - b. Subject's comments and observations
 - c. Subject's conversational partner's comments and observations of subject

I. Subjects

High Anxious Male:

Alan is a twenty-two year old, attractive, slightly overweight, bearded white Jewish male, born in the United States. He works full-time during the day and majors in psychology during the evening. He is single, has never married, and reports his health is good. He is employed as a mental health paraprofessional working with severely mentally retarded children. He lives at home with both parents and has an older sister who is married and living away from home. He has completed three years of his undergraduate college education and reports a gross family income of \$9,001 - 11,000.

In situations involving interaction with acquaintances he reports having an uneasy feeling, gets fluttering feelings in his

stomach, feels very tense, and reports that his heart beats faster. He sees himself as experiencing anxiety in these situations and also reports that he doesn't enjoy them at all. He reports the same degree of anxiety in interactions with a stranger as he does in situations where he is about to, or may encounter physical danger. In his daily routines, Alan describes himself as having an uneasy feeling, but doesn't feel tense and reports no experienced anxiety. His anxiety score during his daily routines is just slightly above the mean of the subject pool's in contrast to his anxiety score during interaction with a stranger, which falls close to two standard deviations above the mean. In interactions involving friends, he reports a self-evaluative anxiety score exactly equal to that of the subject pool and claims to enjoy these situations.

Low Anxious Male:

Isaac is an attractive, slender eighteen year old white male born in the United States who reports no religious preference. He works part-time during the day as well as attending day session at City College as a full-time student. He has not yet declared a major but is leaning toward social psychology. He is employed at an advertising agency in the capacity of a "boy friday". He lives at home with his parents and has a younger sister. He has completed one year of his undergraduate college education and reports a gross family income of \$15,001 - 20,000.

In situations involving interaction with acquaintances he reports that he enjoys these situations and doesn't perspire, get

fluttering feelings in his stomach or feel tense. His anxiety score for this situation is equal to that of our norm group. In situations involving interactions with a stranger, he reports a slightly higher anxiety score, but well within the limits of a non-anxious subject, according to the criteria defined by this study. He reports that his heart beats faster yet he has little or no experience of anxiety. In situations where he is about to or may encounter physical danger, he does report that he has an uneasy feeling, perspires, gets fluttering feelings in his stomach, feels very tense; his heart beats much faster, and he generally feels very anxious. His anxiety score for his daily routine is equal to that of our norm groups.

High Anxious Female:

Jennifer is an attractive twenty-three year old white female, born in the United States, who reports no religious preference. She is unemployed and attends City College on a full-time basis during the day, majoring in psychology. She shares an apartment with several roommates and has an income of under \$5,000. She is single, never married, and reports her health as excellent. Jennifer is an only child and has completed two years of her undergraduate education.

In situations involving interaction with an acquaintance, Jennifer experiences herself as perspiring heavily, having an uneasy feeling, getting fluttering feelings in her stomach, and feeling very tense; her heart beats much faster and she generally feels very anxious. She claims not to seek experiences like this. Her anxiety

score for this situation is well above the mean response for this item and falls close to two standard deviations above the mean. Interestingly, her anxiety score for interaction with a stranger falls slightly lower than her anxiety score for interaction with an acquaintance, but still places her in the high-anxious category for the purposes of this study. She scored the maximum anxiety score in regard to encountering physical danger and slightly below the mean score with regard to her anxiety level during her daily routine.

Low Anxious Female:

Ann, a thirty-one year old white Jewish female, born in the United States, is an only child. She works part-time during the day and majors in psychology during the evening. She has been married, but is now divorced. She reports her health as excellent. She is employed as a teacher in a Montessori School and lives with a boyfriend. She has completed three years of her undergraduate college education and intends to go on to graduate school in psychology. She reports an income of \$5,001 - 7,000.

In situations involving interactions with an acquaintance she reports no anxiety at all. In fact, her total anxiety score for this situation is the minimum value, given the employed scoring procedures. She claims to enjoy these situations, has no uneasy feeling, no fluttering feelings in her stomach, and no experience of being tense. Her reported experience of interaction with a stranger is almost identical to that of an acquaintance. Again,

no anxiety, no feeling of being tense and she claims to really enjoy these situations as well as seeking experiences like this out. Her anxiety score for this situation also falls well below the mean value of our sample group. She does however, report considerable anxiety in situations involving a threat of physical violence and reports her heart beating much faster, an uneasy feeling and feeling generally very anxious. In her daily routine she reports an anxiety level approximately equal to that of interacting with a stranger and both scores again fall below the mean value.

CHAPTER III

II. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Having detailed the method of investigation and presented some background characteristics of the four participants, we will now turn our attention to the actual descriptive analysis presented within the case-study format. Throughout the presentation the initial taped interactions will be described in present tense while the comments of the participants during their observations of the video-tapes will be presented in past tense.

The first case to be presented will be that of Alan, the representative high anxious male. He will be followed through his six dyadic interactions with the three other participants. We will employ the strategy of describing each interaction in detail, and generalizing about Alan's interactional style only later, when all the interactions have been presented. The order of analysis will follow the actual order in which his interactions took place. His first interaction occurred in the video-room with Jennifer, the high anxious female.

Video-Room

Immediately, Jennifer assumes the role of spokesman for both herself and Alan. In the initial stage of this dyadic interaction, immediately following the instructions by the investigator, she continually refers to "we" rather than "I" and asks, "We can speak about anything we want?" and follows, "We already talked outside, we're talked out." While these comments or perhaps protests are being made to the investigator, Alan sits smiling and acknowledges what she is saying by an occasional head nod, but doesn't add anything verbally to her communications. He

remains silent and permits Jennifer to voice some hesitancy about the impending interaction.

The interaction actually begins somewhat hesitantly. Jennifer, having expressed her lack of enthusiasm regarding the prospect of talking to Alan, takes the matter in hand and begins the verbal exchange by asking Alan several questions in rapid succession relating to his living in the Bronx. She starts, "I've never been to the Bronx; how do you like the Bronx? Why do you live there?" Alan, apparently very nervous at this point, sitting with his legs tucked under his chair, feet resting on their toes and hands clutching the arms of his chair, answers in a low, almost cracked voice, "Not really; I don't; It's just, I can't get out." Jennifer, seemingly unsympathetic* to Alan's current extreme anxiety state, sits apparently comfortably with legs crossed, smoking a cigarette and asks, "What do you mean you can't get out?"

The role definitions set up in this initial exchange persist throughout the interaction. Jennifer maintains a posture that appears relaxed yet seems rigidly maintained; she directs the flow of the interaction exclusively through questioning. Alan, on the other hand, makes no attempt to direct the interaction and merely answers, at length, the questions directed toward him. This arrangement necessitates Alan assuming a passive yet significantly more verbal role in this interaction.

* There were no direct references made by either participant in regard to this unsympathetic attitude. However, Alan did remark on how rigidly she adheres to her questioning role. After her first series of questions elicits such an anxious response from Alan, she immediately follows with another question of the same order.

This immediately defined and persistent role differentiation of Jennifer as interviewer and Alan as interviewee continues unchallenged throughout the entire course of the conversation. Jennifer's questioning is persistent except on two specific occasions. On one occasion Jennifer comments, after learning that Alan was only twenty-two, that she is surprised since his job is so "demanding". In response to this, Alan strokes his beard and talks about how he started working when he was sixteen. We shall later see that this beard stroking becomes characteristic of Alan when complimented. The only other exception to the question-answer format described above is Jennifer's volunteering that in contrast to Alan's Psych. I class, her course was taught strictly from the textbook.

The power of this interaction unquestionably resides with Jennifer*. She acts as spokesman for the dyadic pair in communicating to the investigator before and after the interaction and also defines and maintains the structure of the interaction. Through her questioning she is able to control the topic of conversation and the length of time spent on each specific topic. Alan does, in part, control the length of time spent on a particular topic by the length of his answer. However, his answers can be, and in fact are, on several occasions, cut short by another question from Jennifer. Also, the topic can be continued by further questioning by Jennifer, or can be changed by the same method.

* Jennifer actually stated that she felt she had the power in this interaction and admitted she enjoyed it. Alan made no direct reference to power per se, but did point to this inequality by describing her role assumption as "superior".

With reference to speaking turns in this dyadic interaction, the following format is integrated into the ongoing interaction. Jennifer determines the topic directly through questioning and Alan gives an elaborated answer. Jennifer either continues the discourse on the same topic by means of further questioning or changes the topic completely by the same method. The topics range from where and why he lives in the Bronx; his present living situation; his automobile accident, which was presented as his reason for moving back home; his jobs; why he's studying psychology; his Psych. I class; child psychology; and, finally, working with emotionally disturbed children and his reactions to this. Jennifer shares none of her feelings or thoughts regarding these topics..

Alan maintains a very rigid posture throughout this particular interaction. He starts the interaction rigid, with both hands clutching the arms of the chair. His legs are spread slightly and his feet rest on their toes. His torso remains rigidly positioned, as described above, throughout the entire interaction. The only movement can be seen with his hands. Hand and arm movements are continually employed to supplement his verbal communication. In addition, he exhibits a great deal of "accessory" gestures like scratching his head and legs, stroking his beard, etc.

One apparently defensive gesture that also persists throughout the interaction is "crotch covering". As described earlier, Alan begins the interaction grasping onto the arms of the chair he is seated in. A short time into the interaction, he positions his left hand to directly cover his pelvic area. This gesture occurs when Jennifer, somewhat jokingly implies through a question that Alan was hit by a garbage truck

while working on it. When telling her he dropped out of high school to work full time, both hands are used to cover his crotch. His covering or protective gesture continues to the end of the interaction, with his hands only being removed for supplementary communicative gestures.*

Throughout the interaction Jennifer generally reinforces Alan's verbal productions with periodic head nods and verbal cues such as Uh, Ha, Mmm, really, etc., although her attitude is one of patience with the task rather than a genuine interest in the actual situation.** There are three rather obvious exceptions to this attitude. One is when Alan informs Jennifer of his accident, in which he broke his neck. Jennifer responds verbally, "really!" while repositioning her body in a way that seems very expressive of her interest in hearing more. She sits forward in her chair, decreasing the distance between herself and Alan while grasping the arms of the chair and shifting her entire torso into a more upright and attentive position. This dramatic movement not only brings the interactants into closer proximity to each other, but also brings their eyes on a closer approximation to a horizontal plane. Alan, during his observation of the tape, commented on this segment of the interaction, "I felt at this piece we are just talking because we were told to talk. What she's asking is just to keep the conversation going..."

* Alan was not directly questioned about this gesture nor did he make any reference to it. This gesture is nevertheless designated as "protective" by the investigator due to the immediate circumstances surrounding its use and the subject's subjective report of feeling threatened.

** Alan and Jennifer both confirm the investigator's impression of Jennifer's attitude. Their actual comments will be detailed later.

it's not that she's really interested." However, Jennifer commented on this same segment of tape, "I was not interested in what he had to say in the beginning, but when he said he was hit by a garbage truck, I was really taken back."

Alan seemed to accurately sense Jennifer's general attitude regarding this interaction, yet he seemed to be unable to selectively attend to the specific exceptions to this general attitude.

There are two additional examples of Alan's inability to sense interest. On one occasion Jennifer, prefacing her question about how old Alan is with "I'm curious," sits forward in her chair by shifting her entire upper torso and neck and thereby decreases the distance between herself and Alan. After the answer is delivered, she again returns to her relaxed seated position, as described earlier. On one other occasion, during a discussion of working with emotionally disturbed children, Jennifer again prefaces her question with "I'm curious", while holding her leg with both hands in order to maintain a forward sitting position comfortably for the remainder of the interaction.

In each of the cases mentioned above, Jennifer demonstrates an increased interest by repositioning her body to decrease the distance between the interactants.* This phenomenon can also be seen as demonstrating an additional aspect of her assumption of power in this

* During her viewing of this interaction, she affirmed that she was in fact more interested at the moments mentioned above. Alan did sense some increased interest on Jennifer's part during their discussion of emotionally disturbed children, but not on the two earlier occasions.

exchange. Jennifer alone controls the distance between the interactants. If she feels any shift in the proximal distance is necessary, she makes it by repositioning herself. Alan, on the other hand, remains rigid in posture with no gross movement of his legs and upper or lower torso. He thereby maintains a fixed distance from Jennifer that she can and, in fact, does vary. There is absolutely no evidenced complementary movement to compensate for her repositioning.

The passivity with which Alan deals with this situation, and his uncomfortable feelings, remain apparent throughout. On one occasion, having reached for a cigarette in his shirt pocket, Alan searches in vain for a match. Jennifer, smoking at the time, chooses not to offer him one. He is unable to ask for one and sits holding the unlit cigarette until the end of the interaction. In each participant's observation of the tape, no mention is made of this. Alan, however, did remark "If you notice, when I got into the anxious state, what did I reach for -- my cigarettes. Whenever I get really uptight, all smokers do -- I must have gone through a pack and a half of cigarettes during this whole thing." No mention was made that it is never lit, nor was he directly asked about it.

A further point regarding Alan's interactional style with Jennifer needs mention. Jennifer, in the very beginning of the interaction, while Alan was struggling with reasons why he "can't get out" of the Bronx, suggests "money" as the reason. Alan quickly responds "no" and then proceeds to give an elaborate explanation of how he couldn't work or support himself and that necessitated his moving home with his parents. On another occasion, toward the end of the interaction,

Jennifer asks if, in his opinion, the emotionally disturbed children he has worked with can be rehabilitated. He says "Oh yes," but then answers that it is not a rehabilitation process. He proceeds to describe what appears in every sense of the word a rehabilitation process: "It's a long process of bringing them back to reality, making their delusions disappear..." Perhaps this tendency to answer negatively, while delivering an explanation that necessitates a positive answer, is indicative of his own negative feelings. We must wait to see if this tendency persists in subjectively more positive interactions.

Alan basically describes himself as being "very,very nervous" and finds the interaction, in general, very uncomfortable: "I really didn't know what to say." He seemed able to posturally identify his nervousness and states, "That's the way I am when I get nervous, I start talking with my hands. Also, the way I'm sitting with my feet curled up under me." He feels that Jennifer, in contrast, is much less nervous than he is.

He reports feeling very uncomfortable with the format of the interaction. He saw it as a "question-answer period," and stated that he would have felt better with a "normal conversation." He saw her questions as consistently not really intended to gather information, as if she were really interested, but rather just to keep things going. He saw her as immediately assuming the "superior role" and that gave him the feeling that she was continually "talking down." When questioned several times about what it was about her that made him feel she assumed the superior role, he stated, "the way she's sitting, the way her hands are; she seems very relaxed, more than I was." He also explicitly

stated that he had the feeling that she had done something like this before because of the ease with which he handled this situation. This made him feel at a disadvantage.

At a particular juncture of the interaction, Alan has the opportunity to tell her he plays twelve different instruments. In the following inquiry, he was asked if he thought she was impressed. His answer was "No, not at all. If she was impressed she would have gone on asking about it; instead she just dropped it and went on to something else." Jennifer's comments on this same segment were, "that was amazing me; I was thinking how amazing people's stories are; what a wide variety and how unexpected. I became interested at this point." Again, we have an example of how the general attitude is perceived correctly, but specific exceptions are lost within the context of the more general attitude.

Throughout Alan's observation of the tape he pointed to her assumption of the superior role and how uncomfortable that made him. He claimed that a part of his nervousness was due to the camera, but that the greater part of his nervousness was due to her and her attitude. He felt very strongly about this during the interaction as well as during his observation session. He was extremely dissatisfied with his performance and felt that he should have done something to change it. When asked what he might have done, he responded, "make a joke about something or ask her a question. The way it was is that she was asking questions and I had to answer." He felt that she had absolutely no interest in what he had to say, except toward the end when they spoke about emotionally disturbed children; and this was indicated to him by

her repeated questions on the topic. He also made note of her changed posture, which put them in closer proximity to each other, as indicating an increased interest. Her increased expression of interest made him feel more at ease and more relaxed. He noted at this juncture that his use of hands while talking had diminished. When asked how he thought Jennifer regarded him during the interaction, he was unable to make any definitive statement.

Jennifer had very definite impressions of the interaction. She claimed to feel like a "social worker", and felt that she was stepping forward and taking responsibility for keeping the interaction going. She felt very tense and strained with that role and found herself just thinking up questions to avoid a pause. She also admitted liking the power of that situation and commented that she really couldn't imagine the interaction being reversed. With regard to Alan, she found it difficult to concentrate on what he was saying. She found him, in general, "Unstimulating." She found him to be not too articulate and commented that his manner of verbal presentation was in "monotones and monorhythms." This perception could not be affirmed by the investigator. At one point during her observation of the tape she remarked, "Maybe I should have said 'well maybe you should do the talking,' but I didn't." She didn't feel any pressure to do any talking "simply because I really didn't want to." The most prominent thought on her mind was that "I better have something else to ask him in the event that he might say something that wouldn't lead to another question."

Waiting Room

In contrast to the previously described interaction between Alan and Jennifer in the video-room, their interaction in the waiting room takes on a strikingly different form. This interaction with each other occurred immediately after their video-room interaction.

Alan enters the room and assumes a much more relaxed posture. He sits slightly slouched in his chair with much more of his body exposed to Jennifer. His legs are slightly apart, his right hand is slung over the back of the chair and left arm resting on a table adjacent to his chair, with no hands covering any part of his body. Jennifer is seated forward in an attentive manner with her legs uncrossed. She once again defines the proximal distance between the interactants through the movement of her torso. Alan, although apparently relaxed, exhibits little torso movement. Only movement in his extremities could be observed.

Jennifer begins the verbal exchange before she even becomes settled in her chair by continuing with the earlier discussion of emotionally disturbed children. Again, as in the video-room, Jennifer takes charge of the interaction by defining the topic to be discussed, as well as the shape and form of the interaction. This aspect of Alan's interactive style seems to remain consistent across the two different conditions with Jennifer. It seems worthy of mention here that this aspect of his interpersonal style does manifest itself in his other interactions, but to varying degrees, as we shall see. Alan commented after viewing several seconds of the waiting room interaction, "I was just sitting there wondering if she was going to come up with the same thing as before." This comment, as well as the actual manner in which the interaction unfolded,

indicates a general passivity on Alan's part in defining and structuring his interaction with Jennifer.

The only specific exception to this stance described above occurs about midway through the interaction. Jennifer quite abruptly chooses to change the topic of conversation from emotionally disturbed children by asking Alan whether he is in therapy. After some comments by Alan of a defensive nature for never having been in therapy, he successfully changes the topic from individual therapy to group therapy by expressing an interest in the latter. Except for this instance, Alan consistently allows Jennifer to direct and control the flow of the conversation.

Since the interaction in the waiting room develops more in the form of a dyadic conversation rather than an exclusive question-answer format, as in the video-room, more competition for speaking turns is evidenced. At several times during the interaction, simultaneous speaking does occur. And, in most cases, Alan relinquishes his speaking turn to Jennifer. For example, during the conversation about emotionally disturbed children, Jennifer is describing a summer camp when Alan interjects, with an air of authority, "What it is is that..." Jennifer disregards Alan's attempt to gain a speaking turn and continues her discourse. At a point when she appears to have completed verbalizing her thought and pauses, Alan begins speaking. He would occasionally interject some thought before Jennifer would finish a sentence, yet these contributions to the conversation frequently occur when Jennifer is struggling for a word and they may be regarded as his attempt to fill a pause in the interaction. In fact, both Jennifer and Alan are quite intent on allowing absolutely no speaking pauses throughout both of

their interactions. Perhaps this is indicative of the anxious quality of this dyad.*

Another notable consistency of Alan's interactional style with Jennifer seems to be the ease and willingness he has to speak about himself in regard to work and other personal experiences that tend not to be too revealing of personal emotions. A particular example of this is his lengthy elaboration of working with emotionally disturbed children. During these times his verbal productions are plentiful, relaxed, fluid, and presented with an air of authority.

The ease and openness of his verbalizations become quite defensive, in contrast, when confronted with more revealing topics. For instance, when asked if he has ever been in therapy, his response is that money is the only problem. When Jennifer responds that there are many low cost treatment facilities available, and explains that she is being seen at one of them, he begins to go into a lengthy explanation about how time is the critical factor responsible for his not going. Also, in this regard, Alan tends to use intellectualizations to guard against these more revealing issues. When speaking about working with emotionally disturbed children, and reference is made to the feelings in oneself that this work engenders, Alan elaborates on this issue by speaking about Freudian and Piagetian stages.

Interestingly, this same evasive quality in responses regarding more revealing issues is attributed by Alan to Jennifer. During his observation of the tape he states, "When she did talk about herself it

* This anxious quality seemed less true of the other dyads as we shall see.

was vague. I went to the shrink and that was it, nothing else." "She didn't say what the shrink did for her or anything else." "It was very vague." Jennifer speaks in the interaction of wanting to go into analysis but that her relationship with her present therapist is very strong and she doesn't want to leave him. In regard to group therapy she states,

"I've been in group for two years...I've changed a whole lot, I used to be very withdrawn and introverted...when I went to group I was scared to death, couldn't talk, cried almost all the time. I think it's a good experience for those people who feel they are the only people who experience these feelings."

Although these remarks seem reasonable revealing of her experience upon entering a group, Alan describes her as "not saying anything about herself." "She wanted to know about you, but she didn't want you to know about her." "Made me feel a little leary of the whole situation."

This preceding description of Jennifer was radically different from his initial impressions at the beginning of this interaction. During their discussion of emotionally disturbed children, Alan observed,

"She's totally different at this point. She seems to be another person. In the video-room she didn't say anything about herself. That's when I realized the room was doing it, because right off the bat she started talking about herself instead of asking questions. At this point, she came down off the superiority thing and now she's back to a person again."

This radical change from his perception of her occurs when Jennifer very abruptly changes the topic to personal therapy. Perhaps Jennifer, at this juncture, initiates a topic that necessitates a response too personally self-revealing for Alan. Up until now, the discussion

centers around the topic of working with emotionally disturbed children which Alan claims to have a great deal of experience with and consequently regards as a non-threatening topic of conversation.

As the tape continued through the therapy portion of the interaction, Alan described Jennifer as follows:

"It seemed to me she was an introvert (She had just, several minutes earlier, shared this feeling with him). She didn't want any of her feelings to be known. I felt she didn't want to tell me anything. She's on the superiority kick. I don't think it's a put on, I think it's her, part of her. It didn't make me as tense as in the video-room because I wasn't under the camera...I feel she had the superiority thing throughout. I'm still feeling tension, her attitude makes me feel uncomfortable."

It's also interesting to note that this is the first and only time that Jennifer had an opportunity to speak about something from a personal experience.

At this point, Alan has painted a picture of Jennifer that seems quite applicable to the previous interaction in the video-room, in which she just asks questions, while sharing nothing of herself. However, this perception is strikingly different from his earlier reported perception during the first part of the waiting room interaction, when he described her as coming "down off the superiority thing and now she's back to a person again."

One point should be made in regard to Alan's possible investment in his passive position in these interactions. It has been reasonably illustrated that Jennifer seems to maintain the power and control. This conclusion was arrived at by a careful inspection of her behavior regarding speaking turns, determination of topics, length of time spent

on each topic and the proximal distancing of the interactants. In every case where Alan is feeling anxious or generally uncomfortable, he attributes these feelings to her behavior or attitude. It's as if by her "controlling" the interaction, she also controls and is responsible for his feelings and reactions and, consequently, his passive position protects him from experiencing his anxiety as due to some inner deficiency in his interpersonal skills. This notion seems to gain further support when we look at his description of himself during the more anxious moments of the previous interaction, when he states, "I don't like what I'm seeing...I feel it isn't me...it's not showing the real person that I am...I'm seeing a scared version of me." This presentation of himself is in contrast to his perception of himself on the questionnaire where he describes himself as being equally as anxious in situations involving interactions with a stranger as he would be in situations involving physical violence.*

Jennifer saw the interaction in the waiting room as being quite different in some respects. She felt, upon observation of the interaction, that they had finally worked themselves up to talking about something they mutually share an interest in, namely, emotionally disturbed children. She felt that it took the interaction in the video-room to warm up and that she was feeling more comfortable at that time. She felt that he seemed more relaxed and pointed to his slightly slouched posture and softer voice as being indicative of this (Jennifer's perceptions are consonant with the investigator's observations).

* Incidentally, Alan is in fact noticeably less anxious with the others.

In regard to the portion of the tape in which they discuss therapy, Jennifer was notable to get a sense of whether Alan is receptive to what she is saying. She stated during her observation of this exchange that she began to feel very self-conscious because, "something within myself was saying 'I am boring this person.' He wasn't giving me any feedback, but I felt it was important enough that I wanted to tell him anyway."* She claimed that he was wearing tinted glasses and that she couldn't see his eyes clearly to ascertain whether he was understanding what she was telling him. She felt that his unresponsivity to what she was telling him about her therapy experience made her feel very uncomfortable. She felt glad that the interaction ended and felt bored with what he had to say beyond the point of her feeling that he was unresponsive. It's interesting that after sharing her therapy experience and feeling that he wasn't responsive, she, in turn, became bored with what he had to say from that time on. This aspect of her boredom will be discussed further below in describing interactions with Jennifer as the primary focus.

In sum, Jennifer felt Alan was too "I" oriented and felt he was not responsive to what she shared with him. She claimed to feel very drained by the whole thing. She also claimed to want to "call the shots" and concluded that she felt responsible again and could have controlled it or handled it differently.

* As stated earlier, Alan generally gives a minimal amount of verbal and postural feedback during his interactions.

We will now turn our attention to the series of interactions that Alan engaged in with Isaac, the low-anxious male. We will begin our analysis of the interaction in the waiting room, which represents their first meeting.

Waiting Room

Alan is already seated in the waiting room when Isaac arrives from the video-room interaction with Ann. Alan leans forward and extends his arm to Isaac as Isaac sits down, and Isaac introduces himself with a handshake. Alan sits back, after this initial greeting, and assumes a resting seated position identical to the one with Jennifer. His legs are slightly apart, his right hand slung over the back of the chair and left elbow rests on a table adjacent to his chair. Again, as with Jennifer in the waiting room, his hands are not covering any part of his body. Isaac assumes an upright seated position with his legs extended out and both feet planted firmly on the ground. His arms are crossed in front of him and rest around his mid-section. Isaac initiates the interaction by speculating about the possibility of there being a camera behind the one-way mirror. Alan picks up on Isaac's initiated topic and contributes a possible plan of how the taping might be occurring and possible rationale for it being done. Some light joking and laughing occurs during this exchange regarding these possibilities.

Alan commented during his observation of this segment, "We both think there might be a machine, but we don't know for sure. I felt he was a really nice guy because right off the bat we started goofing

around. Nothing serious about what we were talking about whatsoever. It took all the tension off." Alan did in fact report staying relatively unanxious in this interaction due to the way in which it begins.

After this initial exchange, Isaac asks Alan for a cigarette. He lights it and the longest silence of the interaction occurs at this time. Isaac breaks the silence by asking Alan if he is a psychology major. Alan responds positively and Isaac begins to explain that while still being undecided of his own major, he is now leaning toward social psychology. Alan acknowledges Isaac's stated preference in psychology and seizes this opportunity to begin speaking at length, and, as an authority, about several experiments he learned about in his social psychology course. (All of these experiments, incidentally, dealt with issues of peer pressure.)

Isaac commented during his observation of Alan's explanation of his social psychology experiments,

"I started to notice at this point that Alan was dominating the conversation. I felt that maybe I should give a little more to the conversation instead of making him give all the conversation. Maybe he was feeling he was dominating too much and I should take over. There were no external cues of this, just an internal feeling."*

Isaac now assumes the speaking floor, which Alan seems to relinquish without a struggle, and relates the theme of peer pressure to a personal experience with his friends. He recounts how one evening his friends wanted to walk on the subway tracks to a "ghost station" in order to

* Alan during his observation of this segment, did not make any specific comments regarding his domination of the speaking floor. However, he did make note of how Isaac is able to pick up the theme of the conversation and relate it to his own personal experience.

paint graffiti, and how he didn't yield to peer pressure because he felt it too dangerous. It seems that Isaac is able to be internally connected to his feelings and perceptions and has the social skills necessary to respond to them in a constructive manner and that he is thereby spared a great deal of anxiety in these situations. Isaac does, in fact, confirm this perception and generally views himself as socially competent. Alan, on the other hand, while perceiving an inequality in the interaction, as in the case with Jennifer, feels unable to intervene and effect some change, and consequently experiences an increased sense of uneasiness. These feelings are subsequently seen as being caused by his partner in the dyad.

After Isaac's sharing of personal experiences with respect to the ongoing theme of peer pressure, Alan carries it further by commenting, "That's like why most people start smoking." Again, Isaac picks this up and speaks of his own experience regarding smoking and how his starting to smoke relates to issues of peer pressure. Isaac is still speaking when the investigator interrupts the interaction.

During the periods when Alan is speaking, Isaac seems quite proficient at communicating an understanding and interest. Frequent head nods and smiles can be seen at particular intervals, as well as verbal reinforcements such as, "right," "Mmm," "that's funny," "what happened then?" "that's interesting," etc. On inquiry, Isaac did report feeling genuinely interested in what Alan had to say. Alan, on the other hand, gives much less verbal and postural reinforcement of Isaac's verbal productions. Another method employed by Isaac in communicating an understanding and attentiveness is by completing sentences that Alan begins.

This occurred on several occasions during the interaction.

Isaac also made several postural shifts during the course of the conversation, thereby affecting the proximal distance between them. Alan, although displaying increased movement and fluidity, maintains a fixed posture throughout. His use of hands to supplement his verbal productions can be estimated as being equal to his hand movements with Jennifer.

Alan commented at the completion of his observation of this interaction,

"I was not feeling very nervous. If the interaction started out with my talking about the social psychology experiments and not about the thing with the camera, I think I would have been nervous. Being that we were goofing around first, I wasn't nervous."

He then proceeded with some general impressions of the interaction.

"Out of all of them, I think this was the best. What I appreciated most was his interest in what I was saying. We were both interested in the things we were talking about. The main thing is the way it started -- walking in laughing, joking, and kidding around. Right then and there he set the mood that everything was going to be good; it's going to be at ease. I felt that I was able to handle what was going on and react to it in a good way without tension or anxiety, pushing or getting into heavy thought about what he was saying. I didn't feel I had to put on any airs."

Again, as in the previous interaction, Alan presented a passively dependent experience of having his dyadic partner define the mood of the interaction. Previously, he felt subject to Jennifer's determination or definition of a more serious quality to the interaction. Although extremely non-appreciative of this mood, he felt compelled to passively adhere to it. In this interaction, Alan once again expressed this dependency by describing his feelings of relief that Isaac initi-

ated a discussion of a hypothetical hidden camera in a light and joking manner.

Although Alan commented that his frequent hand movements were indicative of his nervousness in his prior interaction with Jennifer, the same frequency of hand gestures occurs with Isaac, where his subjective experience is strikingly different.* Another similarity in his behavior across subjectively different experiences is his lack of torso movement. He maintains an apparently relaxed** posture from the beginning, and it remains unchanged to the end of the interaction. During this same time, Isaac makes several postural changes.

The interaction proceeds in a non-threatening manner, in that no remarkably self-revealing topics are initiated or referred to. This established boundary of non-threatening topics remains unviolated. Alan alluded to this when he spoke of how "Isaac made the interaction easy and light -- just goofing around." "He made me comfortable."

Video-Room

We will now turn our attention to the video-room where Alan is having his second interaction with Isaac. Alan assumes what has become at this point his typical video-room seated pose. He is seated straight back in his chair, his legs are slightly spread and his feet are tucked under his chair and up on their toes. His elbows rest on the arms of the chair and his hands lie on his hips, not covering his pelvic area.

* Alan was not questioned about this.

** Alan, in his observation of this interaction, did report seeing himself as being posturally more relaxed.

His entire torso is turned slightly away from Isaac so that in order to look at him he must turn his head slightly to the left. Isaac sits slightly slouched in his chair, his legs spread apart and feet tucked under his chair and also up on their toes. His hands are folded across his mid-section.

The interaction begins, as the previous one, with Isaac asking a question regarding Alan's work. Alan answers and directs the same question back to Isaac. Alan commented while observing the opening moments of the tape that he had realized what had happened in the previous interaction with Jennifer and it was very much on his mind when he came right back with a question: "I didn't want to get into a one-sided thing again."*

Alan seems much less spontaneous in his verbal productions during the opening moments of the interaction. He also seems quite intent on not allowing the interaction to proceed as it had with Jennifer in the video-room. For every question directed toward him in the beginning, he directs one back.

Isaac asks at this point how long has he been going to City College. Alan explains that he graduated from a community college and there seems to be some momentary misunderstanding as to Alan's status as a student. A lull in the conversation develops at this juncture.

Although Alan seems intent on not having the interaction develop as it did previously with Jennifer, he still seems unwilling to take charge

* We begin to see here the emergence of some adaptive social behavior on Alan's part, something that seemed totally absent in his prior series of interactions with Jennifer.

and direct the course of the conversation. Alan, hesitatingly, breaks the brief silence in the conversation by commenting that he's tired and will be glad to get it over. Although this statement seems entirely appropriate and descriptive of the turn of events in the present interaction, he was actually referring to his schooling which was the topic being spoken about before the brief pause.

Isaac, at this juncture, picks up something that Alan has said about waiting out the summer before he can complete his undergraduate education, and starts talking about his plan to take some summer courses to enhance his hoped-for transfer to an out of town college. After speaking for a while about his schooling situation, Isaac successfully turns the interaction around and directs the focus back toward Alan. This is again accomplished through direct questioning. Alan begins to speak at great length about his feelings regarding day school students as opposed to night school in response to Isaac expressing some curiosity about night school, "having never gone during the evening." Isaac, after listening intently and delivering many verbal and postural reinforcers for Alan to continue speaking, comments that he is in the habit of going during the day.

During Alan's subsequent observation of the tape, he expressed surprise at this point that Isaac was a day student when, in fact, it was Isaac's comment that he was curious about night school, having never gone at night, that led Alan to speak about the topic. Alan stated, "I was putting down day students and didn't realize that Isaac was a day student. I guess it threw me off a little bit. I didn't expect it since the rest of us are going during the evening." He then stated

spontaneously, "there is a mutual definition of where the conversation is going." Perhaps in order for Alan to feel this mutual definition, he had to "forget" Isaac's earlier leading remark.

Isaac, at this point, takes the speaking floor and talks about his desire to transfer from City College, elaborating about the difference in campus life at an out of town school. Alan does contribute to this and then leads Isaac to speak of his living plans when he transfers. This then leads Isaac to speak of a friend of his who shares an apartment with four other people. The interaction becomes extremely light and joking at this point, accompanied by a great deal of loud laughter about the line in the morning for the bathroom. When this topic is initiated, Alan undergoes a postural change. His legs remain spread apart while he repositions his hands in front of his crotch, thereby obstructing this portion of his body from Isaac's view. His feet become firmly planted on the floor in contrast to the tucked in, on toe position he had held from the beginning of the interaction. Alan also begins some grooming behavior, like fixing his hair, etc., while Isaac continues speaking. As the interaction grows louder and the laughter increases, Alan grabs the arms of his chair and almost shouts, "The waiting line to the bathroom has got to be insane," while almost lifting himself out of his chair. Directly after this remark, his hand is raised to his mouth, his head is pulled back and then he returns to his earlier seated position with both hands directly in front of his crotch. In the final moments of the interaction, Alan and Isaac assume synchronous positions with legs spread, feet up on their toes and tucked under their chairs, and hands resting on their thighs. Isaac continues

speaking until the interaction is interrupted.

It is interesting to note that Alan reacts both verbally and posturally to Isaac speaking of men sharing an apartment together. From his postural readjustment, including the covering of his genitals, one might wonder whether there was an implicit threat inherent to the content of the conversation.

Alan appears to speak significantly less with his hands in this interaction than in the prior ones. However, he still has many auxiliary hand movements that are not explicitly communicational in nature. These take the form of scratching, straightening his hair, touching his beard, etc. Generally speaking, there is no spontaneity of torso movement, but rather the maintenance of a fixed posture, except for the one time mentioned above.

Alan reported that he felt one of the reasons it was easier to relate to Isaac was that he was a man, and consequently they had more in common. He claimed that "Isaac's relaxation made me feel more relaxed and better able to cope." However, feeling more relaxed did not make him less aware of the camera. He stated, "I was just talking to a peer; I wasn't talking up to anyone. You could just sit and laugh about anything. Isaac made me feel more comfortable, more down to earth. He came in with a peer attitude."

When asked how he felt Isaac regarded him from these interactions, he said, "I don't know if he liked me; I don't think he disliked me. I guess he had a neutral attitude toward me." Isaac, on the other hand, was able to state after his observation, "I feel he liked me and I

liked speaking to him." Again, Alan seems unable to evaluate how his conversational partner regards him.*

Now, let's turn our attention to Alan's dyadic interaction with the other female in the study, Ann. Two important factors need to be mentioned before we begin our descriptive analysis. First, Alan is entering this interaction after having interacted in similar situations four times. Therefore, some of the behavioral change we will be noting here may be due to an order effect or practicing, as well as to an increased familiarity with the design and structure of the study, including the camera. Needless to say, Alan's interaction with Jennifer will bear to varying degrees on his interaction with Ann. However, if certain behavioral changes do occur as a result of the four prior interactions, it would seem worthy of noting. A second factor we must attend to throughout this analysis is that Ann differs quite significantly from Jennifer in terms of their self-appraised competency in dyadic interactions with strangers. This will prove to be an interesting vantage point from which to view these interactions and the effect this difference has on Alan and his interactional style. Let us begin with the video-room interaction which represents their first meeting.

Video-Room

Before the investigator leaves the video-room, Alan assumes a seated position with both of his elbows resting on the arms of the

* This inability to evaluate how one's conversational partner is regarding you seems to be developing as a consistent finding among the high anxious subjects. This will be highlighted and discussed in a later chapter.

chair and his hands are folded with his fingers interlocked in front of his crotch, thereby completely obstructing this portion of his body from Ann's view. His legs are slightly spread and feet are up on their toes tucked under his chair. Ann assumes a similarly defensive* posture with both hands in her jacket pockets and her right leg very tightly crossed over the left. Her entire torso is shifted to the left and turned slightly away from Alan while gaining support from her left elbow which is resting on the arm of her chair.

In the opening moment, Alan looks toward Ann and when his gaze meets hers she turns her head away to the left and down, perhaps indicating her unwillingness to begin. Immediately thereafter, Alan does in fact begin the interaction by questioning her about her work, which she had apparently mentioned to him before the interactions had begun. He follows her response with a follow-up question of the same order, necessitating an elaborated answer regarding her work. The sense in the opening moments is that Alan is not entirely comfortable with his role assumption as interviewer. This is indicated by his difficulty in keeping the flow of conversation going through direct questioning.

After two direct questions, he falls back on the non-directive method of reiterating or reflecting back to Ann the essence of what she had just said to him. For example, after Ann explains that she teaches in a Montessori school, Alan keeps the conversation going by asking how she likes working with little kids. She responds that she's tired of teaching, having taught for five years and that she feels she would

* Ann, during her observation, viewed her posture, with her hands in her pockets, as being "protective".

rather work with them emotionally rather than in a teaching capacity. She pauses for a moment and Alan makes his reflective statement, "Tired of teaching." She picks the conversation up by restating that she would like to quit and look for another job working with them emotionally. Again, a reflective statement-question, "in the psychology field." At this point there seems to be a shift in the format established in the beginning. Ann expresses interest in working at Willowbrook and begins to question Alan repeatedly on the topic as if he was an authority on the subject. Alan appears to be much relieved with the turn of events and begins speaking freely about the topic at hand.

At this time, Ann explicitly establishes a bond between them by noting that they seem to be looking for the same job, and immediately follows this by asking if that makes him angry. He answers "no" quite emphatically.

During the tape observation by Ann, she spontaneously stated at this point in the tape:

"I just love him. I just feel he's really a comrade. I really like him. He reflects myself; I think that's what I like about him. He seems like I'm talking to someone who's very like me. He seems ethnic, Jewish, interested in the same things. He's just terrific; I really connected with him deeply."

Interestingly, Alan commented about this same segment:

"I noticed one thing. Her physical appearance made me feel a lot more comfortable. I have dungarees, long hair, a beard and a work shirt. She comes in with a dungaree skirt and frizzy hair. I think this made me feel more at ease because this is the type of person I'm used to hanging around with. So this makes me feel this is a person I hang around with."

He claimed not to be attracted to her sexually, but just felt a comradeship. He also claimed to be less aware of the presence of the camera, unlike any other interaction.

In the opening minutes of this taped interaction, we see the development of certain trends that seem crucial to the quality of the remaining interaction. First, Alan seems able, even though momentarily, to take an "assertive" stand and initiate the interaction with a question. (We must remember, however, that he had looked toward Ann and she had signalled her unwillingness to do so.) Secondly, their common interest is immediately made explicit, thereby establishing a bond that remains throughout the interaction and, to a large extent, shapes the content of the conversation. Thirdly, there seems to be an affirmation of this bond through similarly styled appearances. For Ann, this seems to be a narcissistic investment in that she stated, "What I like about him is that he reflects myself." For Alan, however, it seems that this narcissistic investment takes on additional meaning in the context of this situation. He claims that her appearance makes him feel "this is a person I hang around with," thereby subjectively transforming her from a stranger, which he feels very uncomfortable with, to someone familiar like a friend. This transformation, in terms of his subjective experience, makes him feel much more at ease.

Throughout the first part of the interaction, neither Alan nor Ann exhibit any gross body movement. Both maintain their fixed positions assumed at the beginning of the interaction, and these positions take on an air of defensiveness. Alan sits with his hands covering his genitals, his legs tucked under his chair, and his feet resting on their toes.

Ann sits with both of her hands in her pocket, her torso turned slightly away from Alan and her legs tightly crossed over one another and pulled in toward her own body. Alan, although not demonstrating any gross torso repositioning, does in fact display increased hand movements. These hand movements, however, take a slightly different form. They are not so much to supplement his verbal communications, but rather pure auxiliary movements like scratching, rubbing his eyes and grooming behavior, like fixing his hair. These gestures may, in part, be seen as imitative in nature since Ann frequently engages in these auxiliary movements as well. But, with a few exceptions, they do not occur simultaneously with his dyadic partner.

There are some proximal distancing readjustments that do in fact take place during the interaction, and these repositionings are controlled and initiated by Ann, exclusively. For example, some time into the interaction, after a perceived bond had been established between the interactants as described earlier, Ann asks a question regarding Alan's knowledge of working in orphanages. This question is accompanied by a striking shift in Ann's seated posture. By holding on to the arms of her chair to support her weight, she repositions herself in a more upright position while turning slightly so that her entire body is now facing directly toward Alan. Her right elbow now rests on the back rest of the chair and her left elbow rests on the arm of the chair. Her hands are removed from her pockets and clasped together in front of her. Her legs are re-crossed left over right and extended out, away from her own body toward Alan's. Given this new position, she could now talk to Alan and look at him without having to turn her head as before. During

this repositioning, Alan remains absolutely still, in the fixed position he had assumed at the beginning and demonstrates no complementary movement.

Again, further on in the interaction, Ann readjusts the proximal distance between the interactants while asking whether he is really a nurse. This is accomplished by her leaning forward, extending her upper torso, neck and head toward Alan. This is once again not accompanied by any movement or readjustment on Alan's part. In fact, Alan maintains the same fixed seated position he assumed at the start of the interaction, for its entire duration. This seems to be a consistent feature of his interactional style thus far that remains constant across qualitatively different dyadic experiences.

In relation to topic and speaking turns, there seems to be no rigid and strict adherence to any role assumption, yet definite trends did develop. Alan initiated the interaction and directed the opening moments with regard to topic and speaking turn. As stated earlier, however, he seems uncomfortable with this role and soon turns to a pair of non-directive questions. Ann subsequently assumes the questioning role and maintains it for the duration of the interaction, with only one major exception. After a series of questions and personal comments which leads Alan to talk about Willowbrook, his reactions to their looking for the same kind of job, his age, orphanages and foster placement agencies, Alan disregards a further question and begins speaking about the New York Foundling Hospital. Ann continues questioning after this point and pretty much controls the topic flow. Alan did not find this quite as disturbing as previously with Jennifer, perhaps due to Ann's

versatility in regard to her method of control. The questioning is conducted in a sort of childish naïvete and Alan is made to feel as the experienced authority on all the topics discussed. Alan seems quite pleased with the role her questioning cast him in to. In addition, her questioning was intermittantly dispersed with relevant personal comments and experiences, which do not necessitate Alan having the pressure of the speaking turn continuously. Yet Ann still seems to maintain the control. At one point Ann actually cuts Alan off in the middle of a sentence to change the topic to his being a nurse. On another occasion, after the longest silence of the interaction, Ann reinitiates a topic previously discussed and the conversation continues.

Alan's general impression of this interaction was very positive.

He stated:

"Her being at ease and relaxed made me feel the same. It seemed that I was able to talk to her a lot easier. I felt more at ease. Her interests and mine were the same. That was one of the main things. Also her dress. She was someone I would hang around with. I felt comfortable because we talked about things I liked. I felt on an equal plane - no inferior/superior thing."

The most prevalent feature of his positive feelings during this interaction can best be expressed by his comments, "Out of all of them, she was most like what I would hang around with outside." "Most familiar to me." "It was like talking to a friend I knew from outside."

It seems worthy of noting at this point that Alan consistently evaluates this interaction by comparing it to the one with Jennifer. He continually makes comparisons of the two women and how they make him feel throughout his observation of the tape. Isaac was never included in these comparisons although he had already interacted with him twice.

Incidentally, this was true as well for the women. They also compared the two men throughout their observations, and these comparisons almost never took the form of comparing the interactions they experienced with a man and with a woman.

Ann's feelings about the interaction were similarly positive:

" I liked him. He seems open and nice. The way he looks indicates an openness. He's not uptight..Maybe his appearance makes me think he's not uptight. The way he talks is very warm and inviting. Everything about him is very nice."

When Alan was directly asked how he felt she regarded him after this one interaction, he responded, "I feel uncertain at this point how she regards me." He continued in a slightly defensive manner, "I'm not generally concerned; if they do, they do; if they don't, they don't."

It also seems noteworthy that Alan was unable to definitely ascertain how Jennifer and Isaac felt about him as well. This uncertainty as to how they regarded him continued unchanged throughout the entire series of dyadic interactions. While perhaps guarding against any anxiety this attentiveness may have engendered, this uncertainty may have also been a source of anxiety for him.

Ann perceived this situation as a safe one. She stated, "I could have taken a lot of risks." "I could have said to him I do not want to speak anymore, shut up." "I could have said I'm bored, let's talk about something else." She did not make any statements of this kind during the interaction, but her feeling that she could seems to have been an important component of the interaction. Essentially, Alan presents himself as extremely non-threatening, passive with regard to the direction of the conversation and more than willing to speak at length about any

experience of a not too self-revealing nature. Ann also presents herself as non-threatening and never directs the conversation toward any uncomfortable topics. These mutually shared boundaries seem to be acknowledged and accepted by both participants and the interaction proceeds without deviation from these boundaries. In contrast, Jennifer did not adhere to any such boundaries, and would ask questions like "why do you live home with your parents in the Bronx?" and "have you ever been in therapy?" which would necessitate a defensive answer as to why not.

Before turning to their waiting room interaction, it seems important to mention that Ann did find Alan unresponsive at times. In speaking to Alan of her experience with an interviewer, in which she was told that she looked a little wild, she did not receive the response she expected. "I didn't think he was interested in what I had to say," she reported. "He seemed bored and didn't care." On another occasion she extended an invitation to him to visit the school she teaches in. She stated in the following, "I really wanted him to come." "I didn't feel he really wanted to." "I wanted something from him now, but he didn't ask for the address." "I didn't think he really cared to come." When Alan observed this portion of tape he perceived no invitation at all. He claimed, "I felt it was more of a thing to see what a Montessorri School was like, not an invitation to go to her school per se."

Waiting Room

Upon entering the waiting room both interactants assumed comfortable fluid postures. Ann sits forward and begins to retie her boots while

holding her head upright to listen and look at Alan. Alan sits straight in his chair, his legs uncrossed and slightly spread. His feet are firmly planted on the floor and not tucked under his chair. His arms are resting on the arms of the chair. Alan reaches for a cigarette during the opening moments and begins talking about the prospect of there being a camera behind the one-way mirror. It seems interesting to note that the opening moments of this interaction are strikingly similar to how Isaac opened the previous waiting room interaction with Alan. Alan is attempting to utilize Isaac's method of opening the interaction which, he subsequently remarked, was successful in relieving the tension in the interaction. Also, in a sense, Alan is establishing a bond between himself and Ann by externalizing the threat in the situation, (the camera), to outside the room, just as Isaac had done previously with him. Ann comments during her observation of the opening, "I don't believe that it is there, he does. I don't really care or believe him."

Alan commented upon the opening moments of the interaction, "she immediately got into a relaxed type thing (she raised her hands over her head in a stretching like motion)." "She immediately showed me there wasn't going to be any really great tension." Again, Alan perceives these interactions from a passive position, although he consistently does most of the talking. Not only does Ann essentially control the speaking turns and topics, but also whether the situation will be tense or not. The reliance on his dyadic partner to control and shape his subjective experience seems to be a consistent feature of his interactional style. This also serves the purpose of externalizing the blame

for his anxiety to outside himself and consequently he does not have to view his anxiety as due to any inner deficiency in his social skills or interactional style.*

After the initial exchange, in which Alan begins a discussion of the possibility of a camera and Ann participates, she then takes control and introduces the topic of Lenny Bruce. In doing so, she once again successfully attempts to create another bond between them, by establishing the fact they are both Jewish and proceeds to quote a racial joke of Lenny's.

Ann commented during her observation of this segment, "He didn't respond the way I wanted him to once again. I wanted him to really get involved in Lenny Bruce." "I got scared that he wasn't responsive." At this point in the tape she placed her hands in her pocket and described this during her observation as a "protective reaction."

The preceding incident illustrates the power distribution in their dyadic interaction. She gets "scared" when Alan doesn't respond as expected or as she had intended him to. This may perhaps be seen or perceived by Ann as a challenge to her assumed power and control. Except for the instances mentioned above, Alan generally responded as expected and thereby successfully enabled her to maintain control of the flow of the conversation.

* This is not entirely the case as Alan does in fact acknowledge his anxiety on occasion as due to some personal deficiency.

A feature of this interaction that hadn't occurred in any other is Alan's contribution to the proximal distance of the participants. In the beginning moments of this interaction, he defines the distance by actually moving his chair, once seated, closer to Ann. Also during the interaction, he makes frequent postural changes and torso readjustments both synchronously and dyssynchronously with Ann. He is by far more fluid in his movements in this final interaction, than in any other.

At a particular point in the interaction, after some discussion of Lenny Bruce, which led to Red Foxx (a topic he initiated), there is a lull in the conversation. Alan commented during his observation, "the interaction is not going too good." "A lot of lulls." "I was trying to think what they were for." "It's just not going." "Just a thing of not knowing each other." It is interesting that after repeated remarks of how familiar she is to him because of her style of dress and previous interaction, he now attributes the frequent lulls in his second interaction with her to their not knowing each other. When in his subjective experience, the interaction is not going well, she becomes the "stranger" again.

The interaction picks up after Ann initiates a conversation about the nature of the study they are participating in. This leads to her speaking about her experience talking to Isaac as compared to him. She tells Alan that in contrast to her interaction with Isaac, she actually felt interested in talking to him. Alan makes some comment which narrowly defines their mutual interest as "looking for the same job." A long pause develops after this. Ann commented during her observation,

"You see, right here I'm feeling disappointed in him. He has let me down. I didn't feel we were talking about looking for a job. I feel we talked about what we felt about life in a certain way. I felt that he was less interested in me than I thought. I'm disappointed."

After the pause, Ann again reinitiates the conversation by asking if he makes good money as a nurse, and follows this up with if he ever saw anyone die, questioned in a somewhat naïve manner. This naive questioning quality continues and has the effect of placing Alan in an authority position, as mentioned earlier. This also seems to have the effect of having Alan give more elaborated answers. The rest of the interaction continues with Alan discussing his experience of delivering babies. Ann maintains a very attentive posture with her head supported on her hands, her elbows resting on her knees and her upper torso leaning forward, through most of this segment. She asks questions which take him through different aspects of his experience, and the conversation flows continuously to its end. Ann also supplies many verbal and postural reinforcers to what he is saying in an attempt to keep the flow of conversation steady.

Alan's general impression, after the conclusion of his observations were as follows:

"There were a lot of questions being asked of me, but I didn't feel that superiority/inferiority thing even though I was the one with the knowledge. I think this was because I wasn't trying to prove that I was smart or better. She seemed interested and cared about what I was saying. That's why it seemed more of an interaction. I felt that she was relaxed, constantly talking in a relaxed position. In the beginning, I was a little weary of what was going to happen. I didn't know which way we were headed. I was satisfied with the interaction, but the slow start killed it. I should have picked it up instead of letting it slow down."

Alan stated that he was generally pleasantly surprised with his performance on these tapes, except for his interaction with Jennifer. He considered his observations as a tremendous learning experience. He saw this as an unique experience to be an outside observer of himself, and didn't expect to see himself as being so competent, in general. He felt that he has to learn not to talk with his hands so much.

One very interesting feature of Alan's interactional behavior and experience seems very much related to issues of familiarity and predictability. As illustrated numerous times during the preceeding description, Alan seems most comfortable in dyadic situations where he maintains a feeling of familiarity with his conversational partner. This familiarity seems to equip Alan with greater powers of prediction; an increased ability to ascertain what will transpire and within what context. Since Alan has been shown to essentially assume a passive position with regard to conversational topic flow, speaking turns and general atmosphere of the interaction, this ability to familiarize himself with his dyadic partner and thereby have some sense of what's in store, seems critical of his sense of safety and well-being. In situations where he is able to immediately assess his conversational partner, Alan subjectively experiences the interaction relatively free from anxiety. In Isaac's case, he explicitly stated that his "goofing around" right from the start indicated to him that the rest of the interaction would go well. In Ann's case, he almost immediately focused in on her appearance and transformed his experience of her into a non-threatening friend; "it was like talking to a friend I knew from outside." However, in Jennifer's case, she remained unfamiliar and vague to him, perhaps due

to her own anxiety, and the direction of the interaction remained uncertain. He had no clear sense of what kind of question she might ask him or what personal boundaries she might violate by her questioning. This kept him ill at ease and tense throughout the interactions with her. Further support is given to this idea when we look at the more difficult moments of the generally pleasurable interactions. During these times Alan attributes any difficulties to their not knowing each other and consequently not being able to predict what might happen.

In order to get a complete picture, we must follow all the participants of this study through each of their dyadic interactions.

The second case to be presented will be that of Jennifer, the representative high anxious female. Again, as in the previous case, the order of analysis will follow the actual order in which the interactions took place. Her first interaction occurred in the video-room with Alan, the high anxious male. Since this interaction has been previously described in detail in our descriptive analysis of Alan, we will only highlight here certain salient features of her interactional style that will aid in our understanding of her social behavior and anxiety coping mechanisms. For a complete and detailed description of this interaction, the reader is advised to refer back to the previous chapter on Alan, in interaction with Jennifer.

As described earlier, Jennifer immediately assumes the role of spokesman for both herself and Alan and actually initiates and sustains the verbal exchange through questioning. Jennifer maintains a posture that appears relaxed yet seems rigidly maintained. She sits comfortably with her legs crossed left over right, seated in an upright position and her arms resting comfortably on the arms of her chair. She is facing Alan and although the interaction begins somewhat hesitantly, eye contact is established from the onset. The initial role definition of Jennifer as interviewer and Alan as interviewee persists throughout this particular interaction and remains unchallenged and rigidly adhered to by both conversational partners.

In viewing the opening moments of this interaction, Jennifer admits feeling "very uptight," and "on the spot to talk." When questioned during her tape observation what her experience of the opening moments were like, Jennifer replied,

"In the beginning I was trying to test myself. I'm always trying to step forward and take responsibility. That's what I was trying to do to keep this thing going."

She continued, "I really felt under strain by doing it; it didn't happen naturally." "It took a deliberate effort and I found it very hard to concentrate on what he was saying."

After some questions designed to get some elaboration on her statement about her difficulty concentrating on what Alan was saying, Jennifer responded,

"As I was listening to him and trying to concentrate on what he was saying I was remembering that he might say something that might not lead to something else. So I thought to myself I better have something else to ask him. I have to stay ready in case of a lull."

It seems interesting to note at this point that both anxious subjects thus far have expressed concern regarding conversational lulls, however, neither person was able to identify why such a lull results in an increased experience of anxiety.

Stemming from Jennifer's description of her experience of this particular interaction, it appears that although she did assume the power and leadership in the interaction with Alan, this subsequently was a large source of anxiety for her. However, Alan in viewing the same interaction, comments on the ease in which she handled herself. He remarks,

"I think she's a lot less nervous that I was. She just seemed to sit there. She's more in control of what she's doing - more than me. She seems experienced in what she's doing like she's done something like this before."

He concluded that his subjective experience of her being so relaxed, made him feel extremely uncomfortable.

Although Jennifer claims to be uneasy and tense with her assumed role in this interaction, she admits that if it was the other way around (e.g., Alan as interviewer and herself as interviewee) it would have been considerably more "tense" for her. Consequently, it appears that Jennifer had chosen for herself a role in this interaction which could be considered the lesser of two evils. On the one hand, the anxiety generated by her role assumption distracted her from being able to fully concentrate on Alan's verbal productions, however, on the other hand, her ability to maintain the power and control in the dyad was felt to be more rewarding and satisfying than its adverse consequences. In this regard, Jennifer commented, "I kind of liked the power." "I felt it powerful to be asking the questions." From the first interaction, we begin to see a hierarchy in her interactional style. Power and control seem essential features for the maintenance of a sense of safety and integrity, even at the expense of more immediate discomfort.

Another feature of Jennifer's interactional experience seems to be a wide variance in her perception and subjective evaluations of her conversational partner. As detailed in the previous chapter, Jennifer generally maintained a less than interested attitude toward Alan, which can also be described as tolerant.. However, as her stated interest in the conversation increased, so did her opinion of Alan. For instance, after the topic of conversation progressed through several subjects in which Jennifer claimed not to be interested, it settled on a discussion of jobs, particularly in the field of emotionally disturbed children. Jennifer states at this juncture, "My interest is increasing." "I'm thinking about myself because I'm looking for a job now." This interest

is expressed not only posturally, by an appropriate repositioning that puts her in closer proximity to Alan, but also through verbal reinforcements and persistent questioning on the topic. This increased interest in the conversational topic is accompanied by a striking change in her subjective experience of Alan. She stated at this point in her observation, "He changes as a person here." "He's becoming more real." "This is the first time I feel he is really a person." "It's very easy to talk to him." Alan comments at this point that he senses an increased interest on her part and points to her repositioning that makes her "move closer toward me." However, he regards this as only an interest "in hearing about psychology," and is unable to sense any change in her opinion of him. He does state, however, that her increased interest made him feel more at ease.

Jennifer's concluding statement regarding this interaction was as follows:

"I was surprised I didn't look as awful as I thought I would.
I thought I would see myself and say hey, I look like shit.
I don't know why! I thought I sounded O.K. I liked the way
I sounded. It surprised me!"

In terms of how she thought Alan regarded her, Jennifer stated, "I never really got an impression of what Alan was thinking about me at all." Incidentally, Alan also was completely unable to ascertain how Jennifer regarded him. As we shall see, Jennifer's inability to evaluate how her conversational partner is regarding her seems to emerge as another consistent feature of her interactional style and generalized social coping mechanisms.

Waiting Room

During the opening moments of the waiting room interaction with Alan, Jennifer assumes a strikingly different and verbally more productive role. Jennifer begins the verbal exchange before becoming settled in her chair by continuing with the previous discussion from the video-room concerning emotionally disturbed children. Once settled in, she assumes a seated forward and attentive posture with both legs uncrossed and firmly planted on the floor. Jennifer commented, after viewing the initial segment of this interaction, "I seem more relaxed and animated." This perception is also confirmed by the investigator. Jennifer seems much more fluid posturally and the rigidity witnessed in the previous interaction seems absent in the present one. When questioned further as to this apparent difference between her video-room behavior and her waiting room behavior she responded,

"I feel mostly its based on the fact that we finally worked up to talking about something we were both interested in and felt that I can get information from him that I wanted to know."

She added, "I didn't feel that the camera greatly affected the interaction." "It was more that we hit upon something I'm more interested in." Alan, on the other hand, attributes this noticable difference as resulting exclusively from the change in the rooms. He stated, "She's totally different at this point; she seems to be another person." "In the video-room she didn't say anything about herself; that's when I realized right off the bat that the room was doing it, because right away she started talking about herself instead of just asking questions."

This perceptual difference in the attributed cause for the change

in the interaction seems interesting. Alan, while assuming a basically passive role in regard to speaking turns, conversational topic as well as proximal distancing, attributes this difference to external factors (i.e., the room) thereby relegating the responsibility for what changes occurred to factors outside the control of the interactants. In contrast, Jennifer views this difference as resulting from factors very much within the locus of control of both interactants, namely the topic of conversation. However, while Jennifer almost exclusively determines the conversational topic in both interactional situations, she tends to share this responsibility in her subsequent analysis of the tapes. She consistently referred to "we" rather than "I" as in "we hit upon something ..." "we worked up to talking about something...", etc. Although in practice, she assumes exclusive control of conversational topic, in her reflective analysis of the situation she shares this responsibility with her conversational partner. By doing so, Jennifer is then able to attribute the "blame" in part, to Alan when she feels the interaction is not going well. For instance, at a later segment in this interaction, Jennifer comments, "I'm not interested in what he's talking about." However, Jennifer actually initiated this topic by means of direct questioning. This aspect of Jennifer's interactional style, pointed to above, remains consistent throughout.

At a later juncture in the interaction with Alan, Jennifer quite abruptly changes the topic of conversation from an intellectual discussion of professional work with emotionally disturbed children to a more personally revealing topic of individual psychotherapy. This topic change was again accomplished by directly questioning whether Alan

was ever in therapy. Alan responds to this question by defensively stating that money, and later, time prevented him from entering, and then successfully changes the topic to group psychotherapy. However, during this segment, Jennifer commented, "I wasn't sure whether he was receptive to what I was saying." "He was so used to talking, I don't know whether he was listening." Jennifer claimed that this uncertainty made her feel extremely self-conscious about what she was sharing regarding her own personal therapy experience. Nevertheless, she continued with her self-revealing comments. Her final analysis of this situation was, "I really wasn't picking up he was really hearing me." "He didn't seem stimulated at all." The interaction continued beyond this discussion of psychotherapy and Jennifer immediately commented that she is not finding the interaction very interesting. When questioned about this experience Jennifer replied, "He's talking about stuff I felt I knew more about, so I wasn't getting anything out of it." "I'm just bored." Again Jennifer, as she did in the first interaction, makes her evaluation of the interaction based on the conversational topic. However, since her experience of boredom was immediately preceded by her perception that Alan wasn't receptive to what she was saying, it seemed interesting to pursue this chain of events with her. Jennifer admitted that there "probably" was a connection, however, she was "totally unaware" of it at the time. She claimed to feel "terrible" that she responded to Alan's unresponsiveness with subsequent feelings of boredom and stated that she felt that was "unfair". She concluded, "maybe I could have handled it differently." This seems to be an obvious example of how phenomena not fully attended to or recognized at the time can greatly affect one's

social judgment and subsequent behavioral responses. It was as if Jennifer, feeling Alan was bored by her apparent attempt to share something personal, responds with boredom in return. This boredom can also be viewed as somewhat defensive in that this response guards against any subsequent feelings of hurt or rejection. In fact, it is she who is rejecting Alan at this point, by stating that she is no longer interested in what he has to say.

In Jennifer's concluding comments regarding this interaction she felt that she "wasn't gratified by seeing myself." She continued,

"I tried to share some very intimate things and it didn't get anywhere. He just wasn't setting sparks in me. By and large, I didn't have a good time talking to him."

With respect to her assumed role assumption in this interaction, she commented,

"I felt responsible; I wanted to talk about what I wanted to talk about. I felt like I was saying, let me keep probing you to find the things I want to talk about. Let me call the shots."

Again, as mentioned in the previous interaction, Jennifer claimed to have "no idea" of how Alan regarded her during this exchange. Alan, likewise, was unable to state how she regarded him. This particular feature of these interactants' evaluative faculties remained unchanged during the two exchanges just described.

Alan commented that he also was glad the interaction was over and felt that Jennifer wasn't relaxed. This was viewed as a partial cause for his uncomfortable feelings. In addition, he pointed to the fact that when Jennifer was speaking she generally did not look directly at him, as opposed to his tendency, when he spoke and she was listening,

to maintain eye contact. Alan interpreted this as being indicative of anxiety on Jennifer's part. He generally evaluated this interaction negatively, stating, "It didn't flow - she would start and stop." Again, we see the difference in individual focus and perspective between these two interactants. Alan seems to subjectively evaluate conversations in terms of form (i.e., flow and lulls) while Jennifer in terms of content, specifically, conversational topic.

We will now turn our attention to the interactions that Jennifer engaged in with Ann, our representative low anxious female. We will begin our description with their meeting in the video-room which represents their first contact. The interaction begins with Jennifer seated forward in her chair, her left leg crossed over the right and her left hand crossed over her right hand and resting on her thigh. She positions her torso away from Ann in such a manner so that in order to look at Ann, she must turn her head approximately 45 degrees to the left. Jennifer maintains this forward seated position for a good part of this interaction, until the conversation progresses to an explicitly stated non-threatening subject. Immediately, upon viewing the opening segment of this interaction, Ann comments, "I see her as closed up completely; she's really tight." "Her arms are crossed, her legs are crossed." "I feel she's saying, keep away from me." Ann immediately, before any verbal exchange had occurred, interprets her body language and commented, "I feel she's threatened by me."

Ann begins the interaction in a slightly slouched position with her left leg crossed over the right. Her hands are initially out of her pockets and resting on the arms of her chair. Her torso is positioned

in such a manner that she is able to look directly at Jennifer without turning her head significantly.

Jennifer initiates the verbal exchange by asking Ann's name. Ann responds and returns the question. Once these brief introductory gestures occur, Jennifer, once again, reassumes her characteristic role of interviewer and asks a series of questions. Jennifer commented on viewing the opening of this present interaction that her observed role assumption was quite "intentional". Resulting from our observations of Jennifer thus far, it seems quite apparent that she deals with her interpersonal anxiety by attempting to gain control of the dyadic conversational flow. Her characteristic method of accomplishing this seems primarily through direct questioning. Jennifer, admittedly, views her questioning role as "controlling" and "powerful" and it is not intended as purely an information gathering technique. However, in this interaction, once the introductory gestures had taken place and Jennifer assumed her "interviewer" posture, this role assumption was challenged by Ann.

Ann at this point simply disregards a further question and begins asking Jennifer a series of questions and consequently assumes the interviewer role from a reluctant Jennifer. The "power shift" as defined by Jennifer, is accomplished by Ann's assumption of the questioning role. Jennifer commented during her observation of this exchange,

"You see I'm thinking! Right away I'm taken back. I was feeling all this intenseness that I was going to structure this whole thing and then the whole thing went 'KAPOOEY'".

Jennifer seemed so shaken at this point that when asked how old she was

she answered her wrong age. Jennifer commented during her observation,

"My God, I lied. I said 22, I'm 24. I must have been so nervous because she shifted it, I didn't tell her my real age. It shocked me to death!"

Incidentally, Ann while viewing the above series of events, makes absolutely no reference to any power shift or struggle. This entire segment was unremarkable from Ann's perspective. In fact, when questioned regarding the power distribution in this interaction, she remarked that she felt it was shared and added that she didn't feel she had to "take care" of Jennifer as she felt she had to with Isaac. Jennifer's quite extreme internal reactions to what had just transpired went entirely unnoticed by Ann.

Immediately preceding this series of events there was some indication that Ann was dissatisfied with the role assumptions that Jennifer had defined. Jennifer asked Ann "when did you go to school," which was consistent with the benign quality her questions had up to this point. Ann responds somewhat angrily, "I went to school when I was supposed to go to school." The tape observation was stopped at this point for Jennifer's comments. She said:

"I felt she was being obnoxious. She seemed to have a chip on her shoulder about something I didn't know about. I think she was a little nervous; a little 'cocky'. I feel she didn't like my questioning and that's why she had an attitude and responded the way she did."

Ann also commented on these events immediately preceding the "switch over" in role assumptions. She commented, "maybe I was angry. Angry just about her. I didn't want to be there with her then."

Jennifer's initial impression of Ann at this point was that she didn't like Ann, but that she wouldn't let it "stand in the way."

Jennifer also speculated at this point that Ann "seemed very concerned about her age" and admitted that perhaps her question touched upon this point. In any event, the interaction progressed from this point.

Jennifer, once again as she did with Alan, focuses on primarily a content analysis to explain events and reactions within the interaction. For instance, in an attempt to explain Ann's reaction, she looked into the nature of her question and viewed its content and implicit message as being the cause for her "obnoxious" response. Ann, on the other hand, responds somewhat more globally, "Maybe I was angry, angry about her," without making any specific reference to Jennifer's inquiry directly. We shall later see how these patterns persist across varied conversational partners.

Jennifer, although quite shaken by the events just described, manages to return the question regarding her age and Ann responds "thirty-one". Jennifer immediately responds in a flattering manner, "it doesn't show at all!" This is one case where flattery will get you everywhere. Ann's initial impression of Jennifer changes radically at this point. Initially, Ann commented, "I did not want to be there with her." "I was really hesitant about her." "I just don't like her." However, once complimented, she remarked during her tape observation, "I'm beginning to like her." "She seems less angry and more interested and open." When questioned further about her sudden and quite radical change in opinion at this juncture she answered, "I don't know." "I started out not liking her which is unusual because I am much more comfortable with women than with men." "Then I got to be really interested in her." Again, as in the previous example, Ann seems unable to narrowly define the

source of her reactions, but rather attributes them to general or global impressions, not specific events. Ann also commented that she felt that Jennifer was very interested in her and added, "much more than I am in her."

A series of questions followed regarding living situation, locality of apartments, etc. and a brief silence occurs. Jennifer commented while laughing nervously,

"You see! Now I don't know what to say now. There's an uncomfortable silence. She took the power, but she didn't follow through with it I felt."

Jennifer picked up the exchange at this point by not asking any further questions, perhaps due to Ann's "angry" response from the last one, but instead begins talking about herself and her general career plans. She states, "I don't know, I had thought of going for psychology, but my grades are really not good enough. I'm thinking now of something in Special Ed." In viewing this segment of the interaction, Jennifer commented,

"I feel a little uncomfortable. It puts me on shaky ground. When you are talking about yourself you have to think about what you're going to tell and what you're not going to tell. You have to talk and think ahead at the same time."

The interaction continued until it reached the topic of financial aid. At this point Ann began to question Jennifer repeatedly on the procedures for obtaining it and the benefits involved. Ann commented, "these questions are really different than keeping her away from me." (Ann had commented earlier with regard to her questioning of Isaac that her questions were designed to keep him away.) Jennifer, clearing her throat and sitting back in her chair for the first time since the

interaction began, begins to explain the details and procedures. It is also interesting to note that this postural change of Jennifer's was also accompanied by a torso readjustment. Jennifer shifted her body, thereby exposing more body surface area to Ann and she also no longer had to turn her head to look directly at her. Jennifer commented,

"At this point I feel more at ease. I knew what I was going to say. It's the difference of giving factual information versus talking about myself."

However, the apparent ease with which Jennifer continued to explain about the details of financial aid was somewhat in contrast to her internal experience. Jennifer spontaneously commented while viewing this, "I feel very silly when I look at myself doing this." "I see myself assuming an authority role, as if I know all the answers." "It makes me a little uncomfortable." She continued, "I also feel where is she at; she's in school and doesn't know anything about financial aid?" "She's playing stupid or naïve." We have previously seen in our chapter on Alan that Ann does in fact "play naïve" when questioning her conversational partner. We will discuss this feature of Ann's in a later chapter.

The interaction continued on the theme of financial aid until Jennifer abruptly and somewhat timidly interjected a question about where Ann lives and with whom. After Ann's answer there appeared to be a brief conversational pause and Jennifer quickly directed the conversational topic back to financial aid where the conversation remained until its end.

Ann's general impressions of the interaction was that she was "glad it was over." She felt that Jennifer was "more interested in me...a lot more than I was interested in her." She also commented that she felt

Jennifer was dull and serious and "wasn't full of life" In addition, although Jennifer absolutely perceived Ann as assuming "control" of the interaction, Ann seemed to perceive things quite differently. After a brief silence had occurred and Jennifer proceeded to break the silence, Ann commented:

"She was playing the role here that I was playing with Isaac. She wanted the conversation to go on and she just took control. I didn't feel I had to take care of her as with Isaac. She was doing alright because the conversation kept going. She wants this to be just as interesting as I do."

Jennifer, in contrast, did not view her position in this interaction as powerful. In fact, the only power Jennifer felt was what she termed "informing power" which specifically related to her passing down information about financial aid. Jennifer's general impressions of this interaction was that she was uncomfortable. She stated at the end,

"Something about her made me feel uncomfortable. Maybe I saw myself in her. Maybe it was also her questioning me that didn't appeal to me. She was asking me what I was about. There was something about her that made me feel a little defensive - that she was sitting there judging me. I felt I was there to be judged."

Jennifer seems stuck in her self-perceived powerlessness in this interaction although Ann viewed Jennifer as assuming a large part of the responsibility for keeping the conversation going. Once threatened by Ann's assumption of the questioner role, Jennifer seemed unable to revise and modify this perception even though the questioning was shared subsequent to this occurrence. One further point should be made before proceeding to her second interaction with Ann. Jennifer seemed much more focused on the conversational lulls than did Ann and remembered them more distinctly in her final evaluation of this interaction.

From our analysis thus far of our two "anxious" subjects, it appears that this seems consistently true for both of them.

Once again, as in the prior interaction, Jennifer commented, "I didn't pick up her judgment of me." "I don't know how she felt about me."

Waiting Room

Ann begins the verbal exchange in the waiting room by commenting, "I wasn't nervous at all," and added, "I just felt bored." Realizing the possible offensive nature of her comment she immediately added, "Not by you, the situation." Jennifer quickly agreed with a smile, head nod and verbal response of "hah." This leads to an ongoing discussion of previous interactions.

Ann begins this interaction seated comfortably back in her chair in a slightly slouched position. Her hands are folded around her midsection and her left leg is crossed over the right. She sits looking attentively and directly at Jennifer. Jennifer, on the other hand does not assume a resting seated position, but immediately busies herself with reaching for a pack of cigarettes on an adjoining table, opens it, takes one out and lights it, while engaging in conversation with Ann. She remains seated slightly forward with both legs uncrossed, slightly apart and both feet firmly planted on the floor. Her torso is positioned so that she is also able to look directly at Ann without any head turning. Eye contact is established at the onset and is generally maintained throughout the interaction.

The conversation centers on a discussion of men in general and on the men participating in this study, specifically.* Jennifer commented during her observation, "women love to talk about men...I find that distasteful but I'm easily sucked into it -- it's fun." The nature of this comment indicates again a perception that she continued to see herself as being led with regard to conversational topic. Ann has no comment regarding topic at this point.

There is a mutually positive regard for one another at this beginning point of the interaction. Jennifer states during her observation, "I'm liking her." "She seems relaxed; very relaxed." "I feel she's giving ." "I like her now -- the conversation is flowing very freely." Ann similarly comments, "I feel better about her right now." "We shared something together and now we are going to be in this room." "I want to talk."

The conversation progressed to Ann restating her preference for talking to women. Jennifer commented, "I didn't know where she was coming from with that." "It's common that women share their feelings more with each other, but still." "I felt like saying she's in a different generation." Jennifer responded to Ann's comments by sharing her own feelings regarding men and stated that she is witnessing a change regarding her standards for men. She views herself presently as being more selective which results in her feeling better about herself.

After a brief lull, Jennifer once again broke the silence and

* This topic was initiated by Ann stating, "I had to ask all the questions with Isaac," and Jennifer acknowledges and relates a similar experience with Alan. This immediately secured some "common ground" between them.

commented, "I don't have a boyfriend." Another silence occurred and Ann broke this lull by changing the topic of conversation to academic issues, namely a personality theory course. It seems worthy of mention here that Ann had previously stated that she had a fantasy that Jennifer felt she was a "lesbian". This seems to shed some light on the internal motivation at this point for Ann's topic change. Ann became apparently uneasy. She looked to the right and then behind her while sinking lower in her chair. However, this fantasy of Ann's will be discussed in more detail in a later chapter focusing on her specifically.

In line with the initiated discussion of the personality theory course, the conversation progressed to a discussion of the investigator, with Ann asking Jennifer about her feelings. Jennifer answered positively and another silence ensued. Jennifer commented at this juncture, "Once again it's touch and go." Jennifer seems much more concerned about the frequent brief pauses that occur. However, it appears that Jennifer felt less impelled to break these lulls than she did with Alan. Nevertheless, her evaluation of her interactional partner seems negatively correlated with the frequency of conversational pauses. After her comment regarding the "touch and go" quality of the interaction, she then comments critically about Ann, "She was touching her hair and primping herself -- I don't like that -- it's vain -- it turns me off -- another generation."

Another pattern seems to have emerged. The more positively Jennifer feels about Ann, the greater her need to identify with Ann. In the same respect, when feeling negatively, Jennifer tends to highlight the difference between them as in her comment "another generation". Jennifer also

comments at this point, "I felt like a young college student and she was an older person," again pointing to their differences. These comments of Jennifer's are in striking contrast to earlier comments when her evaluation of the interaction and the interactional partner was more positive. She commented earlier, "I felt we had similar things in common. I liked talking to her. I felt akin to her because she was an older woman and sometimes I feel the same. I wanted to get to know her."

The conversation continued to a brief discussion of the previous interaction in the video-room.* Ann asks, "Do you feel I took the more aggressive stand with you?" Jennifer answers that she felt a "switch-over." She explained that in the beginning she had been asking the questions and then Ann "asserted" herself and started asking questions back. She adds "I had to rearrange my framework." Ann commented upon viewing this segment, "I think she's saying that when we were together, I had the power." "I agree with her." This comment seems to slightly revise Ann's original perception of the prior interaction, when she stated that the power and responsibility was shared.

A comparison was drawn between their previous interaction with each other and past interactions with the other men in the study. Both women admit that they controlled the interaction and felt responsible for their respective male conversational partners. Ann commented in reference to her prior interaction with Isaac, "I felt like his mother." "I felt very responsible for making it happen." Jennifer quickly

*This discussion immediately followed a brief pause after Jennifer related her positive feelings about the investigator to Ann.

identifies with Ann with reference to her interaction with Alan, yet concedes the power in her interaction with Ann.

Jennifer remained very fluid in her movement, while talking a good deal with the aid of hand gesturing. In addition, there was a fluidity of movement in her torso, arms and legs. Throughout the interaction her legs remained uncrossed and both of her feet remained firmly planted on the ground.

Two major proximal repositionings occur on separate occasions and both are initiated by Ann. On these occasions, Ann directly questions Jennifer regarding how she perceived her in the last interaction. This repositioning is accomplished through a gross movement of her upper torso, consequently significantly decreasing the distance between them. After receiving her answer she would sit back comfortable in her chair and reassume the posture in which she began the interaction. Jennifer remained seated in an upright position during these postural maneuvers. Incidentally, Jennifer's answers to Ann's questions about the prior interactions were in general concessions of power.

At one point in the discussion of the previous interaction, Jennifer stated, "I liked talking to you," and fell silent awaiting Ann's response. Ann responds, "I liked talking to you too." This answer is accompanied by her placing her hand over her mouth and recrossing her legs right over left and turning her torso slightly to the left, away from Jennifer. Ann commented during her observation, "when she said that I thought I don't want to see you again." When questioned whether she felt this was communicated to Jennifer she answered, "No." In the example mentioned above, we see a prime example of a discrepant communica-

tion. We have already seen that there appears to be a direct relationship with the amount of body area exposed to the conversational partner and the degree of positive regard at any particular moment.* In this case, Ann responded verbally in a positive manner, but her comments during the observation, as well as her body posturing during the actual segment in question, indicated the contrary. Jennifer, during her observation, did not comment directly on Ann's apparent discrepant communication, but interestingly made a negative comment about the interaction at that point. She pointed to the frequent lulls in the conversation and almost seemed to blame Ann for not keeping the conversation going.

In Jennifer's concluding comments about this interaction, she stated:

"I felt more androgenous and she was more feminine. I felt like this book full of facts and I was still giving her more information."

She continued,

"I don't know -- I'm into this wierd thing sometimes. I want to be the super-star and yet I could feel myself withdrawing and not being that because of her presence."

She concluded,

"Perhaps I wasn't stimulating. I don't feel I stimulated her at all. She only got off on the fact that I was a female. That was the only common ground."

Jennifer sounded distinctly depressed in affect when making her summary statements and explicitly stated that she felt very disappointed

*This relationship emerges when we compare the seated position of the interactants in the previous exchanges with their subjective reports during their respective tape observations. In doing so, a consistent trend does emerge.

in herself from this interaction. This was not elaborated upon although questioned further. It seems worthy of mention here that Jennifer similarly felt that she was unstimulating in her attempt to share something personal with Alan. We begin to see a picture of Jennifer as viewing herself as somewhat socially ineffectual, being unable to "stimulate" her two previous conversational partners.

We will now complete our chapter on Jennifer by focusing on her last two remaining interactions, with Isaac, our representative low-anxious male. We will begin with the waiting room interaction, which constitutes their first meeting.

Jennifer, already seated in the waiting room, awaits Isaac's entry. She is sitting with her right elbow on an adjacent table and her head is tilted to the right and resting in her hand. Her left hand rests on her hip, while her feet are slightly apart and firmly planted on the floor. When Isaac enters the room, she does not reposition herself at all, however, she does acknowledge his presence by directing her gaze toward him and smiles. Isaac introduces himself and sits straight back in his chair with his legs also slightly spread and resting on the floor. His hands rest on his thighs. Jennifer states to Isaac that she feels tired and actually initiates the discourse by asking him a series of questions regarding school. Isaac answers her questions at length, while also volunteering information above and beyond that required by her direct questioning. Isaac returns a series of similar questions to Jennifer and she responds with only one-word answers. Jennifer, at this point, reassumes responsibility for the interaction

by directing the conversational flow by means of further questioning, as well as through frequent elaborations and personal additions to Isaac's responses.*

Jennifer commented regarding her subjective experience at this point,

"With Isaac I felt he was a younger person and I can easily relate to without feeling any defenses at all. I feel very comfortable in this situation. If he was an older man, I'm sure I would have felt on the spot. I felt there was nothing to be threatened about."

Jennifer pointed to her comfortable feelings by noting she didn't feel any need to reposition herself when he entered the room. She merely kept sitting with her head in her hand.

Isaac initially commented that although he found her to be nice and he liked her, he felt that she started the interaction "abruptly" with questioning, and he saw her as "rather jumpy." This "jumpy" comment referred specifically to her early attempt not only to control the topic flow, but also to her repeated successful attempts at changing the topic of conversation. It appears, in light of Jennifer's perceived powerlessness in her prior two interactions with Ann, that she may have been reaffirming her "social power" with Isaac by successfully accomplishing repeated topic changes in this present interaction. These topic changes could not be attributed to a lack of interest on her part since she explicitly expressed interest in the topics being discussed. Isaac made no attempt to challenge her assumed authority over the conversational topic, but merely answered at length any question directed toward him.

* Here Jennifer now does show social adequacy, in contrast to her earlier resort to one-word answers.

Jennifer commented at this point, "Isaac is charming; good presentation; his presence is right there; I like it, I want to hear what he has to say."

Although Jennifer asserted her control of the interaction through questioning, the general format of the interaction is a mutual exchange and very much a conversation rather than the former "interviewing" format with Alan. The conversation progressed through various topics and the interactants began to accumulate a "common ground" between themselves. They learned that they both live in a similar area in Manhattan and in addition, that Isaac attended a secondary school that many of Jennifer's friends had once attended. As the common ground between them became apparent and grew, Jennifer's interest and positive regard for Isaac increased. This increased interest was also accompanied by a postural shift from her head-in-hand position previously described, to a more upright, attentive and "head-on" seated position.

Jennifer commented upon viewing the progression of events up to this point,

"I like it. He lives on the upper-west side; he went to a private school that people I grew up with went to. I can relate to my past."

At this point an interesting thing occurred during Jennifer's tape observation. As you will remember, in the beginning of the interaction Jennifer relied quite heavily on their age difference to insure herself that "there was nothing to be threatened about." However, now she attempted to minimize this difference. She stated, "We're not that far apart in age." "People that are in their 20's - there's really no age difference at all." In an attempt to establish and strengthen this

common ground, a previously relied upon difference, utilized to insure a sense of safety and well-being, is now thoroughly erased. Interestingly, to take this point a step further, at the end of the interaction Jennifer commented, "I'm really surprised how young I look." "I had an impression of myself as being very young." It must be pointed out that in no other interaction did Jennifer comment about her young appearance, in fact, in the previous interaction with Ann, Jennifer was quick to identify herself with Ann as another "older woman." This apparent powerful need for some identification between conversational partners seems compelling.

At this juncture, Isaac initiates a topic regarding his planned transfer to Boston University. Jennifer interrupts with another question regarding whether he is a native New Yorker. Once another common feature was established Isaac quite gracefully brings the topic back to his impending transfer, that Jennifer willingly engages in. After some more discussion, she subsequently changes the topic back again to the upper-west side ("common ground"). Isaac willingly flows with these abrupt topic changes, yet manages to bring the conversation back to what he would like to speak about as well without threatening Jennifer or challenging her "control".* During this exchange, Jennifer reaches for a cigarette, however unlike in the previous interaction with Ann, this was carried out without any distraction to the interaction and the complete maintenance of eye contact.

* Isaac accomplished this by essentially associating his topic to her previously initiated topic.

Jennifer seemed extremely fluid in her movements, while utilizing complementary hand gestures to supplement her verbal communications. Upper torso movements were used to effect proximal distancing. Isaac, on the other hand, maintained a fixed torso position with the only movement visible in his hands and legs.

Jennifer had very positive feelings toward Isaac from this interaction. She commented at the end of her observation,

"It feels good; he's giving me information. I feel we're becoming friends. There's more common ground than in the other interactions. It feels good."

It appears that Jennifer's positive regard for Isaac was established early in the interaction and during the remaining exchange, she attempted to gather additional reasons for her feelings. For instance, during the conversation, Isaac wrongly chooses a word, stops what he was saying, and corrects himself. Jennifer, upon viewing this commented, "He seems like he's really into improving himself. I like that. He corrected his speech rather than letting it go unnoticed." This positive regard persists throughout the course of the interaction and could possibly be attributed not only to the common ground established, but also due to the extremely non-threatening stance he assumed with her.

However, Jennifer's feelings about herself were not quite so positive. She stated, "I didn't like watching myself fidget - not really too much poise." "I seem like a boppy teenager almost."

Isaac regarded this interaction well. He stated,

"I thought this interaction went very smoothly. I felt that it was pretty enjoyable. I felt generally at ease. We were both understanding what we were talking about."

Video-Room

The interaction in the video-room started immediately with Isaac continuing with his conversation from the waiting room regarding his small group process course. Jennifer assumes a seated forward position with her elbows resting on her thighs and her legs slightly spread. Her feet are up on their toes, and heels resting on the base of her chair. She begins the interaction smoking a cigarette. Isaac is positioned in a slightly slouched position. His elbows rest on the arms of his chair while his hands are on his thighs. His legs are extended out and crossed at the ankles. Jennifer remains in this seated forward pose throughout the entire interaction. Jennifer viewed Isaac as being extremely relaxed and commented, "He seemed very relaxed - his whole body seems relaxed." "His relaxation made me feel relaxed also."

As stated above, Isaac began the verbal exchange in the video-room. He commented on this opening by saying,

"I probably started it out of nervousness. I felt that she wasn't going to start it and therefore I just stepped in and started it myself because I felt she wasn't going to do it."

It appears that Isaac was perfectly willing to continue with his passive attitude in this interaction, as he had generally assumed previously with Jennifer, however once he perceived that Jennifer would not initiate this interaction, he appeared to have no difficulty taking charge.

Jennifer's extremely positive feelings toward Isaac continued through the opening moments of her tape observation. She commented,

"I like Isaac. I thought he was very bright, young and fresh. I felt I could have a good conversation with him. I found it easy to talk to him. I found his whole essence appealing. I'm not attracted to him yet I found him an attractive person."

Isaac continued with his discourse on the small group process course, while Jennifer conveyed an interest in what he was saying through her eye contact, verbal reinforcing comments, as well as her body gestures (i.e., seated forward, attentively).

The conversation continues essentially through Isaac's continuation of his discourse on the group process course until Jennifer interjects a thought. Isaac had been speaking about how he had prior knowledge of the group format and Jennifer stated that perhaps this prior knowledge gave him an unfair advantage over the other group members. Isaac responds somewhat challenging, "What do you mean!" During the tape observation, Isaac commented that his response appeared somewhat challenging now, but he did not experience it that way at the time. Jennifer immediately backs down from her original comment regarding this unfair advantage. She answers Isaac, "Oh..I don't know...Yah, you're right." Jennifer didn't interpret Isaac's response as challenging, but simply remarked during her observation of this exchange, "I was off the mark."

At this point in Jennifer's observation she freely remarked that she was sweating more when she talked to Isaac than in any other situation. "I was getting more involved in this interaction and I felt myself sweating." When questioned further, Jennifer claimed to view sweating as a "sign of anxiety," and subsequently came to her own conclusion, "the more involved I get, the more anxious I get."

However, she remarked that this experience of anxiety did not interfere with this particular interaction although it did in other situations. She was unable to elaborate further regarding the difference between situations, although questioned about this.

There were several occasions during the present interaction when Isaac would apparently come to an end of his description of the group process course and a brief lull would transpire. Jennifer would not readily make an intervention to break the silence and consequently, Isaac would pick up the conversation and continue talking about another aspect of this group course. One one of these occasions, Jennifer commented during her observation,

"There were times, like right then, when there was a silence and I said to myself 'Oh No!', but he kept on sailing. That made me comfortable that he would pick up the ball and wasn't defensive about it."

This somewhat "passive" attitude of Jennifer's was in striking contrast to the position she assumed previously in the waiting room.

As the conversation continues, Isaac encounters some difficulty attempting to convey the flavor of what the group consultant's interventions were like, and he stumbles over his words. Jennifer commented while viewing this, "He's trying to think now. I really feel for him. I'm saying to myself, come on Isaac, get it together." Jennifer seemed to convey this empathic understanding of Isaac's difficulties on several occasions during the interaction. Similarly, Isaac also conveys an empathic understanding of Jennifer's nervousness. He commented during his observation, "Her uncomfortable feelings tends to make me feel uncomfortable. I do feel an obligation to do something when she is nervous."

"Perhaps by my being relaxed and at ease, she will also relax." He concluded by saying, "I feel in tune with her nervousness."

As this conversation continues, Isaac by this time has already given an exhaustive account of his group process course. Jennifer interjects a comment at this point, seemingly in an attempt to move the conversation onto another topic. She says, "Patterns are funny, aren't they?" Isaac merely acknowledges her intervention with "Yah" and proceeds with his description of the course. Soon thereafter, Jennifer again tries to intervene by relating what Isaac had been talking about to a course she had taken that also involved some group process. Isaac, in this instance, seems generally unresponsive and continues with his description. During Jennifer's first intervention described above, Isaac commented,

"Right there I felt she could go on to make another point, but I prevented her. I think she was making progress toward a different subject matter, but I prevented her because I was so into what I was discussing."

On the second occasion when Jennifer tried to relate what he was saying to a personal experience of her own, Isaac commented during his observation,

"Her cutting in like that interrupted the fluency of the conversation. I thought by her doing that the conversation would come to a halt. She cut in and made a statement and then left me at a loss for words. I felt she had a right to bring up points but it effected the consistency of the conversation. I started feeling the presence of the camera then."

During Jennifer's observation of these events, she exhibited a very strong reaction, while not being able to precisely pin-point the cause for her reaction. She first asked the investigator, "How come I'm getting very

depressed right now watching myself?" The tape was stopped at this point to pursue this. She said,

"I'm getting very dulled by this whole thing. I don't feel good at all (laughs nervously). I wanted to share something with him, but he didn't get it. I wasn't formulating anything and giving back to him. I wasn't sure he was really listening and hearing me. At the time, I enjoyed it, but now its not setting off any sparks in me."

When questioned as to what she felt precipitated these feelings, she responded,

"I don't know what triggered these feelings. I just got bored. It was empty. It's pretty scary because I feel pretty awful right now."

Although Jennifer claimed to feel good during the interaction itself and that her current feelings were purely a result of her present observations, her behavior during the actual interaction changed significantly at this point. She once again fell back to her interviewer role and began to rely quite heavily on questioning again, a technique she hadn't utilized for the past two interactions. She delivered a series of six questions to Isaac in the remaining few minutes of the interaction. It seems quite apparent that Jennifer was feeling bitterly disappointed and depressed. Up until this point she had trusted Isaac and her attempts to guide and control the conversation flow were unchallenged. However, at this point, her two unsuccessful attempts at making an intervention apparently renewed her feelings of powerlessness and subsequently increased her level of anxiety. Consequently, perceiving his unresponsiveness, Jennifer fell back to her safer role of interviewer and was able to complete the interaction. Interestingly, when Jennifer did reassume her role as interviewer at this point, she continued questioning Isaac

about his group so as to avoid any confrontation that a topic change might have engendered.

At the very end of the interaction, there was some competition for the speaking floor, with both interactants speaking at once. Isaac just continued speaking and gained control of the speaking turn. He commented about this,

"I had to get my point across. She would be able to express her point just as soon as I got finished. I started and was in the middle and felt I wouldn't be able to explain it as well if I stopped."

Jennifer did not comment about this competition, in fact she had no further comments about the interaction until its end.

Despite Jennifer's preceeding reactions, her summary statement regarding this interaction seemed positive. She stated,

"I liked it. I liked talking to him. I felt most at ease with him and the least pressure of them all. I felt I didn't have to be pretentious with him on any level."

Jennifer added that having had such a good interaction with him in the waiting room, prior to their video-room interaction, helped a good deal.

Isaac similarly had positive feelings. He stated, "I found it interesting." "There were parts that were a little uncomfortable, but I liked her and felt that she liked me."

Jennifer, as in all her previous interactions, could not clearly ascertain exactly how Isaac regarded her.

We will now turn our attention to Ann, our representative low-anxious female. Since certain interactions with Ann have been described in detail, we will only highlight here those salient features that will

aid us in our overall description and analysis of this subject's interactional style. The reader is again advised to refer back to previous chapters for a more complete description of the interactions being described.

Waiting Room

We will begin our present analysis of Ann with a description of her interaction with our representative low anxious male, Isaac, in the waiting room. The interaction begins with Ann sitting comfortably back in her chair in a slightly slouched position. She is wearing a jacket which is zipped up and her right hand is in her jacket pocket, while her left elbow rests on an adjoining table at her side. Initially she is looking directly at Isaac, while his gaze is directed away from her and down toward the floor.

Isaac begins the interaction also posturally comfortable, sitting back in his chair with his left leg crossed over his right. His head is tilted somewhat forward and turned slightly down, while his elbows rest on the arms of the chair and his hands grasp both his legs.

Isaac greets Ann with a nod of his head and this is not acknowledged. Ann, instead, begins the verbal exchange by asking Isaac if he had the investigator as an instructor. Isaac responds and continues with a brief discussion of his Psych I class without any visible postural or verbal reinforcement from Ann.

Ann commented regarding her initial impression,

"I turned off to him; a really quick judgment. Maybe it was his physical appearance -- young, boring. I make quick judgments -- that's typical of me."

Isaac, on the other hand, commented that he is "feeling at ease," and added that he didn't know for sure if she was interested in what he was saying.

A brief silence occurs when Isaac finishes his explanation and he subsequently follows with a question to Ann whether she is currently enrolled in a class of mine. She answers "yes" and while doing so turns around in her chair, while keeping her lower torso motionless, and reaches for a book resting on a desk behind her. Isaac remains motionless and follows her movements with his eyes, in silence.

Ann becomes solitarily engaged in leafing through this book and Isaac crosses both hands around his mid-section and begins visually scanning the room.

Ann commented during her observation, "I'm reaching for a book," and continued to explain that she viewed this as saying, "look, I really don't want to talk to you." Isaac only commented that he found the progression of events thus far, "humorous."

Isaac fixes on the two-way mirror in the waiting room and makes a comment about it. Ann momentarily looks up from her book and there is a brief exchange regarding the mirror. Ann subsequently begins to fix her hair in the mirror while the interaction falls silent once again. Isaac reinitiates the verbal discourse by referring to a similar two-way mirror at his job. Ann asks where he works and Isaac answers in an advertising agency. Ann commented at this point,

"Now I'm becoming more interested in him. He works in an ad agency. He seems more interesting."

Isaac remarks at this juncture, "now she seems to be fairly interested because her attention is focused on me." Without further encouragement or questioning Isaac begins to speak of his "focus groups" at work. Ann merely responds with a seemingly bored "Mmm" and returns to her book. After another silence, Ann spontaneously begins to read questions from the book she had been engrossed in, and indicates to Isaac that he should answer the questions she reads. The format now established continues for some time. Ann reads a question from this book, Isaac answers and Ann subsequently shows a definite disinterest in his answer. During this she busies herself by picking lint off her jacket, or fixing her hair in the mirror. No discussion is generated by these questions. Instead, she would merely read a question and Isaac would simply answer whether he agrees or disagrees. Isaac makes no effort to effect the course of the interaction. However, when silences do occur he seems ready to initiate a new topic. On several occasions when he did so, these attempts were only met with brief responses, thereby not providing Isaac with a means for keeping the verbal discourse going. Isaac appears uncomfortable by his inability to engender a conversation and this anxiety seems to be expressed in his clenching his stomach as well as shaking his foot and leg, while keeping his body fixed posturally. It appears from a careful analysis of these events, that Isaac's anxiety is expressed motorically in an increased activity level or fidgetiness, while he also maintains a generally fixed torso position. In other words, Isaac's legs and feet move without any gross repositioning. It seems interesting to speculate at this point that his movement of his legs may be indicative of a desire to escape this anxiety provoking situation,

while the maintenance of a fixed and frozen position insures that this would not be acted upon. Isaac did not directly comment on his inability to initiate an ongoing discussion during his observation of this segment.

At one point toward the very end of the interaction, Ann looks up momentarily from the book and asks, "Are you getting bored?" and Isaac laughs in response. Ann commented during her observation of this, "I'm asking him if he's bored because I do feel bad about what I'm doing." Ann subsequently puts the book down and Isaac apparently senses this action as a willingness on her part to engage in conversation. Isaac shifts his position, crosses his right leg over his left and begins to speak about his impending transfer to Boston University, but this proves no more successful than any of his previous attempts to engage Ann.

It is interesting to note that once Ann placed the book down, she could be observed to be in constant motion. She sat up in her chair, looked in the mirror, fixed her hair, cleaned her nails, picked lint off her jacket, rubbed her nose, stretched, and continued to tap her finger on an adjoining table, while rocking her leg. This constant activity seems to be in striking contrast to the relaxed, motionless (except for frequent grooming behavior, as noted) absorption in the book. When the book is placed down, Ann appears behaviorally anxious.

Ann had a good deal to say regarding her observed behavior in this interaction. Her comments ranged from self-reproach for her behavior to comments attempting to justify her actions. She commented,

"I'm feeling very anxious watching this. I don't like it. When two people are in a room, my expectation of myself is to connect with him in some meaningful way. I'm not pleased with myself. I seem fidgety, aware of myself and generally not nice. I didn't like that. It's like he's not there and I'm so concerned with how I look."

With regard to this self attention, Ann added:

"I don't like to think of myself as someone who is so concerned with how they look. Jesus, I was so concerned, I don't like that. I hated sitting in front of the god-damned mirror because I don't like to look at myself all the time. But I felt compelled to with that mirror there. Maybe I was aware I was going to be taped and I was concerned with how I looked. I just felt very uncomfortable. Maybe I should have just sat there-- not looked in the mirror."

However, Ann did attempt to justify her behavior by pointing to an internal dialogue she was having with herself.

"I was trying to give myself permission that if I don't want to talk to someone, I could do that. I feel judgmental with myself -- I should have been more engaging -- it seems angry toward him. Yet while I was sitting there I was feeling -- look, do you want to talk to him? No -- so don't. I was just doing what I felt like doing!"

Isaac, on the other hand, viewed her behavior as being indicative of her feeling uncomfortable and anxious. He felt she utilized the book "as a conversation piece." He stated, "I think maybe she's feeling very uncomfortable and she has to use the book or something to interact." He continued,

"...her fidgetiness made her seem uncomfortable and I thought that maybe that reflected on me -- how I was handling the experience or that maybe I wasn't controlling the experience well enough, but I just decided to let things go it's natural course...I felt the uncomfortable moments were sometimes a reflection on me and sometimes a reflection of her uneasiness."

Isaac also commented on Ann's observed attention to herself. He stated:

"She did display her femininity with certain movements. Looking in the mirror, fixing her hair, you know, not seductive yet displaying her femininity."

Ann did offer several comments regarding Isaac's observed response to her behavior. She said:

"If that was him that was doing that I'd be enraged. I would have been pissed if he picked up a book. He seems weak and that's why I'm not interested in him. He seems non-assertive and weak. That makes me crazy. I was abusing him; I pushed him a lot. How far will you let me go? I wanted him to challenge me. What are you looking at that book for? Stop looking in the mirror! That made me not like him."

Video-Room

Ann immediately expresses some concern about being left in the video-room with Isaac and asks the investigator, "you're just going to leave us in here?" She sits back in her chair in a slightly slouched position with her torso turned to the left, away from Isaac, necessitating that she turn her head slightly to the right in order to look directly at him. Her right leg is crossed over the left and both hands are resting on her lap. Isaac is sitting straight back in his chair with his left leg crossed over the right and both hands resting on his thighs. His torso is similarly turned to the right away from Ann and in order for him to look directly at Ann, he must also turn his head approximately 45 degrees to the left. Isaac initiates the verbal exchange by referring again to the one-way mirror and speculating out loud about the design of this study. Ann disregards his initiative and abruptly changes the topic by asking him about his impending transfer to Boston University which he briefly mentioned earlier in the waiting room. At this point,

Ann places both her hands in her pockets which she later described as a "protective" gesture. This "protective" position is maintained throughout the interaction barring the exceptions mentioned below. Isaac welcomes Ann's question, appearing pleased with the structure and definition she imposes on the interaction, and begins to answer in depth, covering such topics as his friends in Boston, the college town atmosphere, as well as the "spirit" at Boston University as opposed to City College.

Ann commented at this early juncture in the interaction,

"I'm feeling like this great listner. I'm sitting with my hands in my pocket which is protective. I'm not concerned with how he's regarding me. I'm just bored."

She continued:

"I don't think I let the conversation die at any point. It would disturb me, I would feel responsible. I would have liked to just sit there, but instead I took over."

When questioned about her stated need not to let the "conversation die," she responded,

"I think it's very difficult for me to trust the silence between two people. I think it's a matter of control. I have to keep it going; I don't want it to be boring. I feel that questioning definitely controls the flow."

Isaac, on the other hand, stated at this same juncture,

"I feel she's not really interested in what I'm saying. She's just asking me questions because she has nothing to say. I feel she's uncomfortable with this situation."

A fairly long silence occurs when Isaac completes his explanation of his impending transfer. Ann commented, "I'm feeling that in order to make or allow silences to happen, I'm going to have to get a little

angry, like O.K., you do it." Ann sits silently waiting for Isaac to pick it up. Isaac stated during his observation of this silence:

"I answered her question; now I'm waiting for her to share one of her own experiences or to ask another question. I had to ask her a question to get her to relate to her own experience."

Isaac asks Ann whether she will graduate from City College. Ann seizes this opportunity to explicitly state an earlier, internal perception, "Well, I don't know, I'm a little bit older." This apparently has nothing to do with Isaac's question, but she immediately continues, "Well yah, I think so. I've just gone back to school; its really different going back to school." Isaac interjects at this point that he also "contemplated taking a year off." Ann advises, while also cutting him off in order to gain a speaking turn, "Finish it!...its really hard -- its different." Isaac at this point asks for some clarification on this difference. Ann responds, "Well you're older -- your life is different at 31 than at 19. You're more insecure in classes with people that are not your age." Isaac, questioning this experience asks, "Being older, don't you come in with a more confident attitude?" Isaac changes his position. He extends his feet straight out and crosses them at the ankle and folds his hands around his waist in a more expansive posture. Ann, having some difficulty being more specific about this "difference" and conveying this to Isaac in a concrete way, leans forward in her chair, recrosses her legs right over left and explains,

"It took me a week to decide, do they use yellow to underline, do they use blue; what kind of notebook? I like it now, but it really was uncomfortable...to admit (pause) it's kind of embarrassing; you're 31 and you don't have your degree yet -- all those social things."

Isaac at this point expresses some understanding of her experience and adds that there are many people in her position at City. He tells her of one friend taking time off from school and subsequently returning to Boston University. Ann pursues this topic of Boston University, which had been Isaac's conversational topic, and thereby shifts the topic away from taking time off which was her topic. Ann sits back in her chair and reassumes the "resting" position described earlier. Ann appeared very anxious during the previously described exchange. There was an increase in auxiliary movements of hands to supplement her verbal communications and, in addition, a gross postural repositioning. Also, Ann's speech appeared strained and jumpy. Ann commented during her observation, "I felt he was interested in me -- more interested in me than I was in him." In fact, all of Ann's comments during this specific exchange focused on his interest in her. Isaac commented, "I felt she was thinking more about what she was going to say next. I could see she was uncomfortable."

Ann became bored at this juncture and commented, "Now I'm bored; I can tell from my face I'm only hearing part of what's he's saying." Again, as in several previous interactions, we see the defensive use of boredom at an interesting juncture. Ann seemingly having experienced an uncomfortable segment which necessitated her sharing a personal experience, now feels bored. The effect of this boredom is for her to express a disinterest in Isaac, thereby somehow rejecting him. This seems, however, to be a reaction to a personally threatening experience.

The interaction continues to a point where Isaac mentions his small group process course. Ann communicates an interest in hearing more about

this through further questioning as well as a postural repositioning.

She leans forward thereby decreasing the proximal distance. Ann commented during her observation,

"I feel intersted at this point. You see, I lean forward, because I really wanted to know. He seems interested too."

Isaac begins to explain and apparently experiences a good deal of difficulty. Isaac commented,

"Here, I'm having trouble. I didn't feel I could explain it. Her questions indicated she wasn't understanding. I'm losing the ability to explain it and get through to her."

When questioned about what cues indicated that he wasn't getting through, since Ann never explicitly stated that she wasn't following, he answered, "Her lack of response, a head nod, yah, I understand or something."*

Ann stated at this juncture,

"At this point, I lost him -- I didn't know what he was talking about. He reached a point where I really couldn't follow. I didn't say, what are you talking about. I feel I was very passive in this interaction. I didn't tell him what I felt. I wasn't very honest with him. I didn't say hey, I'm feeling very bored by you or I don't know what you're talking about. I don't know whether I could ever say -- I'm bored by you. I'm usually very aggressive, I think. I feel I was passive yet controlling here. I sort of steered it where I wanted it to go. I was interested when I wanted to be and then sat back and got lost."

The interaction was interrupted by the investigator at this point.

* It seems worthy to point out here that throughout the interaction, Isaac seems able to realistically assess the exchange and be sensitive to both positive and negative components in the interaction itself.

Ann commented at the end of her observation,

"I was surprised that on several occasions I did allow the conversation to stop. That surprised me because my image of myself is not to let silences happen. Maybe because I feel responsible. Maybe I feel you will get too close so I'll push you away with a lot of words. I'll make it happen the way I want it to. I ended up liking him a lot. At the point where I got lost I just looked at him and felt here we are -- just two human beings -- I wasn't interested in what he was saying -- just looking at him."

When asked how she felt he regarded her she answered,

"I don't know how he felt about me. Romantically, he felt I was a wise older woman who was quite interesting and fun. I felt he liked me."

Isaac commented that he felt Ann to be very "fluctuating" and that her attention wandered. He also felt that she was a bit conscious of the camera and this made her uncomfortable. He made no specific comment that he liked her.

Video-Room

We will now turn our attention to the interaction Ann engaged in with Jennifer and begin with their interaction in the video-room, which represents their first meeting. The interaction begins with Ann assuming a negative and rejecting attitude towards Jennifer. Upon viewing only five seconds of the present interaction, she stated,

"I did not want to be in there with her. Something about her; I didn't like the way she looked. I was really hesitant about her and my first impression was that I didn't want to be in that room with her."

Ann's opening impressions of Jennifer are strikingly similar to those she assumed previously with Isaac. In both situations, before the interactions actually start, Ann assumes an initial negative and

rejecting attitude toward her interactional partner. It appears that this stance affords her some added safety in these situations. By devaluing and rejecting her conversational partner, at so soon a point in the course of an interaction, she may save herself from the concern of their subjective evaluations. This feature was made explicit in her previous interaction, when after stating that she didn't like her conversational partner, she then added that she really didn't care how he felt about her. It appears that in this interaction she begins with a similar attitude. However, in this situation, her initial attitude soon undergoes a major revision. Immediately after Jennifer complimentarily comments that her age doesn't show, Ann commented, "I'm beginning to like her here." When questioned further as to her drastic change in opinion, Ann was unable to identify the source of her feelings. Similarly, when questioned about her negative feelings earlier, she was unable to specifically identify their origin as well. The defensive quality of this initial negative assessment becomes apparent when we observe how readily she changed her opinion, once Jennifer presented herself as entirely non-threatening. This non-threatening presentation of Jennifer's is based not only on the fact that she complimented her, but also, and perhaps more importantly, she allowed Ann to assume the greatly valued interviewer's role, and thereby control the conversational flow, without any struggle or challenge.

Another feature of Ann's interactional style which appears to remain constant across her two interactional partners thus far is her feeling that they are much more interested in her than she is in them. On a number of occasions in her previous interaction with Isaac she commented

"He seems much more interested in me than I am in him." In this present interaction with Jennifer, she also made some statement to the effect that Jennifer was very interested in her; more than she was in her. However, on both occasions neither interactional partner actually expressed this interest as Ann had subjectively perceived it. One may again speculate, as with her initial negative assessment, on the important defensive purpose that this position affords her. Ann did comment that this position of feeling Jennifer's extreme interest in her made her feel a bit uncomfortable. She stated, "I felt some pressure to continue to interest her." However, this pressure seemed far more acceptable to Ann than the pressure of facing the uncertainty of how they actually felt about her. In fact, during the interactions both Isaac and Jennifer did continuously evaluate Ann, but her assumed position allowed her to selectively not attend to this. Ann appears to exclusively direct her attentions to her own personal evaluations, and thereby avoids the concerns and perhaps anxieties that an attention to their evaluations might engender.

The interaction progresses to the topic of financial aid, as detailed earlier. Here Ann assumes a position similar to that with Alan. Ann exhibits an increased interest at this point not only through repeated questions on the topic, but also through a body repositioning that brings her in closer proximity with Jennifer. Ann assumes the role of naïve questioner, while during her observation she commented, "I really like her now." It appears that Ann feels most comfortable when being "fed" information. This view is further supported by the fact that in her interaction with Alan, where the interaction primarily took

this form, she subjectively evaluated that interaction as "most pleasurable." There seems to be some connection on Ann's part with being "fed" information and being felt cared about.. She commented during her observation of the events under examination, "I felt she really cared about me right here." However, Jennifer felt that Ann was "playing naïve," and just appeared "immature for her age."

Ann stated during her concluding comments of this interaction,

"I felt not great about her, but I became more trusting of her as the interaction went on - particularly when we talked about financial aid. I was also aware that I wasn't taking care of her as with Isaac. I didn't feel responsible for the conversation."

Waiting Room

Ann begins the verbal exchange in the waiting room by commenting on her subjective experience of the previous interaction in the video-room. She begins this interaction seated comfortably back in her chair in a slightly slouched position. Her hands are folded around her mid-section and her legs are crossed left over right. This position is generally maintained except for two gross postural repositionings. These repositionings occur with specific reference to conversational topics initiated by Ann, and on both occasions her postural change results in decreasing the distance between the conversational partners. Early in the interaction, Ann questions Jennifer about her own performance in their prior interaction. With her hands remaining crossed around her mid-section, she leans her upper torso forward toward Jennifer. There is no complementary movement on Jennifer's part and once the expected answer is delivered, Ann reassumes her seated back position, as described earlier.

The second repositioning occurs later in the interaction when Ann once again directs the conversational topic back to their previous interaction in the video-room. Ann asks, "Do you think I took the more aggressive stand?" While the question is being asked, Ann again leans her upper torso forward, thereby decreasing the proximal distance between herself and Jennifer. As soon as the question is delivered, Ann reassumes her resting seated back position. Jennifer remains seated, during these postural maneuvers, in an upright position with her right hand holding a cigarette while her left hand is positioned directly in front of her crotch. It appears that Ann's primary interest in this interaction centers on personal inquiries. At other time her attitude can best be described as tolerant. This fact is further supported by Ann's comment during her observation of this interaction,

"My first interest was getting what I needed in that room. How did you think of me, how was I in this (video) room. Then, boredom. I'm not interested anymore -- that's it."

This aspect of Ann's interactional style seems consistently maintained across her two interactional partners thus far and is perfectly exemplified by her previous statement, "My first interest was getting what I needed...then boredom." Again, as in the previous interactions, boredom becomes the predominant subjective state. Jennifer accurately senses her subjective state and commented during her observation, "I'm involved and trying to share my feelings, but she seems interested in something else."

As mentioned earlier in our chapter on Jennifer, Ann imagined Jennifer to feel that Ann was a lesbian. Ann stated, "My feelings

changed about her a lot. I liked her, I didn't like her. At one point I thought she felt I was a lesbian. I really went through trips with her." The "point" Ann was referring to is when she says that she enjoys speaking to women more than men. Jennifer responds with obvious surprise by opening her mouth, yet not uttering a word. Jennifer becomes a bit restless in her chair. Ann, in response, becomes apparently uneasy, looking to the right and behind her, and eventually sinks lower in her chair. Ann commented, " I felt a little strange then; that scared me." She continued,

"I think I was trying to shock her by saying I enjoy talking to women more -- but she didn't fall for it. She just started talking about how she felt for men."

Ann, at this point, commented, as Jennifer is speaking, "I see this interaction now as empty chatter. I'm feeling, at this point, tired and bored and I would like to stop." Again, she experiences boredom, when immediately prior to this she was admitting feeling "scared." The defensive utilization of boredom on Ann's part seems apparent. A short time later, Ann commented,

"I feel like I'm talking too much about myself. I'm not asking enough questions. I'm giving too much and she's getting too close -- she's knowing too much."

Throughout this series of events, Ann repeatedly reported feeling bored, yet on no occasion did she report the experience of anxiety. It appears, given her experience of "she's getting too close, she's knowing too much," this might have precipitated some anxiety. However, Ann reported experiencing only boredom, disinterest and, subsequently, rejection. This reaction enables Ann to maintain a picture of herself

as non-anxious in interactions with a stranger, as she reported in the screening questionnaire.

Toward the end of the interaction, Ann resorts to questioning Jennifer regarding statistics and seems content with being fed factual information by Jennifer, as in the previous interaction.

There are no observable power struggles in the present interaction, perhaps due to Jennifer's explicit concession in this regard. Ann now also agrees with Jennifer's formulation that she controlled the previous interaction, although Ann stated during her observation of the video-room exchange that she felt this control was shared. However, Ann does seem to determine the conversational topics as well as the proximal distancing between the interactants in the present interaction.

One further feature of Ann's non-verbal behavior seems worthy of mention before moving on to her interactions with Alan. There appears to be a correlation with Ann's subjective state and aspects of body positioning. During her reported positive states, Ann extends her crossed legs out away from her body, extends her arms to an adjoining table, again away from her body, and leans her upper torso forward. During her reported negative experiences, her legs are drawn back toward her body, her arms are brought back and, on occasion, her hands are placed in her pockets and her torso is in a more upright position drawn back away from her conversational partner. These respectively "expansive" and "constrictive" body positions seem to express aspects of her internal emotional experience.

Video-Room

Ann assumes a somewhat constrictive posture as she settles in her chair in the video-room with Alan. Both hands are placed in her jacket pockets and her right leg is very tightly crossed over the left. Her entire torso is shifted to the left and turned slightly away from Alan while gaining support from her left elbow, which is resting on the arm of her chair. This position exposes less body area to Alan and also necessitates her turning her head slightly to the right in order to look directly at him. Alan, similarly, assumes a somewhat constrictive postural attitude with both elbows resting on the arms of the chair. His hands are folded in front of his crotch, thereby obstructing this portion of his body from Ann's view.

Ann appears unwilling to begin the verbal exchange in this interaction. After the investigator leaves the room, Alan looks toward Ann and she turns her gaze away to the left and down. Alan subsequently begins the verbal exchange by questioning Ann regarding her work.* It's interesting to mention that while in the waiting room with Jennifer, Ann questioned her about Alan and wondered out loud what would happen if she just sat there with him. She seems at this point to be finding out. However, after a series of questions from Alan, Ann, as with Jennifer and Isaac, reassumes control of the conversation topic by directing questions toward Alan. This change is welcomed by Alan, as he seems a bit uncomfortable with his assumed role. The interaction pro-

*For a more detailed description of the actual dialogue that transpired between them the reader is again advised to refer back to the section on Alan.

ceeds at this point to its completion with the presently established roles: Ann directing the conversational topics through questioning and Alan delivering elaborated answers,

Both interactants had similarly positive evaluations of each other. Ann's positive feelings seemed narcissistically based. She commented,

"I just love him. I just feel he's really a comrade. I really like him. He reflects myself; I think that's what I like about him. He seems like I'm talking to someone who's very like me."

This narcissistic orientation, pointed to above, enables Ann to maintain interest in Alan throughout this particular interaction, in contrast to her two previous interactional partners, with whom her overriding experience was that of boredom and seeing them as more interested in her than she was in them. In fact, at no time during the present interaction did Ann report feeling bored. The fact that "he reflects myself" enables Ann to subjectively experience Alan as "safer." She stated, "It just seems right."

Interestingly, on one occasion, Ann questions whether Alan is bored with her. This occurred when she was relating an experience to Alan of a job interview in which she was told she looked a little "wild". Alan did not directly comment on her experience, but instead continued the conversation by relating to his own similar personal experience. Ann commented at this point,

"I don't feel he was very interested in what I said right there. He seemed bored. He didn't seem to care what I was saying."

When the investigator asked what kind of response she would have liked, she answered, "Really! or something like that."

Alan's positive feelings seem based on the fact that he was able to transform Ann, virtually a stranger to him, into someone quite familiar by focusing on her style of dress. He stated, "Her physical appearance made me feel a lot more comfortable. This is the type of person I'm used to hanging around with."

The interaction progresses to a point where both interactants have assumed a role in which they seem most comfortable. Alan remains passive in regard to the flow and course of the conversation and is able to answer at length any question directed toward him, while Ann is again in the position of being "fed" factual information. This is accompanied by a significant shift in Ann's seated posture described earlier. By holding on to the arms of her chair to support her weight, she turns her entire body so that she is now directly facing Alan and consequently exposing a greater body area to him. This new position enables Ann to look directly at him without having to turn her head as before. Her hands are also removed from her pockets and clasped together in front of her. Her legs are also recrossed left over right and extended out, away from her own body, toward Alan. There is no complementary movement on Alan's part and this new, more expansive body positioning seems to reflect Ann's subjectively reported positive experience.

Ann's questioning, as with Jennifer, is characterized by a sort of childish naïvete. However, unlike Jennifer, Alan welcomes being made to feel like an authority on all topics discussed, and willingly answers her at length. Her questioning is also interspersed with relevant

personal comments and experiences which does not necessitate Alan's having to deal with the speaking turn continuously.

Ann maintains control not only of conversational topic through questioning, but also of speaking turns. This is evidenced several times during the interaction when she interrupts Alan to interject a comment or to change the topic of conversation. However, Ann at no time during the discourse directs the conversation to topics of a too personally revealing or threatening nature.

Before turning to their waiting room interaction, an interesting individual difference was made explicit. Alan commented during his observation of this interaction that he felt extremely comfortable with Ann. He stated, "I think her being comfortable made me feel comfortable." Ann similarly enjoyed speaking to Alan more than any other interactant and stated that she felt "safe" and "comfortable." However, she did note, "He wasn't as relaxed as I was," and continued, "I felt I had an edge on him." It appears almost as if Alan's slight uncomfortableness made Ann feel she had an "edge" resulting in her feeling more secure and comfortable, while, on the other hand, Alan's perception of Ann's relaxed state made him feel more relaxed. For Alan, interacting with someone less anxious makes him feel less anxious, while apparently for Ann, interacting with someone slightly more anxious enables her to feel less so.

Waiting Room

After a generally positive experience in the video-room, both Ann and Alan assume fluid and expansive seated positions in the waiting room.

Ann sits forward in her chair and begins to retie her boots while holding her head upright to look and listen to him. Alan sits straight in his chair, his legs are uncrossed and slightly spread. His feet are firmly planted on the floor and also not tucked under his chair. Alan reaches for a cigarette and begins the verbal exchange without prompting. Both interactants are engaged in activity yet each is attentive to the other and eye contact is established immediately and maintained throughout the interaction.

Ann comments at the beginning moments, "I'm interested in him so it takes on a completely different quality." "I'm interested so I'm not manipulating." When asked what about Alan makes you interested at this point, she again reiterated, "He seems like me; he's like something you know about, something you understand." The most interesting difference between this interaction with Alan and her two previous interactions is the fact that she initially felt positively toward Alan while in the other situations she initially felt negatively. We shall see the immediate consequences of this "completely different quality."

After some exchange regarding the design of the study, Ann attempts to expand upon the "common ground" already established in the video-room. By making an ethnic joke she apparently attempts to unite herself and Alan on their being Jewish. However, Alan doesn't respond as expected and merely begins to talk about a related subject. Ann commented at this point, "I got scared that he wasn't responsive." "I wanted him to really get involved." This reaction is accompanied by a postural readjustment. She places her hands in her pocket and draws her legs in slightly. Ann makes specific reference to placing her hands in her

pocket and commented, "this is a protective reaction."

The interaction continues and at a certain point Alan makes reference to the previous interaction. At this juncture Ann attempts to reaffirm their varied common interests that she felt they had spoken about in the previous interaction, but Alan merely responds, "Yah, we're both looking for jobs," indicating that this is what he feels is the basis for the common ground. Ann commented during her observation of this,

"You see, right here I'm feeling disappointed in him. He has let me down. I didn't feel we were talking about looking for a job...I felt that he was less interested in me than I thought. I'm disappointed."

Interestingly, in the one series of interactions that Ann begins with a positive regard for her conversational partner, she experiences disappointment that he is not as interested in her as she is in him. This position is in striking contrast to her earlier position with Isaac and Jennifer where she felt they were more interested in her than she was in them. It appears that in certain situations Ann tends to feel more interested in her conversational partner when she perceives less interest on their part.

After a brief pause, Ann seems to quickly recover from this disappointment and she reassumes what we have seen to be her most comfortable role assumption. She begins questioning Alan in her characteristic naïve manner. Alan assumes in turn, what we have seen to be his most comfortable role and delivers authoritatively elaborated answers. The interaction continues through several topics of his being a nurse, working in an ambulance, as well as delivering babies. This format is consistently maintained to the completion of the interaction.

In spite of Ann's numerous "disappointments" experienced in her last two interactions, her subjective experience of Alan remained consistently positive - by far, more positive than in those interactions where she experienced her conversational partners as being extremely interested in her. It appears that the power of this established "narcissistic" bond, explicitly pointed to in the beginning of their first meeting, withstood the repeated disappointments and her positive feelings remained unchanged. She commented at the end of her observation,

"It was fun and wonderful and I felt good about myself and interested. I didn't feel as with the others, bored, what am I going to do. I felt really interested in him. I had a good time. I think I was less aware of myself and more aware of what was going on."

In making some summary remarks regarding her own observed behavior during the entire series of interactions, she commented,

"I seemed to be more fidgety than anyone else. The other people just sort of sat there...I would like to think the last interaction with Alan was more typical of me. The real me was the one in the other room (waiting room). The one in here (video-room) was me trying to be calm and cool - but no interaction was really surprising."

She then commented spontaneously on her frequent use of questioning in social situations. She said,

"The questions really upset me a lot. People have pointed that out to me and I've said no - I'm really just interested in you, but I see its a very controlling thing. It tends to deflate what is happening - it keeps people off of me. Real controlling. I set the whole mood because people generally answer questions."

In conclusion she said,

"I felt glad to see these tapes. I found it helpful and also very painful. I think I understand who I am better. I didn't like my impatience and boredom. I never saw it like this before. If I was to describe myself, I would pick the last interaction; a very energetic, interested and involved person."

We will now turn our attention to the last participant in the study, Isaac, our representative "low-anxious" male. Since every interaction that Isaac engaged in has been previously described in detail, we will only summarize our observations here regarding his specific interactional style and general coping mechanisms.

Waiting Room

The first interaction was with Ann in the waiting room. As we have previously seen, Ann was extremely unengaging, although Isaac made numerous attempts at initiating topics, but with no success. Aside from these attempts, he generally remained passive in regard to the course of the interaction. Ann apparently determined the format of the interaction, while Isaac simply complied with her definition.

Isaac seemed to accurately sense Ann's general disinterest, but on the few occasions when she did report a fleeting interest, Isaac also was able to accurately identify these moments. His evaluative faculties remained intact, even in the face of an impending, and later an overt, rejection.

With regard to Ann's reaching for a book, which she later interpreted as a rejection of him, Isaac dealt with this action by remarking, "I think maybe she's feeling very uncomfortable and she has to use a book or something to interact." Isaac continually focused on Ann's

"uncomfortableness" and thereby saved himself from any anxiety that a personal rejection interpretation of her actions may have engendered. He avoided any personal reference to her actions during the interaction, but at the conclusion of this interaction did comment,

"Her fidgetiness made her seem uncomfortable and I thought maybe that reflected on me - how I was handling the experience, or that maybe I wasn't controlling the experience well enough, but I just let things go its natural course. I felt the uncomfortable moments maybe a reflection on me and also a reflection of her uneasiness."

Isaac also remarked that he didn't feel any pressure to "help her with the uncomfortability she was experiencing" and commented, "I felt that she would be able to deal with it herself."

Toward the end of the interaction, Isaac commented, "I'm kind of bored right here." "As you can see the conversation really wasn't going anywhere and she wasn't asking me questions." "As you can see I am looking around just observing the room." He shared with the investigator that at these times he wondered whether there was a camera on the other side of the mirror. It appears that his attention generally remained focused on external concerns (i.e., Ann's uneasiness, the mirror in the room, etc.) and consequently he saved himself from any anxiety that an internal focus might have engendered regarding this particular interaction and the way things were progressing.

After several attempts by Isaac at initiating topics of discussion, without being able to successfully engage Ann, one could notice an increased activity level. This could be seen in Isaac clenching his hands around his mid-section and shaking his legs and feet, while keeping his torso motionless. His anxiety in this situation, seems to be expressed

motorically in an increased activity level or fidgetiness, but Isaac never really reports feeling anxious. His summary comments on this interaction were as follows,

"I felt very relaxed. I don't think the interaction went too well though. She didn't seem too interested in what I had to say some of the time. Other times she would be interested."

Isaac apparently minimizes her disinterest in what he had to say, while focusing on the times she did show interest. Interestingly, this seems in direct contrast to the more anxious subjects, who focus on the difficult portions of the interaction, while the better portions seem to fade into the background.

Video-Room

Similarly, as in the waiting room, Isaac seems to assume a passive position with reference to Ann, although there is significantly more verbal exchange.

Isaac is again able to accurately ascertain Ann's interest or disinterest in what she is asking, as well as in what he is answering. For instance, early in his observation of this interaction, Isaac commented, "she seems to be just asking me questions because she has nothing to say." However, later in the interaction, Isaac commented, "I think she's really interested in what she's asking." These perceptions are generally confirmed by Ann's comments during her observation of these segments. However, as in the last interaction, Isaac minimizes the disinterest and emphasizes those times when she genuinely appeared interested. In addition, when Isaac does in fact perceive a disinterest, he attributes this to her uneasiness or to her being distracted by the camera, rather

than to any self-deficiency. Isaac incidentally perceives Ann as being more uncomfortable than himself. He stated, "I feel she was very uncomfortable with this situation; she was much more occupied with the camera than me." It appears that this perception of Ann as being more "uncomfortable" supplies him with some added security. This is reminiscent of the way in which Ann perceived many of her interactions with other participants in this study. Isaac never, in any of his interactions, reported feeling anxious about how his conversational partner was regarding him, essentially because he never reported feeling concerned about this aspect of the interaction.

Isaac did in fact, report feeling uncomfortable on one occasion and this occurred when he experienced difficulty communicating a point to Ann regarding his small group process course. He stated,

"I was feeling uncomfortable and frustrated. I couldn't explain it."

When questioned how he felt Ann was regarding him at this moment he answered, "I don't know how she's regarding me. I'm involved in explaining it." Again, we have an opportunity to observe that Isaac's focusing attention away from his conversational partner's evaluation of himself saves him from the concerns and anxiety that such a focus may engender. Isaac's summary comments on this interaction lend further support to this inference about his interactional style. He stated,

"I felt at certain times we were having a good discussion and I was interested. Other times she would fluctuate because she became conscious of the camera. I enjoyed explaining about the class, but she could have related more to her own experiences. I felt she was not consistent. The parts that she did respond, I felt that she was interested in the conversation. When she became conscious of the camera, she became less

interested and more interested in the fact that she had to say something and then threw questions at me."

When questioned directly how he felt Ann generally regarded him, he answered, "Its hard to say how she regarded me." When asked to comment about his own observed behavior, he commented, "I felt relaxed, but when I felt I wasn't getting my point across, it made me uncomfortable." Interestingly, a large majority of Isaac's comments concerned Ann and her "uncomfortable" feelings. In addition, he attempted to attribute her reactions and obvious disinterest to external factors, such as the presence of the camera or to her own anxiety. Consequently, Isaac was able to be socially engaged with Ann without feeling like the object of her emotional gestures and thereby maintained his image of himself as socially non-anxious. However, this coping style of Isaac's was utilized at the expense of some perceptual distortion in that Ann explicitly stated a disinterest in him, rather than a preoccupation with the camera. But this distortion did not effect his ability to accurately discriminate when she was in fact disinterested and bored from these times when she was not. The distortion seems to lie in his attributed cause for her disinterest alone and not in his perception of interest or disinterest.

Waiting Room

Isaac enters the waiting room with Alan and quickly assumes responsibility for the interaction by initiating the verbal exchange and speaking about the possibility of there being a camera behind the one-way mirror. Light joking and laughing occurs regarding this possibility. One may view this initiated topic as an attempt to externalize the

threat in this dyadic interpersonal situation to the hypothesized "hidden camera," rather than Isaac viewing the potential threat as coming from his conversational partner. This attempt is, in fact, successful in immediately relieving the pressure in this situation. Alan's comment that he felt the way the interaction began "took all the tension off," supports this point. In addition, Isaac's initiated opening can be viewed as consistent with his tendency to focus on external factors in the interaction, as was elaborated on in our discussion of his previous interaction with Ann.

Isaac appears quite able to pick up the theme of the conversation and to relate to his own personal experience. This results in Alan not continually having the pressure of the speaking floor in this situation and also creates a conversational "exchange" rather than a purely question and answer format as had occurred in his previous interaction. It also appears that Isaac is proficient at communicating an understanding and interest through verbal as well as postural reinforcers. Frequent statements such as "Mmm," "right," and "that's funny," indicated an interest to his conversational partner and resulted in sustaining the interactional flow.* In addition, Isaac controlled the proximal distancing between subjects and these adjustments seemed to reflect his qualitative experience -- closer proximity reflecting an increased interest, while increasing the distance between interactants reflects less interest.

* Alan did in fact report accurately perceiving an interest from Isaac and this resulted in making him feel considerably more comfortable in the interaction.

Isaac's general impressions of this interaction were positive. He commented,

"I thought it was a good interaction. I felt he liked me and I liked him. There wasn't really anything about him I didn't like. I felt I performed pretty well in this interaction."

He also had some comments at this point regarding viewing himself on video-tape. He stated,

"I liked seeing myself on tape because I feel I can learn that much more about myself, how I interact with other people, how I can either dominate or not dominate a discussion, and what things lead up to that."

He concluded,

"I felt everything went along smoothly here -- everything went well."

Video-Room

In spite of the fact that Isaac generally reported a positive experience with Alan in the waiting room, he assumed a somewhat "restrictive" posture in the video-room and reported feeling "awkward" initially. Isaac sits with his feet tucked in under his chair and his hands are folded across his mid-section. Isaac commented at this opening juncture,

"I feel a little awkward in the beginning when we started off. We were talking in the waiting room and the idea of coming in here broke up the continuity of thought. We had to get started all over again and that's why I felt a little awkward in the beginning."

He also commented about his experience of the camera,

"In here its like there is a third eye to judge our behavior. I feel when there's no third eye, either person can take the conversation as he likes. I feel my performance seems more comfortable in the waiting room than in here."

Soon after the beginning "awkwardness" Isaac reported feeling "comfortable". This comfortable feeling remained with him for the rest of the interaction.

An interesting feature of Isaac's subjective experience was that he seemed to maintain a very high premium on being understood. His major concern, which was expressed a number of times during his observation, was whether Alan was understanding him. This concern does not seem specific to this particular interaction, but is consistently maintained throughout. In fact, the only occasion on which Isaac explicitly reported feeling anxious thus far was during the previous interaction with Ann when he felt he was not being understood. However, even during that situation, he shared the responsibility for the misunderstanding as owing to his inability to explain as well as her inability to understand. In the present situation with Alan, however, his positive feelings about the interaction are based on their ability to understand each other's communications. For instance, on one occasion, Isaac commented,

"This part of the conversation was really enjoyable because the interaction was much more frequent and we were understanding each other. I felt we were relating to each other pretty well. From the reinforcement he was giving me I felt he was truly understanding what I was feeling and there was sort of a compatibility in it."

Interestingly, Alan also felt very positively about this interaction. However, his positive feelings seemed entirely based on the light and joking quality of the exchange rather than on any mutual understanding, which was more of an issue for Isaac.

Isaac stated at the conclusion of this interaction,

"I felt confident. I think we both regarded each other as being fairly confident in what we were saying and how the interaction was going on. I think there was less feelings of anxiety here because the conversation kept going. We each traded off in relating experiences to each other."

He concluded,

"I think he liked me and I liked speaking to him."

Waiting Room

We will now turn our attention to the last series of interactions Isaac engaged in -- with Jennifer. At the start of the waiting room interaction, Isaac commented to the investigator that he felt relieved to be in the waiting room after having interacted in the video-room for two consecutive times. He felt he could relax more in the waiting room.

In this interaction, a number of consistent features that have been pointed to previously again emerge. Isaac still seems equally concerned with his ability to communicate ideas adequately, and evaluates his performance almost exclusively on this single criterion. Often, however, when there is a misunderstanding, he again attributes this to his conversational partner. For instance, early in the interaction with Jennifer she remarks about something Isaac has been explaining, indicating that she does not fully grasp what he has been saying. Isaac spontaneously commented upon viewing the tape,

"Right there she misunderstood what I was saying. I feel its the fault of her understanding -- she didn't quite catch what I was saying. I don't feel it was my explanation."

At a later juncture in the interaction Isaac chooses a wrong word, corrects himself and continues with his explanations. He commented,

"I was very conscious of the fact that I screw up my ideas. It throws me, but I felt I had no trouble recovering."

When questioned about his ability to "recover" from these situations, Isaac responded,

"It depends on the situation -- how much confidence I have in myself at the time and who I'm interacting with. Sometimes I feel that maybe there is a failure in my explaining."

Isaac was unable to be more specific about these situations when questioned further.

Isaac generally displayed a limitation in his scope of conversational topics. In every interaction engaged in, he only initiated topics regarding his impending transfer to Boston University, the possibility of a hidden camera, and his group process course. In each interaction he tested his ability to explain these topics. It appeared as if his major attention was at perfecting his explanation of this limited variety of conversational topics rather than expanding it. This inhibited the spontaneous conversational flow and may have been defensive on his part.

His final analysis of this interaction was that he felt he handled himself "fairly well except for the mistake (I) made." He was referring here to his wrong choice of word, which lingered in his mind due to the high premium he places on the ability to express himself. He stated that he regarded this as a "significant mistake" and remarked, "I'm learning that I should think my thoughts out more clearly." Then he suddenly tried to minimize his concern by stating, "Oh, I think that may have been a spur of the moment mistake."

Isaac generally maintained a passive stance with Jennifer, as she

primarily determined the conversational topic in the waiting room. This stance is in contrast to that taken with Jennifer in the video-room, where Isaac not only competed with her for the speaking floor but also, on several occasions, interrupted her and prevented her from interjecting comments. This difference between rooms, with the same conversational partner, seems interesting in light of Isaac's subjective experience that he could "relax more" in the waiting room. Perhaps this competitiveness is some manifestation of the restlessness he felt in the video-room. Unfortunately, Isaac did not comment on this difference.

Video-Room

In the video-room, Isaac initiates the verbal exchange with Jennifer. He commented on this by saying, "It was probably out of nervousness. I felt that she wasn't going to start it and, therefore, I just stepped in and started it." He again begins talking about his group process course. He stated during his observation, "Now I felt I could describe the group process better because I didn't feel I did a good job in the waiting room." Again, we can see Isaac "practicing" his delivery of this same topic, which, incidentally, he had already spoken of five times previously with other interactants.

He also made his non-self-evaluative focus explicit by stating a short time later, "I'm not preoccupied with the way I'm feeling, but rather with the subject being discussed." This unquestionably appears to be a consistent feature of Isaac's interactional style across different conversational partners. Isaac's final evaluation of his taped interactions was as follows:

"I was not surprised to see myself. It was consistent with my image of myself. There was little that was surprising since it fits my general notion."

He continued to evaluate each conversational partner by stating,

"I felt more comfortable with Alan and Jennifer than with Ann. Ann's uneasy manner made me uncomfortable. I didn't feel I was making her uneasy. She did get interested at certain times but it was easy to see she was throwing questions at me because she didn't know what to say. I saw Ann's inattentiveness as her problem."

He continued by saying that he viewed Ann as more socially anxious in these situations than anyone else. As far as Jennifer was concerned he stated,

"Jennifer seemed like a sincere person; uneasy at times yet sincere. I liked her and I felt she liked me."

When comparing himself to Alan, he remarked that he "wouldn't consider him (Alan) an anxious person." He concluded by stating that he felt he received "added confidence" by viewing these interactions. He continued,

"It's interesting to see how I reacted to other people and how they reacted to me. In situations like this you're attentive to many things like the conversation and how you're presenting yourself to others. Here I got to see things I might have missed. I was pleased!"

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The "results" of this study are tentative hypotheses for further exploration, not "findings" in the usual sense. With so few subjects, one must be cautious in generalizing. The choice made in the present study was to be intensive instead of extensive, in order to have a better chance of seeing new aspects of the problem under investigation. That choice seems to us in retrospect to have been worth making, but it is important to be aware of the limits as well as the strengths of any study, and not to regard interesting initial formulations as established laws.

It also seems important to emphasize that the categories of high and low anxious in this study were based on self-appraisal, not on observed manifestations of anxiety in the interactions. All of the subjects participating in this study did, on occasion, manifest varying degrees of social anxiety, as estimated both by the author and by other clinicians who had access to the data. However, recognizing that anxiety is a complex construct which includes experiential, biological and behavioral components (Hodgson & Rachman, 1974), it was the specific choice of the present study to limit the definition of anxiety to the experiential component or the self-appraisal of anxiousness and to attempt to differentiate those emerging themes that relate specifically to the self-appraised high anxious subjects from those that relate to the low anxious subjects and from those themes that seem generally true for all subjects regardless of one's self-appraised social competency.

One general observation should be made before proceeding to the specific themes. It appears that reactions to interpersonal anxiety vary greatly and there seems to be no specific behavioral response pattern that can be pointed to from subject to subject. In addition, not only are specific responses to interpersonal anxiety radically different from subject to subject, but the source of anxiety seems just as variant. What threatens one person's sense of personal safety and well-being in interpersonal situations, might actually be sought out by another. It does appear, however, from the observations made in this study, that for each person there are consistent, personalized responses to interpersonal anxiety and this behavioral pattern remains fairly constant across varied interactional situations and partners. For instance, Alan consistently responded to his reported subjective experience of anxiety by becoming extremely passive. This passivity was evident with regard to such interactional features as conversational topic, speaking turns, proximal distancing, as well as length of time spent on each topic discussed. In contrast, Jennifer assumed a strikingly different and opposite position from that of Alan in response to her experience of anxiety. During these times, Jennifer tended to become over-controlling of the course of the interaction and attempted to exclusively define the topic of conversation, speaking turns, and the general form and content of the interactional discourse. It therefore would appear, given this simple illustration, that any investigation aimed at defining a standard and generally applicable anxiety response pattern would be of limited value. These important individual variations must be taken into account in any effort to understand the nature and the effect of social anxiety.

However, several common suggestive themes still emerge from the data that relate to aspects of the high anxious subjects, and these will be enumerated below.

One characteristic effect of anxiety that was consistently observed had to do with the individual focus of attention of the participants of the interactions. It appears that the focus of attention of the anxious subjects seemed primarily directed toward their own social performance and toward the anxious elements of the interaction itself. In contrast, the low anxious subjects seemed generally less preoccupied with their own social performance and self-evaluations and, in fact, tended to be more critical of their conversational partner rather than themselves. Given this greater critical self-attention of the high anxious subjects, they repeatedly evaluated their own behavioral performance more negatively than their conversational partners and they also tended to catastrophize the anxious aspects of their own performance as well. In doing so, the high anxious subjects tended to remember and report these anxious aspects in their final evaluation of the interactions more than the low anxious subjects. For instance, in Alan's video-room interaction with Ann, he reported feeling disturbed with the "frequent" lulls that transpired between them. In contrast, Ann's evaluation not only failed to mention any lulls, but she also reported feeling extremely positive about the exchange. Alan's ultimate evaluation of the interaction was strongly influenced in a negative way by the occurrence of conversational pauses, whereas this aspect of the interaction went generally unnoticed by Ann.

Jennifer too reported being so preoccupied with her own performance that frequently this introverted perspective interfered with her ability

to attend to what her conversational partner was saying. Her attention was predominantly directed toward having a ready question available in the event of a conversational lull. In fact, both anxious subjects seemed considerably more concerned with not allowing any conversational pauses to occur than our low anxious subjects, and they tended to evaluate the interaction more negatively if they did occur. The low anxious subjects, contrastingly, seemed generally to maintain an impression based on an overall sense of the interaction, and referred to lulls or silences only infrequently. They also tended not to catastrophize the difficult moments in the interaction. For instance, in Isaac's first interaction with Ann, he was able to register and report both positive and negative feedback, but he seemed more focused upon those times she did indicate interest. He registered accurately the occasions when she was disinterested, but those instances were not central to his overall impression of the interaction. When difficulties did seem to be experienced in the interaction, the low anxious subjects tended to attribute them to their conversational partner, rather than viewing the source of these difficulties as arising out of any inner deficiency on their part.

An interesting occurrence in the interaction between Ann and Jennifer further illustrates this anxious over-concern maintained by the high anxious subjects. As you will remember, a role reversal occurred early in the interaction where Ann assumed the questioning role that Jennifer had originally assumed in the beginning of the exchange. This turn of events so fully captured Jennifer's attention that she not only repeatedly referred to it during her remarks when observing the tape, but also seemed less available to interact with her conversational partner during

the actual exchange. Interestingly, Ann during her observation of the same segment, made absolutely no reference to this turn of events; this entire segment was quite unremarkable from Ann's perspective.

The emerging theme being developed here seems consonant with the findings of Clark and Arkowitz (1975). They report that high anxious subjects selectively attend to and remember the negative aspects of their interpersonal performance. In addition, they found that high anxious subjects overestimate the negative aspects of their performance more than the low anxious subjects. In the present study, too, the high anxious subjects tended to maintain an inner-directed, anxious over-concern with the more negative and difficult aspects of social interactions and exhibit as well exaggerated interpretations of those aspects perceived as being indicative of their anxiety. In contrast, the low anxious subjects generally maintain an outer-directedness and perceive the social interaction more comprehensively, without specific attention to these same anxious elements.

The observations reported here, however, seem to go beyond just a focus on the negative and point to a difficulty in the socially anxious individuals in perceiving signs that they were doing all right. They failed to pick up what might be called "safety signals" from their partner. (cf. Seligman & Johnston, 1973). The low anxious subjects, in contrast, were well attuned to signals that what they were saying was of interest to their partner. This did not seem to be just a function of denial or of a global undifferentiated orientation to the positive. They were quite able to notice negative signals too, though the overall balance of their evaluations tended to be positive. Thus, one might

suggest that the socially comfortable individuals are more "realistic" - able to perceive both positive and negative signals, whereas the socially anxious have a blind spot: they do not pick up signals of reassurance. The possible psychodynamic determinants of this blind spot would be interesting to explore.

Another related characteristic of the anxious subjects can perhaps best be described as an interpretational rigidity or a tendency not to change one's original conceptual view. The high anxious subjects seem to retain an evaluative set, formed early in the interactional discourse, that seems resistant to modification and revision. This "rigidity" not only encompasses aspects of their actual interactional behavior, but also relates to their subjective interpretations of their partner's gestures as well. For instance, Alan frequently pointed to the beginning moments of an interaction to account for his consistent retention of a certain interactional attitude. In his first interaction with Isaac, he emphasized the joking manner in which Isaac initiated the exchange as being wholly responsible for his consistently maintained positive attitude throughout the remainder of his interactional experience with him. Likewise, the initially established negative attitude with Jennifer was consistently maintained although the interaction progressed through several variant positive and negative phases. Having established this initial and apparently permanent set, subtle differences in the attitude and interest of his interactional partner were largely unnoticed or misinterpreted to fit with his initially formed conception.

This feature seemed equally as true for Jennifer. A good illustration of this occurred in her interaction with Isaac where her initially

established positive attitude was consistently maintained although during the interaction itself she felt an unresponsiveness on his part, was prevented from gaining a speaking turn on several occasions and became very depressed during a subsequent observation of the exchange. Her concluding comments remained equally as positive as her original evaluations despite the difficulties she had experienced during the interaction. Similarly, when beginning the interaction within a negatively oriented set, Jennifer maintained this initial evaluation regardless of the positive elements of the actual exchange.

This tendency not to change their original conception was also accompanied by a tendency not to change their seated posture. Alan generally maintained a fixed posture that seemed resistant to change for the duration of the interaction. One would expect that attitudinal revisions and modifications would be accompanied by postural repositionings, as simply in the case of leaning forward toward your conversational partner to indicate an increased interest.

Within Turner's (1968) formulation regarding the progression of dyadic interactions, we begin to see that his postulated "testing and revision" phase becomes most vulnerable to a high degree of anxiety. It appears that our high anxious subjects seem less able to modify and revise their initial conceptions, which subsequently leaves them less able to process many of their partner's gestures without constant disruption or misinterpretations, as in the case of subtle changes in interest and attitude.

This interpretational "rigidity" encompasses assumption of rules in addition to social interpretational and attitudinal features. Jennifer,

having rigidly assumed the questioning role in all interactions, reported a good deal of personal disruption and a significant increase in interpersonal anxiety when this role was subsequently assumed by Ann. Similarly, Alan experienced an increase in anxiety when forced to assume a more active and directing role when his conversational partner declined this position. It appears that in the initial interactions, the socially anxious subjects, in contrast to the low anxious subjects, displayed a limited availability of multiple social roles.

This naturally leads us to a further point regarding issues of social adaptation. It appears, from the results of our descriptive analysis, that the high anxious subjects begin to exhibit adaptive social responses, but only after repeated and successive practice interactions. Given several repeated exposures to the setting and format of the social interactions in this study, the anxious subjects begin to display a variety of social skills that were not readily observable initially. This emergent theme has a two-fold implication. In the first place, it suggests the critical importance of familiarity with setting and format, since the greater the familiarity, the greater the directly observable increase in the interactional fluidity of the interaction. Secondly, it suggests that the anxious subjects may have possessed the later observable interactional skills, but that due to the debilitating effects of anxiety, these were not readily available to the anxious interactants.

As the interactions progressed and Alan apparently became increasingly more familiar with the design of the social encounters, he tended to display the beginnings of a social fluidity that seemed to be initially lacking in his interactional performance. For instance, in his last

series of interactions, he was able to initiate the verbal exchange, something he hadn't accomplished in his earlier encounters. He also began directing questions back to his conversational partner, thereby avoiding the development of a one-sided question and answer format that had occurred in his first series of interactions. In addition, it appeared that this increased fluidity was reflected posturally as well, and by the last series of exchanges, Alan actually affected the proximal distancing between interactants for the first time by moving his chair closer to his conversational partner.

Jennifer, as well, increasingly exhibited more personal elaborations and additions to her conversational partner's comments, thereby creating a quality of a conversation, something which was noticeably lacking in her first series of exchanges. In addition, both anxious subjects reported feeling increasingly more comfortable and less anxious as the interactions progressed and Jennifer directly pointed to the ease with which she was able to handle herself in the last series. The present observation seems entirely consistent with the findings of Goldfried and Goldfried (1977) who report that exposure to social situations is an effective means of reducing social anxiety. This observation is also consistent with Royce and Arkowitz' (1978) finding that practice interactions reduce social anxiety and subsequently lead to increased social activity.

However, this observation is in contrast to the position taken by Curran and Gilbert (1975), who suggest that the anxiety elicited by dating, a dyadic social situation, is the result of anticipating negative consequences caused by a deficit in their personal social skills.

Although the anxious subjects did explicitly report anticipating negative consequences before engaging in the social interactions, this anticipation did not seem to be based in any sustained deficit in their personal social skills. If, in fact, a deficit did exist in their repertoire of social interactional skills, one would not have expected the beginnings of any substantial improvement in their social performance without some re-educative or training experience. However, both anxious subjects did begin to exhibit some observable improvement in their interactive performance, while also subjectively reporting a decrease in their experience of anxiety. This would seem to suggest that the skills necessary for successful engagements in social interactions are present.

The hypothesis offered here is that the lack of skill in the early sessions was due to the debilitating effects of anxiety. But because of the small N it is difficult to be sure that the change was not a function of something else, such as the way the subject felt about each particular partner. It does appear, however, that once familiar with the setting and format of the social interactions, the anxious subjects tended to display more adequate socially adaptive responses. Since the dyadic pairs continually changed while the setting and format of the interactions remained relatively constant, it is further suggested that familiarity with setting, and not just with the individual, plays an important part in the presence or absence of the anxious response.

A general finding seemingly true for all subjects relates to familiarity, predictability and comfortability. It appears that the greater one's power of prediction in social situations, the more comfortably one experiences that interaction. We have already seen how a greater

familiarity with the setting and format of this present study led to increased social activity on the part of the more anxious subjects. Here I would like to call attention to the importance of "common ground" or identification between the participants of an interaction as a determinant of feelings of safety and security. Alan's perception of Ann as someone familiar, since her style resembled that of his friends, seemed to allow him to socially interact with her with considerably less anxiety than with other subjects with whom he reported less personal or stylistic familiarity. In addition, this reported stylistic familiarity allowed Alan to subjectively transform Ann from a stranger, which she was, to a "friend" whose style she resembled. The importance of the "common ground" seemed equally as true for the other subjects in the study. Jennifer, for instance, once establishing "common ground" with Isaac, based on common neighborhoods, schools and interests, appeared more socially available and also reported considerably less social anxiety. In fact, whereas Jennifer initially stressed the difference in age between herself and Isaac in order to increase her feelings of security, she subsequently thoroughly erased this difference, seemingly to increase her identity with him. Ann, as well, reported that her "best" interaction occurred with Alan, who was stylistically most familiar to her.

It appears, therefore, that the greater the perceived common ground between participants of social interactions, the more reported enjoyment by the participants of that interaction. It is likely that this familiarity results in a greater sense of social preparedness and consequently increased feelings of personal safety and security. It is possible, of course, that the primary casual sequence goes in the opposite direction:

greater feelings of comfort leading to a sense of having more in common with the other person. This is an instance of where hypotheses suggested by free observational research point to subsequent more controlled research to answer specific questions raised.

Other general themes that appear to be true for both high and low anxious subjects relate to body positioning and subjective states. The closer the proximity between interactants, at any given point, the greater the liking or interest. This is simply illustrated when we observe subjects leaning forward, thereby decreasing the distance between themselves and their partners, to indicate an increased interest. In addition, the amount of body area directly exposed to one's conversational partner also seems directly related to one's subjective experience at any given moment. This becomes apparent when we compare the subjective report of the interactants with their subsequent body positionings. In the cases where subjects report negative feelings, there is a tendency toward a sideways positioning that necessitates a head turn in order to look directly at their conversational partner. When their subjective reports are more positive, conversely, one can observe a repositioning that places themselves in a more direct, head-on postural orientation with regard to their partners. This aspect of the amount of body area exposed to the conversational partner also can be seen to involve covering or shielding body parts from their partner's view.

In summary we will reiterate the findings just presented:

1. Reactions to and sources of interpersonal anxiety vary greatly from subject to subject. However, each individual subject appears to maintain a consistent individualized

behavioral response pattern to interpersonal anxiety.

2. The focus of attention of anxious subject in social interaction seems directed primarily to their own anxious performance and additionally to the anxious features of the interaction itself. In keeping with this apparent critical attention, they also tend to catastrophize the anxious aspects of their own performance and tend to evaluate their own behavior more negatively than their conversational partners.
3. The socially anxious individuals seem to have difficulties perceiving signs that they are doing all right. They fail to pick up what might be called "safety signals" from their partners. It is suggested that the socially anxious subjects have a blind spot in that they do not readily pick up signals of reassurance.
4. The high anxious subjects seem to retain an evaluative set that appears resistant to modification and revision. In addition, while the general quality of an interaction is accurately perceived, the anxious subjects tend to misinterpret or fail to register subtle changes in attitude or interest on the part of their conversational partners.
5. High anxious subjects exhibit some adaptive responses in the course of several repeated and successive social trials and begin to exhibit skills that were not readily observable during their initial exchanges. This is accompanied by a decrease in their reported experience of anxiety.

6. A general finding true for all subjects regardless of their self-appraised social competency seems to be that the greater one's predictive powers in social situations, the more comfortable one experiences that interaction as being. This predictive power seems dependant upon familiarity not only with one's conversational partner, but also with the setting and structure of the social exchange as well. In addition, it appears that the greater the "common ground" between participants of a social interaction, the greater the immediate predictive powers and resulting security in the interactions.
7. There appears to be an inverse relationship between proximity and liking and/or interest between participants of interactions. The closer the proximity, the greater the subjective report of liking or interest; the less the proximity, the less reported interest.
8. The more body area exposed to one's interactional partner, the more positively one subjectively reports feeling. Conversely, the less body area exposed, as in a sideways postural orientation as opposed to a "head-on" orientation, the more negative subjective reports.

Finally, some reflections on the present design and possible future variations: one of the more interesting features of the present study was the possibility of calling subjects back to view the tapes of their interaction and to comment on them. This allowed two kinds of insights into the experience of social anxiety. Firstly, the subjects could use

the detailed stimulation provided by the tapes to recollect or reconstruct their thoughts and feelings at the time of the original interaction. Such reconstructions are, of course, imperfect - both because the subject may not have been conscious of all his or her thoughts and reactions even at the time and because with time and interpolated experiences, what was available could only approximate what the subject might have been able to report as the experience was ongoing.

Two other approaches, complementary to the present one, might provide useful triangulation in future studies. One is to interrupt the action at certain points and ask the subjects right then and there what they are experiencing. This permits more immediate access to the experiences of the subjects, including experiences which might otherwise be lost. On the other hand, it is obviously disruptive of the interaction, and has the further drawback of requiring the subject to report his experiences in front of the other subject - unless both are removed from the room each time such inquiry was made, thus further disrupting the interaction. The second complementary approach, representing a different compromise between immediacy and disruptiveness, is to interview subjects immediately after the interaction. This is non-disruptive, but in contrast to the present method it does not make use of the ability of concrete reminders of the details of the interaction provided by the tapes to re-evoke the subject's subjective experience.

One could, of course, combine this latter approach with the present one by showing the tape immediately after, but that would require a quite long continuous period of time for the subject to be available (and would present the problem that one of the two subjects would be

providing immediate feedback while the other had to wait to view the tape until the first was finished). These logistic problems are compounded in a study like the present one when one recognizes that each of the subjects interacted with each of the others and thus, even in the unlikely event one had four tape recorders and four copies available, one would have varying degrees of "immediacy" for the viewings of the four interactions even of the same subject. Thus, for all practical purposes the three methods of interruption, immediately subsequent interview, and video playback are separate, and an ideal research program should combine all three (most likely in different studies) and attempt to put together the varying perspectives provided.

The second kind of insight provided by the video-tape playback is more specific to this method - the opportunity it provides the subject to reflect retroactively on what went on again, given richness by the stimulation of the detailed picture provided by the tape. This permits a different kind of inquiry which provides data which can be integrated with the subject's report of what he experienced at the time of the interaction.

Even more interesting data could have been obtained had the subjects been more available to the research. If subjects could have been hired essentially as collaborators or a somewhat idiosyncratic kind of "research assistant," they might have been able to view the tapes a number of times, reacting on the second viewing, for example, to what was reported upon first viewing by their co-interactant (and continuing for as many "metaperspectives" - Laing, Phillipson, & Lee, 1963 - as turned out to be fruitful).

Moreover, with greater access to the subjects' time, subjects could be studied through several different interactions with the same other - including interactions modified by the earlier experience of having viewed the tape, gotten feedback about the other's reactions, etc. This has potential therapeutic as well as research value, which could itself be explored as a research topic.

One possible application of this strategy would be to address the finding of the present study that the socially anxious individuals failed to pick up "safety signals" from their interactional partners. Subjects could be alerted to this issue and subsequent behavior and impressions could be assessed. The preceding example could readily be applied to every emergent theme of the present study, whereby one may observe what would happen in subsequent interactions if subjects were alerted to certain features of their interactional behavior.

Finally, since the "results" of the present study are tentative hypotheses, each emergent theme is open for further empirical testing. Subsequent, more controlled research is needed to see which trends show generality. Future studies might also explore these themes with specific attention to issues such as sexual differences and inter-racial differences in the manifestation and experience of social anxiety in dyadic interaction. The implementation of this design in the study of other select clinical populations might also prove fruitful.

APPENDIX A

***** INVENTORY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD GENERAL SITUATIONS *****

This inventory represents a means of studying people's reactions to and attitudes towards various types of general situations. In the following pages are represented nine general kinds of situations which most people have encountered. For each of these general situations certain common types of personal reactions and feelings are listed. Indicate in the alternatives representing the five points on the scale shown in this questionnaire, the degree to which you would show these reactions and feelings in the situations indicated.

** If you wish to participate in the follow-up study, please fill in the information requested below:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Telephone No.: _____

Please indicate whether you will be available to participate in the follow-up study during June or July (specify whether June or July or both):

YES _____ NO _____

Any additional comments?

SITUATION 1: "You are in situations involving interaction with another person."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 2: "You are in situations involving interaction with a friend."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 3: "You are in situations involving interaction with an acquaintance."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experience like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 4: "You are in situations involving interaction with another person of the opposite sex."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situations:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 5: "You are in situations involving interaction with a stranger."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 6: "You are in situations involving interaction with
a member of your immediate family."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number
which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or
attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences
like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an
uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated
and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering
feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these
situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats
faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 7: "You are in situations where you are about to or may encounter physical danger."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 8: "You are in a new or strange situation."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

SITUATION 9: "You are involved in your daily routines."

Mark directly on this questionnaire, by circling the appropriate number which represents one of the five alternative degrees of reaction or attitude for the above mentioned situations:

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Seek experiences
like this | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 2. Perspire | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | perspire much |
| 3. Have an
uneasy feeling | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 4. Feel exhilarated
and thrilled | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 5. Get fluttering
feeling in stomach | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very much |
| 6. Feel tense | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very tense |
| 7. Enjoy these
situations | very much | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | not at all |
| 8. Heart beats
faster | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | much faster |
| 9. Feel anxious | not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very anxious |

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male _____
Female _____
2. Age: _____
3. Religious Preference:
Protestant _____
Catholic _____
Jewish _____
Other (specify) _____
None _____
4. What is your major field of study (specify) _____
5. Race: White _____
Black _____
Spanish _____
Oriental _____
Other (specify) _____
6. Marital Status:
Single, never married _____
Married _____
Separated, divorced _____
Widowed _____
7. How many years of schooling have you completed?
12 years (high school grad) _____
13 years (first year college) _____
14 years (second year college) _____
15 years (third year college) _____
16 years (college graduate) _____
8. Country of Birth:
U.S. _____
Other _____
(specify) _____
9. Adding up the income from all sources, what was your total family income last year? (Under family include only those people you actually lived with)
- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Under \$5,000 _____ | \$11,001-13,000 _____ |
| \$5,001-7,000 _____ | \$13,001-15,000 _____ |
| \$7,001-9,000 _____ | \$15,001-20,000 _____ |
| \$9,001-11,000 _____ | \$20,001 or over _____ |
10. What is your present work status:
work full-time _____
work part-time _____
unemployed _____
housewife _____
11. Physical fitness:
poor _____
fair _____
good _____
excellent _____

12. Indicate your family size: I come from a family of...
- _____ one child (I am the only child)
- _____ two children
- _____ three children
- _____ four children
- _____ five children
- _____ six or more children
13. What is your position in the family?
- First-born and/or only _____
- Second-born _____
- Third-born _____
- Fourth-born _____
- Fifth-born _____
- Sixth or later-born _____
14. Indicate sex of siblings: (include yourself in this list)
- | | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Oldest (or only) | _____ | _____ |
| Second-born | _____ | _____ |
| Third-born | _____ | _____ |
| Fourth-born | _____ | _____ |
| Fifth-born | _____ | _____ |
| Sixth-born | _____ | _____ |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCES

- Argyle, M. & Dean, J. Eye contact, distance and affiliation. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 289-304.
- Arkowitz, H., Lichtenstein, E., McGovern, K. & Hines, P. The behavioral assessment of social competence in males. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6, 3-13.
- Beatty, M.J. & Beatty, P.J. Interpersonal communications anxiety. Theory Into Practice. 1976, 15 (5), 368-372.
- Birdwhistell, R.L. Kinesics and Context. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
- Birdwhistell, R.L. The kinesic level in the investigation of the emotions. In P.H. Knapp (Ed.) Expressions of the Emotions in Man. New York: Int'l. University Press, 1970.
- Bogdan, R. & Taylor, S.J. Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Borkovec, T.D., Stone, N.M., O'Brien, G.T. & Kaloupek, D.G. Evaluation of a clinically relevant target behavior for analogue outcome research. Behavior Therapy, 1974, 5, 503-515.

Buch, M., Korchin, S.J., Beall, L. & Kiritz, S. Sex differences in the relationship between Trait Anxiety and auditory selective attention.

J. of Auditory Research. 1974, 14, 1-20.

Clark, J.V. & Arkowitz, H. Social anxiety and self-evaluation of interpersonal performance, Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 211-221.

Condon, W.S. & Ogston, W.D. Sound film analysis of normal and pathological behavior patterns. J. of Nervous & Mental Disease. 1966, 143, 338-347.

Curran, J.P. & Gilbert, F.S. A test of the relative effectiveness of a systematic desensitization program and an interpersonal skills training program with date anxious subjects. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6, 510-521.

Curran, J.P., Gilbert, F.S. & Little, L.M. A comparison between behavioral replication training and sensitivity training approaches to heterosexual dating anxiety. J. of Counseling Psychology. (in press).

Davis, Martha. Understanding Body Movement: An annotated bibliography. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Davitz, J.R. & Mason, D.J. Socially facilitated reduction of a fear response in rats. J. of Comparative Physiological Psychology. 1955, 48, 149-151.

Dittman, A.T. The body movement-speech rhythm relationship as a cue to speech encoding. In S. Weitz (ed) Non Verbal Communication. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974, 169-181.

Dollard, J. & Miller, N.E. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950, 127-156.

Epstein, S. The nature of anxiety with emphasis upon its relationship to expectancy. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed.) Anxiety: Current Trends in Theory and Research. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Exline, R.V., Gray, D. & Schuette, D. The incidence of mutual glances in dyads as a form of communication avoidance as a function of interview content and sex of interviewee. J. of Personality & Social Psychology. 1965, 1, 201-209.

Exline, R.V. & Merrick, D. The effects of dependency and social reinforcement upon visual behavior during an interview. British J. of Social & Clinical Psychology, 1967, 6, 256-266.

Fischetti, M., Curran, J.P. & Wessberg, H.W. Sense of timing: a skill deficit in heterosexual-socially anxious males. Behavior Modification. 1977, 1(2), 179-194.

Freedman, N., O'Hanlon, J., Oltman, P. & Witkin, H.A. The imprint of psychological differentiation on kinetic behavior in varying communicative contexts. J. of Abnormal Psychology. 1972, 79, 239-258.

Fromm, E. Escape from Freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1941.

Glasgow, R. & Arkowitz, H. The behavioral assessment of male and female social competence in dyadic heterosexual interactions. Behavior Therapy. 1975, 6, 488-498.

Goffman, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1967.

Goffman, E. Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1967.

Goldfried, M.R. & Davison, G.C. Clinical Behavior Therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1976.

Goldfried, M.R. & Goldfried, A.P. Importance of hierarchy content in the self-control of anxiety. J. of Consulting & Clinical Psychology. 1977, 45 (1), 124-134.

Horney, K. The Neurotic Personality of Our Time. New York: Norton, 1937.

Justice, B., McBee, G. & Allen, R. Social dysfunction and anxiety.

J. of Psychology. 1977, 97(1), 37-42.

Kendon, A. Movement coordination in social interaction: some examples described. Acta Psychologica. 1970, 32, 100-125.

Liddell, H. Some specific factors that modify tolerance for environmental stress. Res. Publ. Ass. Nerv. Ment. Dis. 1950, 29, 155-171.

Lirzman, S. Social activity in anxiety extinction. Dissertation Abstracts International. Ann Arbor: 1955.

Ludwig, L.D. & Lazarus, A.A. A cognitive and behavioral approach to the treatment of social inhibition. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice. 1972, 9, 204-206.

Masserman, J.H. Behavior and Neurosis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Mattsson, P.O. Communicated anxiety in a two person situation. J. of Consulting Psychology. 1960, 24, 488-495.

May, R. The Meaning of Anxiety. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.

McReynold, P. A restricted conceptualization of human anxiety and motivation. Psychological Reports. 1956, 2, 293-312.

Mehrabian, A. & Ferris, S.R. Inference of attitudes from nonverbal communication in two channels. J. of Consulting Psychology. 1967, 31, 248-252.

Mehrabian, A. Relationship of attitude to seated posture, orientation and distance. J. of Personality and Social Psychology. 1968, 10, 26-30.

Milne, D.C. The relation between anxiety and motor performance in young children. Dissertation Abstracts International. Ann Arbor: 71-11925.

Miller, N.E. Learnable drives and rewards. In S.S. Stevens (Ed.) Handbook of Experimental Psychology. New York: Wiley, 1951, 453-472.

Mischel, W., Ebbesen, E.B. & Zeiss, A.R. Selective memory for affirmative information about the self. Unpublished Manuscript. Stanford University, 1973.

Mowrer, O.H. A stimulus-response analysis of anxiety and its role as a reinforcing agent. Psychological Review. 1939, 46, 553-565.

Musumeci, M.A. Speech disturbances as a function of stress induced anxiety in children. Dissertation Abstracts International. Ann Arbor: 75-18892.

Nichols, K.A. Severe social anxiety. British Journal Med. Psychology. 1974, 47, 301-306.

Nevill, D.D. Sex roles and personality correlates. Human Relations. 1977, 30(8), 751-759.

Purcell, K., & Brady, K. Assessment of interpersonal behavior in natural settings. Denver: Children's Asthma Research.

Rehm, L. & Marston, A. Reduction of social anxiety through modification of self-reinforcement: an instigation technique. J. of Consulting & Clinical Psychology. 1968, 32, 565-574.

Richardson, S.A., Dohrenwend, B.S. & Klein, D. Interviewing: its forms and functions. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Riley, M. Sociological Research: A Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World. 1963.

Rogers, C.R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

Royce, S.W. & Arkowitz, H. Multimodal evaluation of practice interactions as treatment for social isolation. J. of Consulting & Clinical Psychology. 1978, 46(2), 239-245.

Reusch, J. & Prestwood, A.R. Anxiety, its initiation communication and interpersonal management. Archives Neurological Psychia. 1949, 62, 527-550.

Sarason, S.B., Davidson, K.S., Lighthall, F.F., Waite, R.R. & Ruebush, B.K. Anxiety in Elementary School Children. New York:Wiley, 1960.

Sarason, S.B. The measurement of anxiety in children: some questions and problems. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed.) Anxiety & Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1966, 63-79.

Scheflen, A.E. Communicational Structure: Analysis of a Psychotherapy Transaction. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press. 1973.

Schwartz, R.M. & Gottman, J.M. Toward a task analysis of assertive behavior. Journal of Counsulting & Clinical Psychology. (in press).

Seligman, M.E., & Johnston, J.C. A cognitive theory of avoidance learning. In F.J. McGuigan & D.B. Lumsden (Eds.) Contempory Approaches to Conditioning and Learning. Washington, D.C.: Winston & Sons, 1973, 69-106.

Sharma, K.M. A study of relationships between belongingness, anxiety and adjustment. Psychological Research, 1970, 5, 50-52.

Smith, E.E. The effects of clear and unclear role expectations on group productivity and defensiveness. J. of Abnormal & Social Psychology. 1957, 55, 213-217.

Smith, R.W. & Sarason, E.G. Social anxiety and the evaluation of negative interpersonal feedback. J. of Consulting & Clinical Psychology. 1975, 43(3), 429.

Solomon, R.L. & Wynne, L.C. Traumatic avoidance learning: the principles of conservation and partial irreversibility. Psych Review. 1954, 61, 353-385.

Spielberger, C.D. Theory and research on anxiety. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed) Anxiety and Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1966, 3-20.

Steinberg, R.S., Chapman, J. & Shallow, D. Psychotherapy research and problem of intrusion on privacy. Psychiatry. 1958, 21, 195-203.

Sullivan, H.S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.

Tiryakian, E.A. The existential self and the person. In C. Gordon & K.J. Gergen (Eds.) The Self in Social Interaction. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1968, 75-85.

Turner, R.H. The self-conception in social interaction. In C. Gordon & K.J. Gergen (Eds.) The Self in Social Interaction. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1968, 93-106.

Wilson, G.T. & Davison, G.C. Process of fear reduction in systematic desensitization: animal studies. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 1-14.