Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

23

Nonverbal Influence

JUDEE K. BURGOON
NORAH E. DUNBAR
CHRIS SEGRIN

When asked, "How do you persuade others?," virtually everyone's first thoughts turn to the verbal messages he or she creates. And yet, if asked how others are persuaded, a person can, on a moment's reflection, generate an extensive list of nonverbal ways in which others are effectively moved to embrace or resist new attitudes and actions. Everything from the use of rewards and punishments to advertising's seductive use of imagery comes to mind. It is these latter forms of "hidden persuasion"—the often overlooked but nevertheless potent nonverbal means of influence—that are the subject of this chapter.

Due to space limitations, we limit our presentation to theories and research evidence pertaining to three classes of nonverbal appeals for influencing others: (a) appeals to attraction, similarity, intimacy, and trust; (b) dominance and power displays; and (c) expectancy signaling and expectancy violations. The first category relies on establishing a favorable interpersonal relationship or fostering credibility and so could be related to a host of theories on interpersonal attraction, identification, relational communication, self-presentation, and image management. Here we consider Heider's balance theory, Duck's similarity theory, Byrne's attraction theory, Anderson's cognitive valence theory, and Giles's communication accommodation theory, although other theories of attraction and relational development, such as uncertainty reduction theory (Berger, 1987) and social penetration theory (Taylor & Altman, 1987), could also be applied to the understanding of nonverbal behavior and favorable interpersonal relations. The second category, that of dominance and power displays, is likewise broad enough to include not only matters of

AUTHORS' NOTE: This research was partially supported by funding from the U.S. Army Research Institute (Contract DASW01-98-K-009). The views, opinions, and findings in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as official Department of the Army positions, policies, or decisions.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:45 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

credibility and image management but also learning theory principles of rewards, threats, and punishments as well as ethological and organizational theories of power hierarchies. Here we center on social exchange theory, Lawler's bilateral deterrence theory, expectation states theory, and Rogers's relational control model. The final category encompasses a constellation of theories concerned with how interpersonal expectancies are formed and signaled and the effects of confirming or violating those expectations. Here we consider expectancy signaling models and expectancy violations theory.

Within each category, we identify what are thought to be the explanatory mechanisms that work directly or indirectly to effectuate persuasion and compliance. Because the matter of social skills tends to permeate or undergird much of the nonverbal influence literature, we include thoughts on the importance of nonverbal skill to communicator competence and successful influence and conclude with suggestions for directions that future research might profitably take.

APPEALS TO ATTRACTION AND SIMILARITY

Social scientists have for a long time been aware of the fact that physically attractive sources are more persuasive than their more ordinary-looking peers. Source attractiveness enhances persuasion independent of argument quality (Norman, 1976), expertise (Chaiken, 1979), and trustworthiness (Norman, 1976). Similarity between a source and target is also a strong determinant of attraction (Newcomb, 1961). Carl Hovland argued that one of the three main classes of stimuli that determine the success of persuasive attempts is "observable characteristics of the perceived source of the communication" (Hovland, Janis, & Kelly, 1953, p. 11). Of those observable characteristics, ones that create perceptions of attractiveness and similarity are among the most powerful. Thus, nonverbal cues that promote or signify attraction and/or similarity have great potential to influence others.

Definitions

Attraction is a positive attitude or predisposition to respond to another in a positive way (Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Berscheid & Walster, 1978). These responses can entail positive appraisals of the target's qualities and attributes, positive emotions associated with that target, and positive behaviors enacted toward the target (Berscheid & Reis, 1998). Given the nature of these outcomes, it is clear that persuasion and compliance are also among the responses to which people are predisposed when attracted to another person. *Similarity* variously refers to sharing attitudes, background, values, knowledge, or common styles in common. Because theories of attraction and similarity typically invoke each other, the two constructs are inevitably linked.

Theoretical Perspectives

A number of theories explain how and why attraction and similarity enhance persuasiveness. According to Heider's (1958) balance theory, people are motivated to hold consistent attitudes in their point of view toward other people and toward certain attitudinal objects. People tend to like others who exhibit signs of similarity because it is reinforcing to their own self-concept and helps them to predict and understand similar others. Thus, people should desire to hold an attitude toward a particular stimulus that is similar to that of a liked other or dissimilar to that of a disliked other. In the review that follows, we show that many nonverbal behaviors that are

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:46 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

instrumental in creating a sense of liking can also enhance a source's persuasiveness. Balance theory offers one theoretical account of why this may be the case. If a source's nonverbal behaviors are immediate and likeable, we may be particularly motivated to hold attitudes similar to those that the source expresses.

Duck's (1994) similarity theory also explains how similarity and attraction may be influential in persuasive processes. Duck argued that the concept of similarity has four components that are the amalgamation of two dimensions: that which is evaluative versus nonevaluative and that which is undeclared versus declared. The evaluative/nonevaluative dimension references facts versus attitudes toward and opinions about those facts. The undeclared/declared dimension refers to background similarities of which two people are aware versus those of which they are unaware. Duck (1998) highlighted the role of nonverbal behavior in making similarities "declared" by stating, "We never see the internal states or attitudes of other persons directly, so we only infer them from . . . nonverbal and verbal behavior(s). . . . Because of this, the two people's readings of each other's nonverbal behavior will be critical to this inference process and highly significant in acquaintance" (p. 73). Nonverbal behaviors are essentially viewed as a fundamental means by which people infer similarity with another person. Recognition of this similarity, in turn, fuels attraction and enhances the ability to influence.

Byrne's (1971) similarity theory states a general "law of attraction" in that attraction toward an individual is thought to be a linear function of attitudinal similarity with that person. As Byrne (1961) pointed out, "Any time another person offers us validation by indicating that his percepts and concepts are congruent with ours, it constitutes a rewarding interaction and, hence, one element in forming a positive relationship" (p. 713). As already noted, attitudes toward those with whom we interact and ideas about which we interact are often conveyed nonverbally. According to Byrne's theory, awareness of these similarities is strongly associated with attraction toward a source. Nonverbal behaviors may convey a sense of attitudinal similarity between the source and target, reinforcing feelings of attraction and a predisposition to be persuaded.Additional theories that can explain the role of nonverbal behavior in creating attraction and possibly enhancing persuasiveness are the class of dyadic interaction theories such as cognitive valence theory (CVT) (Andersen, 1985, 1999), interpersonal adaptation theory (IAT) (Burgoon, Stern, & Dillman, 1995), and communication accommodation theory (CAT) (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). The first two theories explain reactions to changes in nonverbal behavior during the course of an interaction. For example, CVT predicts that an increase in the nonverbal immediacy of a source, if noticed, creates some degree of arousal. This arousal then gets interpreted against a series of cognitive schemata related to factors such as cultural appropriateness, relational appropriateness, and personal predispositions. If the interaction has a generally positive tone, and if the evaluation of the change in behavior is positive, then the experiencedarousal will be positively valenced, creating a good feeling about the source and the interaction. These positively valenced encounters are predicted to lead to positive relational outcomes such as positive affect, a reciprocal display of greater nonverbal immediacy, and increased relational closeness. One can predict a predisposition to agree or comply with the source as an additional positive relational outcome. CAT makes similar predictions. At its core is the assumption that people respond positively to others who adopt a nonverbal, particularly vocalic style that is similar to their own. Listeners perceive nonverbal behavior

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:47 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

that is similar to their own as more attractive and pleasant. As speakers adjust their behavioral style to one that is similar to targets, the targets are expected to respond positively despite being unaware of this accommodation on the part of the source. According to CAT, sources who adjust their behavioral style to be increasingly similar to targets should be perceived as more attractive and more persuasive.

Each of these theories focuses on the role of similarity and attractiveness in producing positive relational outcomes. Chaiken (1979, 1986) developed several explanations for their positive influence on persuasive outcomes. First, attractive people are thought to provide a sense of social reward. Receivers want to be with and be like attractive and similar others.

Second, source attractiveness triggers heuristic processing, whereby people mindlessly tend to agree with those who are seen as likeable. Perceived attractiveness is associated with a halo effect (Dion, Berscheid, & Walster, 1972) such that receivers ascribe a variety of other positive characteristics, including persuasiveness, to attractive sources. The belief that "what is beautiful is good" is a pervasive, if tacit, stereotype that is triggered by both physical beauty and attractive voices (Zuckerman, Hodgins, & Miyake, 1990). This may be one reason why attractive sources get more offers for help when in need (Benson, Karabenic, & Lerner, 1976), earn higher salaries (Hammermesh & Biddle, 1994), and are more able to change the attitudes of an audience (Chaiken, 1979) as compared to their less attractive peers. Because attractive people are generally likeable, the cognitive heuristics of many receivers predispose them to agree with messages from attractive sources.

Finally, some evidence suggests that attractive sources possess better social skills than do less attractive sources (Chaiken, 1979; Feingold, 1992). These heightened skills may allow attractive sources of be more effective and comfortable in persuasive contexts. This influence of social skills on persuasiveness presages the impact of another type of appeal—dominance—in that the portrait of the demeanor of socially skilled individuals corresponds closely with the profile of interpersonal dominance behaviors (Burgoon & Dunbar, 1998). Socially skilled individuals convey confidence, friendliness, dynamism, poise, and other favorable attributes through their communicative behavior, and these behaviors are seen as more dominant in interpersonal contexts (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). Thus, if dominant individuals appear more socially skilled and socially skilled individuals are seen as more attractive, then dominant nonverbal behavior combines power and attraction, making it a doubly effective way to influence others.

Nonverbal Cues of Attractiveness, Attraction, and Similarity

There is good reason to suspect that the relationship between nonverbal behavior and persuasiveness is mediated by the sense of attraction and similarity that certain behaviors create. In many interactions, nonverbal behaviors simultaneously reflect a motivation to create a sense of intimacy and common ground as well as a motivation to exert control and influence over the receiver (Burgoon & Saine, 1978; Patterson, 1983). Research evidence shows that the same behaviors that often signal attraction and similarity between a source and receiver will also enhance the effectiveness of persuasive appeals, perhaps by virtue of promoting the receiver's sense of identification with the sender or creating a close interpersonal relationship on which the sender can draw. What follows is a sampling of that research evidence regarding which nonverbal behaviors make the sender appear more

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:48 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

attractive, signal the sender's attraction for the receiver, or signify similarity between the sender and receiver. Among the cues reviewed, physical appearance, artifacts, gaze, and proximity may serve not only as behaviors that enhance attraction and similarity during an interaction but also as pre-interactional elements in that they may draw people together. In this manner, nonverbal cues may predispose people to interact and be susceptible to influence even before the first word is uttered.

Kinesics. Kinesics relates to all aspects of "body language"—movements of the head, face, eyes, limbs, and trunk—as a means of communication. Among the most powerful indicators of attraction are eye contact and mutual gaze. Gaze increases as a function of liking toward the target (Exline, 1963). Eye contact is both encoded (Rubin, 1970) and decoded (Kleinke, Bustos, Meeker, & Staneski, 1973) as a sign of attraction and relational positivity, and its absence is also a good indicator of relational distress (Noller, 1980).

Gaze has a very reliable effect of increasing compliance rates when compared to those who make requests while averting their gaze (Segrin, 1993). In persuasive contexts, the increased use of gaze has been associated with getting more rides while hitchhiking (Snyder, Grether, & Keller, 1974), having greater success in getting change from others to make a phone call (Brockner, Pressman, Cabitt, & Moran, 1982), getting targets to take pamphlets (Kleinke & Singer, 1979), and having success in requesting donations to a charity (Bull & Robinson, 1981). Given the powerful connection between gaze and attraction, it is plausible to assume that in many of these cases, gazing confederates were seen as more attractive by targets than were those who averted eye contact given that gaze aversion sends a message of disinterest (Burgoon, Manusov, Mineo, & Hale, 1985).

Vocalics. There are a number of paralinguistic (vocal) variables that are associated with attraction between a source and target or that create such a sense of attraction. For example, those who speak at a relatively fast rate with short silent pauses are seen as having more favorable attributes than are those who speak at a slower rate (Siegman, 1987). Silent pauses, filled pauses, and speech hesitations all are negatively correlated with listeners' attraction toward speakers (Pope & Siegman, 1966). Some of these same behaviors, and those that are manipulated to create "warm" interviewer conditions (Siegman, 1987), are also those paralinguistic behaviors that appear to enhance speakers' persuasiveness.

A fast speech rate has been shown to be effective in gaining compliance, especially when recipients havegood decoding skills (Buller & Aune, 1988; cf. Buller, LePoire, Aune, & Eloy, 1992; Miller, Maruyama, Beaber, & Valone, 1976; Woodall & Burgoon, 1983). A requester's "tone of voice" may also have an impact on compliance. Buller and Burgoon (1986) employed interviewers who had either pleasant, neutral, or hostile voices. Participants classified as good decoders volunteered more hours of their time to requesters with a pleasant rather than neutral voice. On the other hand, participants classified as poor decoders volunteered more time to neutral speakers. Hall (1980) also found that good decoders of nonverbal communication were more sensitive to vocal cues of pleasantness and expressiveness and were more likely to be persuaded when these cues were intentionally manipulated. The association between perceived persuasiveness and greater vocal pleasantness, which is comprised of variables such as fluency and pitch variety, was also demonstrated by Burgoon, Birk, and Pfau (1990).

Proxemics and Haptics. Proxemics refers to messages entailing the use of distancing and space; *haptics* refers to nonverbal messages of

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:49 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

touch. It is well-known that friends and intimate partners use less personal space in their interactions than do strangers (Aiello, 1987; Hayduk, 1983). People generally select closer interacting distances with others who are perceived to be attractive, friendly, and positively reinforcing (Byrne, Ervin, & Lamberth, 1970; Gifford, 1982). Likewise, touch functions to convey liking, affiliation, love, sexuality, and comfort toward receivers (Heslin & Alper, 1983; Jones, 1994). Touch plays such a potent role in communicating and establishing intimacy between the encoder and decoder that it is difficult to imagine a close, particularly romantic relationship entirely devoid of touch. It is therefore understandable that closer personal space and touch tend to be associated with increased persuasiveness.

Researchers have asked confederates to approach targets at either "close" (e.g., 1-2 feet) or "far" (e.g., 4-5 feet) distances while requesting behaviors such as volunteering to participate in a study (Baron, 1978; Baron & Bell, 1976), signing a petition (Buller, 1987), giving a confederate a nickel in exchange for five pennies (Ernest & Cooper, 1974), and completing a survey (Glick, DeMorest, & Hotze, 1988). Results generally indicate that compliance rates are inversely related to the distance between the source and target of the request (Segrin, 1993). It should be noted that sources who possess high reward value (e.g., wealthy, physically attractive, well-dressed) are better able to violate targets' personal space and still produce positive effects on targets' compliance (Burgoon & Aho, 1982).

The effectiveness of touch has been demonstrated in a number of field experiments where senders lightly touched, or did not touch, receivers while making requests. Such requests have included getting participants to return dimes that they took from a phone booth (Brockner et al., 1982; Kleinke, 1977), volunteering time for charity (Goldman, Kiyohara, & Pfannensteil, 1984), taking and mailing in a card (Kurklen & Kassinove, 1991), helping to score questionnaires (Patterson, Powell, & Lenihan, 1986), and signing petitions (Willis & Hamm, 1980). In all cases, behavioral compliance was increased by the use of light touch.

The use of touch has also been linked with positive attitude changes toward sources. Patients develop more positive attitudes toward nurses who touch them as compared to nurses who limit their interactions to just verbal behavior (Aguilera, 1967). Waiters and waitresses who touch restaurant patrons, product demonstrators who touch potential customers, and greeters who touch shoppers as they enter a store all are regarded more positively by receivers than are their counterparts who do not touch (Hornik, 1992). The effects of touch on attraction to the source might even operate outside of conscious awareness. Fisher, Rytting, and Heslin (1976) had library clerks touch, or not touch, patrons' palms when returning their library cards during book checkouts. Those who were touched later rated the library clerk more favorably than did those who were not touched, yet only 57% of the participants in the touch condition were even aware that they had been touched by the library clerk.

Physical Appearance and Artifacts. A final set of cues combines physical appearance with personal artifacts. Some evidence suggests that sources dressed similarly to their targets are more persuasive than those dressed differently (Hensley, 1981). Hensley (1981) had well-dressed and casually dressed solicitors seek compliance at an airport where targets are typically well-dressed and at a bus stop where targets are typically more casually dressed. As predicted, the well-dressed solicitor was more successful in the airport, and the casually dressed solicitor was more successful with those at the bus stop. This finding suggests that people may be inclined to comply

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:50 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

with sources who are dressed similarly to the self, possibly through the mechanism of identification. For instance, all social groups—from street gangs, to work groups, to entire cultures—rely on clothing, insignias, ownership of certain brand-name products, and the like to symbolize their in-group status. In other cases, high-status clothing, attractive facial features, and conventional appearance have been shown to increase persuasiveness (Bickman, 1971, 1974; Brownlow & Zebrowitz, 1990; Pallak, 1983; Pallak, Murroni, & Koch, 1983). In these latter cases, attractive appearance may be persuasive in itself, or it may relate to violations of expectations (discussed in a later section).

APPEALS TO DOMINANCE, POWER, AND STATUS

Power, dominance, and status by their very nature imply influence. It necessarily follows that nonverbal indicators of these relational states may profoundly affect the ability to persuade another. These behaviors may exert direct influence independent of what is actually said. By defining the nature of the interpersonal relationship between two parties, they may also frame verbal messages in a way that enhances or diminishes the likelihood of their acceptance. For example, dominant individuals are judged as more credible than submissive individuals (Burgoon & Dunbar, 1998). It seems likely that dominant behaviors fit into a schema for successful communication, one that combines gestalt judgments of competence and credibility with particular communicative routines that qualify as dominant. Dominant interaction also may be effective because it shares key ingredients with socially skilled performances, enabling dominant individuals to influence and even deceive others (Riggio, Tucker, & Throckmorton, 1988).

Definitions

Power, dominance, and status have been defined in numerous, often synonymous, ways by a variety of theorists and researchers (see for example, Berger, 1994; Burgoon, Johnson, & Koch, 1998; Winter, 1973). To achieve conceptual clarity and to eliminate confusion, however, these concepts should be differentiated.

Most definitions of *power* contain a common theme of the ability to influence others, exercised through a variety of resources or power bases (Burgoon et al., 1998; Foa & Foa, 1974; French & Raven, 1959; Henley, 1995). Power is thus a perceptual variable that involves the potential for control or influence that may or may not be manifested behaviorally. Among the different power bases that have been delineated and have implications for nonverbal communication are the five identified by French and Raven (1959). These are *reward power* and *coercive power,* which represent a person's right to reward and punish respectively; *legitimate power,* which is power that comes from holding a high-status position that is sanctioned by society; *referent power,* which is the power that results when others admire and emulate a person; and *expert power,* which is derived from having expertise in a needed field. *Compliance* results when a target accepts influence in order to gain rewards or avoid punishments, *identification* results when a target wishes to be emulate or be identified with an influential other (i.e., from the exercise of referent power), and *internalization* results when messages are consistent with the target's value system, often due to reliance on expert or legitimate power (Berger, 1994; Kelman, 1958). Nonverbal cues that emphasize rewards or punishments, that underscore one's legitimate role or expertise, or that attempt to build identification by cementing interpersonal affinity are drawing on principles of power.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:50 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Whereas power may be latent, *dominance* is necessarily manifest. It refers to context- and relationship-dependent interactional patterns in which one actor's assertion of control is met by acquiescence from another (Burgoon et al., 1998; Rogers-Millar & Millar, 1979). Although dominance elsewhere may be viewed as a personality trait, in the context of communication, it is a dynamic state that reflects a combination of individual temperament and situational features that demand, release, or encourage dominant behavior (Aries, Gold, & Weigel, 1983; Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). Unlike domineeringness, which refers to individual attempts to control the interaction, dominance refers to the acceptance of the control attempts by the interactional partner; that is, it is defined by the sequence of "one-up" and "one-down" acts between two parties (Rogers-Millar & Millar, 1979). Dominance is thus both behavioral and relational.

Status refers to one's position in a socially agreed-on hierarchy that is prevalent in all types of societies, including nonhuman ones (Lips, 1991). High status often fosters dominance and power because one is endowed with legitimate authority, but it does not guarantee the exercise of power or the display of dominant behavior (Burgoon, Buller, & Woodall, 1996). However, dominance is unlikely to be effective in a task group unless a member acts from a legitimated status position (Ridgeway, Diekema, & Johnson, 1995; Ridgeway, Johnson, & Diekema, 1994). Thus, status, dominance, and power are intertwined.

Theoretical Perspectives

One theory that emphasizes the importance of power, status, and dominance is the social exchange framework. Social exchange theorists assume that individuals will act to maximize their interpersonal rewards and minimize their interpersonal costs (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976; Homans, 1958; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). A pivotal concept of this theory is dependence—the extent to which one's outcomes are contingent on exchange with another. Dependence is a function of both value and alternatives inasmuch as people are more dependent on those whose exchange relationships they value highly, especially when alternatives are few (Molm & Cook, 1995). Power, then, is achieved dyadically when one person values exchange with the other and has few alternatives (see, e.g., Emerson, 1962; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). People often express this power-dependence relationship nonverbally by making themselves appear more attractive as exchange partners, by communicating their interest in building relationships, or by signaling that they are not interested in an exchange.

A second approach to the study of power in nonverbal influence is Lawler's (1986) bilateral deterrence theory. Lawler and Bacharach (1987) distinguished between *dependence power* (the control that is achieved by being less dependent on the other) and *punitive power* (the influence gained by a person perceived as likely to inflict harm). Because power in relationships is never zero sum, the total or absolute amount of power in a relationship can vary. *Total power* is the sum of each party's absolute power, and *relative power* is the power difference of each party's absolute power (Lawler, 1992). As Emerson (1962) and other theorists have noticed, power is rarely in the hands of one person; rather, it is shared as people become dependent on one another. This makes nonverbal communication so much more important because as power relationships are negotiated over time, much of this negotiation takes place without words. Thus, a handshake, a tone of voice, eye contact, and other nonverbal cues can have a profound effect on the power dynamic between two people.

A third theory that is especially relevant to the role of power, dominance, and status in

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:51 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

nonverbal influence processes is *expectation states theory.* This theory, which focuses on influence and task performance in groups, revolves around expectations that establish a "power and prestige order" (Berger, Conner, & Fisek, 1974; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986; Ridgeway & Walker, 1995). Group members develop expectations about others' likely contributions to the task based on status characteristics, and these *performance expectations* confer an "expectation advantage or disadvantage," depending on whether the individual is expected to contribute favorably or unfavorably to successful task completion.

Status characteristics are any characteristic of actors around which evaluations of and beliefs about them come to be organized. Examples include age, sex, race, ethnicity, education, occupation, physical attractiveness, and intelligence (Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980). Expectation states theory differentiates between specific and diffuse status characteristics. Specific status characteristics are socially valued skills, expertise, or social accomplishments that imply a specific and bounded range of competencies (e.g., computer skills, mathematical skills). Diffuse status characteristics, such as gender and race, are culturally associated with some specific skills but also carry general expectations for competence that are diffuse and unbounded in range (Ridgeway & Walker, 1995).

Many of these characteristics are signaled nonverbally through one's demeanor and appearance, making this theory especially relevant to nonverbal influence. Those who possess status-valued external characteristics "are more likely (1) to have chances to perform, (2) to initiate problem-solving performances, [and] (3) [to] have their performances positively evaluated, and [they] (4) are less likely to be influenced when there are disagreements" (Berger, Ridgeway, Fisek, & Norman, 1998, p. 381) than are those who lack such characteristics or who possess negatively valued characteristics. In this way, expectations translate into actual influence on group problem solving.

Related to performance expectations are *reward expectations,* which are expectations about whether the status characteristics are more or less likely to create benefits for individual perceivers or the group. There are three classes of reward structures: categorical, ability, and outcome (Ridgeway & Berger, 1986). *Categorical* structures are related to diffuse social status characteristics such as age, gender, and physical strength. These expectations are like the physical attractiveness stereotypes discussed earlier in their ability to engender attraction and confer credibility. A visible physical handicap or tattoo may be stigmatizing; a tall muscular stature and graying hair may, for a male, create a commanding impression. *Ability* structures are associated with the specific task to be performed. Speaking with an authoritative voice or using dramatic gestures may imply greater confidence and expertise (i.e., greater ability). *Outcome* structures are associated with actual accomplishments during the group task. Because the power and prestige order and reward expectations are interrelated, those with high-expectation advantages not only are more likely to take the initiative (e.g., talking first, establishing seating arrangements) and to be more participative but also are more likely to be accorded more deferential treatment by others. In this manner, they will have more of their recommendations acknowledged and accepted. They may also reinforce their advantage by exhibiting verbal and nonverbal status and potency cues, referred to as *task performance cues,* which further enable them to make more—and more influential—contributions to the group's communication and, in the process, to legitimate their power and prestige.

A fourth, closely related theoretical area is that concerning credibility. As noted previously, a person's demeanor and status charac-

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:52 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

teristics can confer credibility. Dominant behaviors, such as direct eye contact, brief casual touching, voices with great energy and volume, short response latencies, and few disfluencies, are generally seen as more credible because they connote confidence and poise (Burgoon et al., 1996). Keating and Heltman (1994), for instance, found that dominant children and adults were better at encoding deception than were submissive children, especially for males. They concluded that dominant individuals have a special capacity to perpetrate convincing deception that indicates that dominant individuals are inherently credible even when being deceptive.

In a study of the nonverbal cues that affect credibility and persuasion, Burgoon et al. (1990) argued that distal cues that can be objectively measured, such as a speaker's vocal amplitude or frequency of illustrator gestures, generate proximal percepts such as *warmth, pleasantness,* and *dominance* that represent subjective judgments abstracted from the objective cues. It is these proximal percepts that lead to perceptions of credibility and persuasion. The authors found that kinesic dominance cues (including distal cues such as facial expressiveness and illustrator gestures) were especially important for generating perceptions of competence, composure, character, and sociability. Kinesic dominance, along with vocal pleasantness, kinesic and proxemic immediacy, and kinesic relaxation, also affected the speaker's persuasiveness.

Dominance is clearly linked to both credibility and persuasiveness, but more research is needed to explore more fully the relationship among persuasion, credibility, and dominance. It is a long-standing assumption in communication that higher credibility leads to more compliance and attitude change (Burgoon et al., 1996). Research such as that by Burgoon et al. (1990) and Keating and Heltman (1994) indicates that dominant communicators elicit perceptions of credibility through their confident demeanor and dynamism. For example, they make direct eye contact, have rapid loud delivery, use facial expressiveness, and use few adapters, all of which serve to engender the perception of credibility and to increase compliance.

A final theoretical perspective is reflected in the program of research on relational control by Rogers and her colleagues (e.g., Escudero, Rogers, & Gutierrez, 1997; Millar & Rogers, 1987; Rogers, Castleton, & Lloyd, 1996; Rogers & Farace, 1975; Rogers-Millar & Millar, 1979). This perspective emphasizes the interactional nature of dominance and power. Examining pairs of messages in a dyad's conversation, they have found that interactants continually define the degree of dominance or submissiveness in their relationship based on who has the right to direct, delimit, and define the action of the interpersonal system (Millar & Rogers, 1987; Rogers & Farace, 1975). While the relational control paradigm emphasizes verbalizations, Siegel, Friedlander, and Heatherington (1992) expanded it to include nonverbal cues. They found that certain nonverbal behaviors, such as a head nod and a raised eyebrow, are commonly understood as discrete ways of either gaining or relinquishing control of a social relationship.

Nonverbal Expressions of Power, Dominance, and Status

Nonverbal behavior is a major avenue for the communication of power, dominance, and status (Henley, 1995). The research on nonverbal communication demonstrates that status, power, and dominance are encoded and decoded reliably by people in everyday interactions. This makes these highly reliable and potentially universal means of achieving influence.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:53 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Kinesics. Eye contact is a complex way to communicate dominance and status. Staring is used to connote dominance, while averting gaze is likely to communicate submission. Dominant people break eye contact last. At the same time, high-status individuals are generally expected to make less frequent eye contact, especially while listening, and subordinates are required to make eye contact with their superiors as a function of attentive listening (Lips, 1991). This may seem like an apparent contradiction, but it becomes clearer in the context of "visual dominance"—defined as the ratio of the proportion of time spent looking while speaking to the proportion of time spent looking while listening. Higher status individuals display more visual dominance (i.e., more looking while speaking and less looking while listening) and are seen as more powerful by observers (Dovidio & Ellyson, 1982, 1985; Ellyson, Dovidio, Corson, & Vinicur, 1980).

Relaxation is also a marker of dominance and status. In mixed-status groups, individuals with higher rank typically exhibit postural relaxation (e.g., slumping in a chair, putting their feet up on the desk), but individuals with lower rank tend to show more postural restraint (Burgoon et al., 1996). This is probably due to the fact that, like soldiers standing at attention, low-status individuals must remain attentive and vigilant while the higher status individual is freer to relax and has less need to be watchful of others (Andersen & Bowman, 1999).

Various gestures have been associated with power, dominance, and status (although the amount of experimentally controlled research on the subject is limited). Some evidence suggests that pointing at another person, using expressive and expansive gestures, steepling the hands, and using gestures while directing others may be dominant gestures (Andersen & Bowman, 1999; Burgoon, 1994).

Vocalics. Dominance has been associated with vocal cues such as rapid speaking tempo, short response latencies, loudness, and a high proportion of speaking time (Burgoon, 1994). These vocal cues connote confidence and authority. Individuals expressing anger, a dominant type of expressive behavior, typically speak louder than do nondominant individuals (Kimble & Musgrove, 1988). Rogers and Jones (1975) found that the more dominant members of a dyad held the floor about twice as much of the time and interrupted their partners more than the less dominant partners. The person who speaks first in a group interaction typically speaks the most and is perceived as the highest status (Lamb, 1981).

Silence can also be used to send messages about dominance and status. Subordinates must wait for their superiors to speak first and must wait to be acknowledged by their superiors. Failing to recognize another person can be a potent reminder of status differences, even when done unintentionally. Giving someone the "silent treatment" and using lengthy pauses while speaking are powerful reminders of status in relationships (Burgoon et al., 1996; Jaworski, 1993).

Proxemics and Haptics. Higher status individuals are afforded more personal space, control access to more desirable territory, and adopt body positions that occupy more space as compared to lower status individuals (Burgoon et al., 1996; Lips, 1991). In office environments, there are lines of power and prestige based on where one's office is located, how large it is, and how many windows it has (Hickson & Stacks, 1993). Some research has demonstrated that individuals with higher status (both experimentally controlled status and diffuse status) actually take up more space with their bodies and possessions than do those low in status (Leffler, Gillespie, & Conaty, 1982). This is consistent with Burgoon, Buller, Hale, and deTurck's (1984)

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:54 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

finding that closer proximity conveys greater dominance because it means that a person with higher status is invading the space of a subordinate. Elevation also provides a symbolic hierarchical function and gives the dominant individual an advantage in both surveillance and protection (Burgoon, 1994). In a study using drawings of male and female figures, Schwartz, Tesser, and Powell (1982) found that dominance was associated with elevation, standing in front as opposed to behind, and standing as opposed to sitting.

In addition to using space, powerful individuals have the ability to deviate from conversational distancing norms. Studies have shown that both close and far interaction distances have been associated with high status and dominance. This is because dominant individuals are freer to deviate from normative distances than are submissive individuals because they must maintain deferential distances in conversations (Burgoon et al., 1996).

Nonreciprocal touch communicates power, status, and dominance (Henley, 1995). Status equals touch each other in similar ways and places on the body, but among status unequals, high-status individuals typically touch their subordinates more often, and those touches are not reciprocated by the subordinates (Burgoon et al., 1996). In addition to the frequency of touch, the type of touch as well as who initiates the touch determines whether or not it is perceived as powerful (Berger, 1994). Direct poking with a finger can be seen as a very dominant type of touch, especially when the response is a recoiling or cowing from the submissive partner. Hits, slaps, kicks, and other types of physical aggression are also considered haptic behavior and are clearly meant to convey power (Burgoon et al., 1996; Straus, 1979).

Physical Appearance and Artifacts. Physical appearance can have a potent effect on the credibility of a speaker, which in turn has a substantial impact on compliance gaining. Brownlow (1992) found that people with mature faces were considered more expert and more persuasive than people with "baby faces," but baby-faced individuals were seen as more honest and trustworthy, perhaps because their babyish facial features conveyed innocence. Rosenberg, Kahn, and Tran (1991) found that women who were dressed conservatively, appeared older, had almond or triangular-shaped eyes, and wore their hair short were seen as more competent political candidates than were other women.

People surround themselves with status symbols or other artifacts to convey their power and prestige over others. Uniforms are often potent cues for manipulating behavior because they signify the ability to reward or punish due to their legitimate power and authority (Burgoon et al., 1996). Bickman (1971, 1974) found that people are willing to comply with the requests of a person wearing an unknown security uniform, even when the requests are outside that person's legitimate authority.

In addition to uniforms, other types of clothing can also be a nonverbal message of power and status. For example, both male and female models' intelligence was judged to be highest when the models were dressed formally (Behling & Williams, 1991). Many studies have shown that compliance gaining and helping behavior are affected by the attire of message sources (Bickman, 1971; Giles & Chavasse, 1975; Lambert, 1972; Lefkowitz, Blake, & Mouton, 1955). Segrin's (1993) meta-analysis of nonverbal communication and compliance gaining showed that sources wearing more formal and higher status clothing were more successful at gaining compliance from lower status targets. In the classroom, numerous studies have demonstrated that instructors who dress informally command limited respect and are viewed by students as not especially knowledgeable and less

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:55 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

intelligent but also more friendly and fun than their formally dressed counterparts (Butler & Roesel, 1989; Davis, 1992; Workman, Johnson, & Hadeler, 1993). Credibility and persuasion ability are associated with formal attire because high-status and privileged members of society tend to wear formal forms of dress more often than do low-status members. Those wearing this high-status form of clothing are thus judged to be more attractive, persuasive, credible, and intelligent.

Chronemics. Time management can be a powerful status cue. In the fast-paced Western world where "time is money," we generally view people with higher status as having more valuable time. Doctors communicate their higher status by having others wait in a "waiting room," and interviewers communicate their hiring power by cutting the conversation short if they do not think the interview is going well or by prolonging the interview if it looks promising. In general, the longer people will wait for us, the more important we are, and the longer amount of time we spend with someone, the more important they are to us. Focusing on one task (monochronism) instead of doing many things at once (polychronism) also indicates that the task at hand must be an important one. The perception that time is valuable even extends to speakers with a fast speaking tempo who are usually associated with perceptions of dominance, status, and increased compliance (Burgoon et al., 1996). Perhaps it is their attempt to maximize the use of their own time or our perception that people in a hurry are important that leads us to associate these people with credibility.

EXPECTANCY SIGNALING AND EXPECTANCY VIOLATIONS

A wide array of theories of human behavior and influence rely on the concept of expectancies, whether labeled as such or embodied in kindred concepts such as scripts, schemata, frames, norms, anticipatory responses, advance organizers, or predictions. Here we consider two that are especially relevant to communication expectancies and their capacity to influence others.

Definitions

Communicators enter interactions with expectations about others—expectations about their background, attitudes, beliefs, and likely communication behavior. *Expectations,* which are cognitions about the anticipated behavior of others, may range from the general (based on sociocultural and contextual roles, rules, norms, and practices) to the particular (adjusted for individuated knowledge or experience with a specific other) (Burgoon & Walther, 1990). Expectancy-related theories, then, draw on that which is typical, commonplace, or appropriate for a class of actors or acts but allow for expectations to take into account unique information about the specific actor.

Theoretical Perspectives

Two ways in which expectancies translate into nonverbal influence are by (a) signaling expectations to a target, who then meets those expectancies, producing a self-fulfilling prophecy, and (b) violating those expectancies in positive or negative ways that elicit corresponding positive or negative outcomes, including attitude and behavioral change or resistance. Theories related to *expectancy signaling* are variously referred to as theories of experimenter expectancy effects, self-fulfilling prophecies, or behavioral confirmation (see, e.g., Darley & Fazio, 1980; Jones, 1986; Jussim, 1990; Neuberg, 1996;

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:56 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Rosenthal, 1976, 1985; Snyder, 1984; Snyder & Swann, 1978). These theories examine how actors' expectancies for a target person elicit the expected behavior from the target, leading to self-fulfilling prophecies and behavioral confirmation (i.e., confirming through the behavior what the actor had expected from them). For example, if teachers are led to believe that a class of students has high achievement potential, they are likely to behave in ways that actually elicit higher performance from their students, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. Conversely, if they expect that the students are underachievers, they will manage to elicit poorer performance from these students. From a communication standpoint, issues of interest are what verbal and nonverbal behaviors by an actor exert this subtle, usually inadvertent influence on targets and the conditions under which targets confirm, disconfirm, or are responsive to these expectancies through their own behavior. Hundreds of studies have explored the issue of expectancy signaling, and there is substantial evidence—a sampling of which is included in what follows—that nonverbal cues are pivotal to achieving these behavioral confirmation effects.

Expectancy violations theory (Burgoon, 1978, 1983, 1992, 1993; Burgoon & Burgoon, 2001; Burgoon & Jones, 1976) posits that, contrary to popular belief, it is sometimes better to violate expectations than to conform to them. Like expectation states theory, some expectations are a function of characteristics of the individual actor (e.g., physical appearance, age, sex), some are a function of the *interpersonal relationship* between actor and perceiver (e.g., acquainted or not, equal or unequal, friendly or hostile), and some are a function of the *communication context* (e.g., formal or informal, task or social, public or private setting). These factors all combine to create expectations for how an actor will communicate nonverbally (or verbally). For example, an older, high-status male stranger may be expected to be somewhat distant, to initiate formal touch, to dress formally, and to speak with a deeper pitched expressive and articulate voice.

When expectations are violated, such as intruding on another's personal space or avoiding eye contact, the theory posits that this triggers an arousal or orientation response (Burgoon, Kelley, Newton, & Keeley-Dyreson, 1989; Le Poire & Burgoon, 1996) in which the violation galvanizes attention to itself and its source, deepens information processing, and instigates an appraisal and evaluation process that results in the violation being valenced as positive or negative. The appraisal process is a matter of determining the possible meanings of the violation. Does close distance, for instance, imply liking or threat? Approval seeking or intimidation? The evaluation process concerns the judgment of whether the act is desirable or undesirable. The combined interpretation and evaluation of the violation, taking into account who committed it, leads to the valencing of the violation. *Positive violations* are hypothesized to produce more favorable results (including more persuasion and compliance), and *negative violations* are hypothesized to produce less favorable results, than expectancy confirmations. According to this theory, then, an actor may be better advised to violate norms and expectations than to abide by them so long as the actor knows that the act will be valenced positively.

A key factor determining valencing of a violation is communicator *reward valence.* Reward valence is a summary term for all the characteristics of the actor that make the person, on balance, rewarding or unrewarding to interact with. Nonverbal features, such as the person's attractiveness and demeanor, may contribute to this reward quotient (just as they do in expectation states theory). When a vio-

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:56 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

lation occurs, the heightened activation is thought to make the characteristics of the actor—good or bad—more salient. These characteristics can directly influence interaction outcomes, such as an attractive or high-status actor being more persuasive. They can also affect the appraisal process by moderating whether favorable or unfavorable interpretations and evaluations are selected. As noted previously, with attractive sources, there is a halo effect such that their actions may be interpreted more charitably and judged as more desirable than those of unattractive sources. The same process applies to other reward characteristics. If, for example, an actor is held in high regard by virtue of having a charming communication style, he or she may be able to invade another's personal space and have that act not only interpreted as an expression of liking but also evaluated as welcome. Conversely, an actor who is unrewarding by virtue of being angry and abusive may have the same act of personal space violation judged as intimidation; even if it is interpreted as a show of liking, it might not be wanted by the recipient. In the former case, the act should qualify as a positive violation, thereby facilitating persuasion and compliance; in the latter case, it should constitute a negative violation that produces, at best, involuntary temporary compliance and not long-term behavioral or attitude change.

Although negative violations are generally thought not to be a prudent persuasive strategy, recent research has shown that the aversiveness of such violations may be due partly to the uncertainty that is provoked (Afifi & Burgoon, 2000). Moreover, even negative violations may confer some added benefit relative to confirmations, once the valence of the violation itself is accounted for, if paired with positive qualities of the communicator (Burgoon & Le Poire, 1993). In this case, the uncertainty may actually permit holding onto initially positive views of the actor.

Nonverbal Cues That Signal or Violate Expectations

In reality, every nonverbal cue has the potential to activate expectancies or to violate them. Here we focus on findings from research that has expressly examined nonverbal cues that tacitly signal expectancies and elicit behavioral confirmation or that create violations with possible implications for influence processes.

Kinesics and Vocalics. A general theme in the expectancy signaling literature, and one that reappears in the expectancy violations literature, is that gestural, facial, and vocal expressivity have persuasive impact. For example, men who expect to interact with attractive women on the phone are more sociable, animated, and warm with them than when they expect to interact with unattractive women, and they elicit similar communication styles from the women (Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977). The degree of positive or negative affect that is expressed through voice and body language also is persuasive. People expecting to interact with a hostile partner are themselves more hostile and elicit more hostility from their partner, thus confirming their expectations (Snyder & Swann, 1978). And judges may inadvertently cue juries to give more harsh sentences to defendants with prior felony convictions by instructing juries in a more negative and impatient voice (Blanck & Rosenthal, 1992).

Proxemics and Haptics. Nonverbal immediacy behaviors are ones that express psychological closeness. They include physical proxim-

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:57 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

ity, direct body orientation, forward lean, touch, and gaze. In the expectancy signaling model, these cues relate to the second factor of *affect* (i.e., creating a warmer and more supportive climate). Harris and Rosenthal (1985) conducted a meta-analysis of 135 experiments on communication of expectations. Their analysis showed that when communicators held high expectations for another's performance, they coupled increased immediacy with nonverbal cues of positive reinforcement. Specifically, they adopted closer distances, used more gaze, and smiled and nodded more. In turn, the presence of these behaviors (especially eye contact, proximity, and smiling) increased the probability of targets conforming to expectations by performing well.

In the program of research on expectancy violations, Burgoon and colleagues initially explored the impact of proxemic violations (Burgoon, 1978, 1991; Burgoon & Aho, 1982; Burgoon & Jones, 1976; Burgoon, Stacks, & Burch, 1982; Burgoon, Stacks, & Woodall, 1979). These experiments confirmed that both close and far distances can qualify as positive violations if committed by a high-reward communicator and that they enhance credibility and persuasiveness. Conversely, the same behaviors qualify as negative violations when committed by a low-reward communicator and have more adverse consequences than conforming to distancing norms (an intermediate conversational distance). For example, in one study, two confederates tried to persuade a third naive person. When the two confederates were both in the high-reward condition, the one who engaged in a proxemic violation was viewed as more credible and gained more acceptance of his or her advocated position as compared to the nonviolating confederate. High-reward confederates were also more persuasive when violating norms in comparison to themselves when not violating. However, committing a proxemic violation was a detrimental strategy for low-reward confederates. In those cases, the net effect was that a violation conferred greater credibility on the opponent—a contrast effect. Other research on proxemic violations (e.g., Baron, 1978; Baron & Bell, 1976; Buller, 1987; Konecni, Libuser, Morton, & Ebbesen, 1975) also fits an expectancy violations explanation in that invasions of personal space yielded more helping behavior when a violation could be justified or was seen as rewarding and less helping behavior when the violation was inexplicable or qualified as nonrewarding.

Subsequent violations research examined gaze (Burgoon, 1991; Burgoon, Coker, & Coker, 1986; Burgoon et al., 1985), touch (Burgoon, 1991; Burgoon & Walther, 1990, Burgoon, Walther, & Baesler, 1992), immediacy (Burgoon & Hale, 1988), and conversational involvement (Burgoon & Le Poire, 1993; Burgoon, Le Poire, & Rosenthal, 1995; Burgoon, Newton, Walther, & Baesler, 1989; Le Poire & Burgoon, 1994; Le Poire & Yoshimura, 1999), which combines immediacy with other nonverbal cues to create an overall level of engagement or disengagement in interaction. These investigations found that high degrees of gaze can be a positive violation but has different interpretations depending on whether it is displayed by a male or female; high conversational involvement is a positive violation, regardless of the reward level of the actor who commits it, but extreme immediacy may not be so; fleeting touch can be a positive violation if committed by a well-regarded person but is fraught with ambiguities that can make it a risky choice in low-reward, opposite-sex interactions; and gaze aversion and nonimmediacy tend to be negative violations, regardless of who commits them.

One investigation contrasted an expectancy signaling explanation with an expectancy vio-

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:58 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

lations explanation for the effects of high and low involvement during dyadic interaction (Burgoon, Le Poire, & Rosenthal, 1995). It confirmed that although targets reciprocate positive expectancies, they may engage in strategic compensatory responses when the expectancies are negative—responding, for example, to negative expectancies with higher levels of involvement and pleasantness than do those without such expectancies. Thus, targets do not inevitably conform to what actors expect of them but instead may themselves employ communication to influence actor behavior.

Other research on immediacy has demonstrated that students develop more positive attitudes toward classes and learn more when teachers use an immediate rather than a nonimmediate teaching style (Andersen, 1986; Kleinfeld, 1974) and that job applicants are more likely to be chosen for a position when they use a highly immediate interviewing style (Imada & Hakel, 1977). Thus, immediacy is a potent factor in exercising influence and may do so by signaling positive expectations held by the actor for the target and/or serving as a positive violation of expectations for actor behavior.

Physical Appearance and Artifacts. Research showing that people who are well-groomed and dressed in more conventional or formal attire are more successful in getting others to sign petitions, make change, accept political literature, or pick them up when hitchhiking (e.g., Bickman, 1971; Darley & Cooper, 1972) implies that in the case of appearance, deviancy is a negative violation with negative impact on persuasion and compliance. One exception is when such deviant appearance is coupled with an unexpectedly well-argued cogent message or a message that is contrary to views stereotypically associated with that appearance (Cooper, Darley, & Henderson, 1974; McPeek & Edwards, 1975). For example, a "hippie-looking" speaker may be more effective than a conventional one in advocating tax reform or speaking against marijuana use. In these cases, the appearance sets up negative expectations that are positively violated by the verbal message, hence making the message more persuasive.

Chronemics. Rosenthal and colleagues (e.g., Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1989; Rosenthal, 1976, 1985, 1993), in theorizing about how teachers (and others) signal their expectations to students (or other targets) and achieve self-fulfilling prophecies, have identified two major factors that communicate expectations about performance: effort and affect. The former is essentially a chronemics variable because it breaks down into more *input, feedback,* and *opportunities for output.* When actors have high expectations for another, they tend to give that person more, and more difficult, information; more time to respond to questions; and more feedback about the correctness of the person's responses to questions. Nonverbally, this translates into more undivided and focused attention to the person and is manifested through more frequent and longer interactions and longer response latencies. These cues, in turn, were found to elicit more matching of the pre-interaction expectancies (Harris & Rosenthal, 1985). Such nonverbal cues, then, can shape another's responding toward the desired belief, attitude, or behavior.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that most of the behaviors that communicate a source's attraction toward a target and/or create perceptions of power and dominance are the same behaviors that increase persuasiveness and compliance-gaining effec-

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:57:59 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

tiveness. The reason why behavioral signs of attractiveness and dominance might increase persuasiveness may stem from reciprocity of apparent attraction or from the connections among attraction, dominance, and social skills. When a source emits or uses behaviors that are indicative of attraction, similarity, or dominance, it is likely that targets will respond positively to their requests. Cues of attraction and liking are easily expressed nonverbally while a persuasive appeal is being made verbally. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that these accompanying nonverbal cues will facilitate persuasion, even though that "liking" may have been consciously fabricated by a source who is well-versed in the reciprocity of attraction. People also respect those in positions of power, assume that they are more credible and knowledgeable than those with lower status, and defer to their influence. It follows that nonverbal indicators of power and dominance, in addition to eliciting behavioral compliance in their own right, should enhance the persuasiveness of messages they accompany.

The inherent credibility attributed to attractive or dominant sources also may give them more leeway to violate expectancies, thus enhancing their persuasiveness even further if the violation is positively valenced. Nonverbal behaviors can provide subtle, but easily recognizable, cues that signal the norms and expectations of interaction partners. Socially skilled individuals, who are typically also viewed as attractive and dominant, are more capable of picking up on those cues and determining when to violate or conform to the expectancies. The ability to assess the situation and choose the appropriate behavior, whether it enhances senders' attractiveness, magnifies their similarities with the target, or demonstrates their power and/or status, is a key component of effective compliance gaining. The skillful use of expectancy violations, then, is one additional means by which nonverbal influence can be achieved.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The facile answer to the question of what directions future research should take is to include nonverbal facets in all influence research. But the injunction to incorporate nonverbal variables in communication research generally is an old one to which little heed has been paid in actual practice despite the lip service paid to its merits. There are doubtless many reasons for the paucity of such integrative research, but one predominant one is the potential enormity of the task. Where does one begin? We offer here several possible directions that are both manageable and likely to yield payoffs in better understanding the nature of interpersonal influence.

First, it would be informative to return to a line of research that began during the 1960s and 1970s examining the impact of discrepancies between verbal and nonverbal channels (see, e.g., Archer & Akert, 1977; Argyle, Alkema, & Gilmour, 1971; Gitter, Black, & Fishman, 1975; Krauss, Apple, Morency, Wenzel, & Winton, 1981; Mehrabian & Wiener, 1967; Zahn, 1973). For example, those experiments might create combinations of friendly, neutral, and unfriendly vocal cues paired with friendly, neutral, or unfriendly verbal expressions to determine which had more influence on judged friendliness of the message. A primary objective of what became a rather voluminous body of research was to assess how people process mixed messages and whether they place greater reliance on nonverbal or verbal cues when interpreting such messages (see DePaulo & Rosenthal, 1979). Although this approach has since been discredited methodologically for its ability to

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:00 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

yield valid claims about the relative potency of verbal versus nonverbal cues, the same research paradigm could be used to assess whether certain kinds of nonverbal cues moderate the impact of verbal messages. For example, an unpublished study that the senior author completed some years ago combined degrees of verbal intensity with degrees of vocal and facial intensity. If similar independent variables were used to test their impact on message persuasiveness, it would contribute to our understanding both of the extent to which nonverbal cues qualify interpretations of verbal messages and the kinds of nonverbal cues that have this moderating impact.

A related vein of research could profitably extend research on nonverbal expectancy violations to consider in more detail their impact on persuasion and compliance. Most of the language expectancy violations work has focused on influence-related outcomes, but most of the nonverbal expectancy violations work has focused on social judgments or interaction processes as outcomes. One of the rare exceptions, the study by Burgoon et al. (1982), produced some provocative findings about the ability of expectancy violations by one person to confer advantages or disadvantages on another group member of equal reward value who conformed to expectations. Not only could this kind of investigation be replicated using different nonverbal manipulations from the distance one used in that experiment, but also research could consider the sequential impact of first conforming to and then subsequently violating expectations or vice versa. The study of message sequencing in the persuasion literature has revealed some rather interesting reversals in message susceptibility over time. The possible benefits of using nonverbal behaviors to establish expectations that are subsequently violated by a verbal message is something about which Burgoon et al. (1996) speculated, based on limited evidence from studies of conventional and unconventional attire, but their speculations have not been subjected to extensive empirical testing. If research in the sales and marketing arena attests to the value of setting modest (rather than unduly high) expectations so that a delivered product or service then positively violates those expectations (Brandt, 1988; Cadotte, Woodruff, & Jenkins, 1987; Fisk & Young, 1985; Tse & Wilton, 1988; Woodruff, Cadotte, & Jenkins, 1983), then it follows that nonverbal cues could be used to good effect to do the same thing. By leading receivers to have limited expectations about a communicator's abilities, competency, status, or the like, communicators might have greater opportunities to violate those expectations in a positive direction with a well-formulated and argued message. By the same token, it would be important to learn what kinds of nonverbal cues might "set up" communicators to create inadvertent negative violations. If expectations states theory is correct that influence in task groups partly flows from the expectations about a person's expertise and status that are established at the outset of any interactions, then it behooves us to investigate more deeply what nonverbal cues are responsible for establishing those expectations. In general, then, learning more about the juxtaposition of the verbal with the nonverbal from an expectancy confirmation or disconfirmation standpoint would seem to be a fruitful line of inquiry.

Just as cue combinations and their expectedness may attenuate or accentuate verbal influence, so may individual difference variables. Accordingly, the role of individual differences in nonverbal influence expressions warrants further exploration. The abilities to encode and decode nonverbal behaviors are part of individual difference variables such as social skills, nonverbal sensitivity, and communication competence (e.g., Riggio, 1986;

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:01 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Rosenthal, Hall, Dimatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979; Wiemann, 1977). Here again, this is an issue that has received very little attention in the literature on nonverbal behavior and persuasion. Where such studies do exist, the results suggest that individual differences may account for a great deal of variance in persuasive outcomes. For example, people who are not very strong decoders of nonverbal communication do not appear to be strongly influenced by nonverbal vocalic cues (Buller & Aune, 1988). On the other hand, appropriate use of vocalic cues may enhance persuasive outcomes when aimed at audiences with good nonverbal decoding cues. There are also a number of personality traits such as Machiavellianism, self-monitoring, and extraversion with established associations to the use of certain nonverbal behaviors and/or persuasiveness. Such traits may prove to be important moderators of the association between nonverbal behavior and persuasive outcomes.

Yet another line of inquiry that would seem a necessity if we are to understand true interaction (i.e., interdependent actions between two or more people) is to expand research to interactions involving familiar others. Although a large body of literature has been amassed on the relationship between nonverbal behaviors and various social influence outcomes, that literature is focused almost exclusively on stranger interactions. It would be useful to extend the domain of inquiry into other relational contexts such as marriage, family, co-workers, and business transactions. A sufficient case already exists for the importance of nonverbal behaviors in these relational contexts (e.g., Gottman, Markman, & Notarius, 1977; Noller, 1984), and it would appear prudent to further explore how nonverbal patterns contribute to social influence processes in these relational contexts.

A final area that deserves future exploration is computer-mediated communication (CMC). With government, businesses, schools, and individuals relying increasingly on new technology for communication such as e-mail, video-teleconferencing, the Internet, virtual communication, and communication with virtual agents, the need for more research into nonverbal cues is obvious. We need to learn more about the role of nonverbal cues when persuasive attempts are computer mediated or delivered via computer agents (Stoner, Burgoon, Bonito, Ramirez, & Dunbar, 1999). Although early researchers made the assumption that CMC filters out nonverbal cues (e.g., Culnan & Markus, 1987), these assumptions are being challenged, especially as we move beyond text-based interactions and into virtual reality, human-computer interactions, and beyond (Burgoon, Bengtsson, Bonito, Ramirez, & Dunbar, 1999; Stoner et al., 1999). Some researchers have already made strides in the examination of nonverbal messages in CMC. Spears and Lea (1992) argued in their social identity/deindividuation (SIDE) theory that when communicators lack visual information, they actually have increased social identification, relating to others on the basis of assumed similarities. Walther's (1996) principle of hyperpersonal communication draws on this possibility, suggesting that mediated communication affords us more opportunity for selective impression management and therefore a better chance to craft a more successful (persuasive) presentation by managing the nonverbal and verbal cues that are presented. Walther, Slovacek, and Tidwell (1999) argued that because some of the cognitive resources used in face-to-face (FtF) interaction are unnecessary in CMC, we may reallocate those resources to message construction as well as the monitoring and planning of our own responses. We need to test whether theories such as SIDE theory and the hyperpersonal framework are correct that as cues are restricted, people place greater reliance on the few that are available so that nonverbal cues take on greater significance. These theo-

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:02 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

ries suggest that nonverbal communication will play a different role in mediated influence than in FtF interactions, and this changing role deserves more attention from future investigators.

A related line of research, still in its infancy, could investigate the effects of mediation on the perception of nonverbal cues to test whether mediated interaction is capable of achieving the same degree of mutuality and synchronicity that is present in FtF interaction. If one of the enabling features of interpersonal influence is interactional synchrony, can this be achieved in mediated environments or even amplified in environments such as virtual reality? Will attractiveness and similarity effects be magnified in CMC if the sources of messages are not visible and their attractiveness and similarity are assumed rather than observed? Will unscrupulous individuals be able to manipulate their potency and dominance to achieve greater influence if nonverbal cues are absent or highly constrained in mediated exchanges? Clearly, mediated interaction opens up a plethora of research opportunities and provides researchers with more questions that must be answered before nonverbal influence is truly understood in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

Afifi, W. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (2000). The impact of violations on uncertainty and consequences for attractiveness. *Human Communication Research, 26,* 203-233.

Aiello, J. R. (1987). Human spatial behavior. In D. Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 389-504). New York: John Wiley.

Aguilera, D. C. (1967). Relationship between physical contact and verbal interaction between nurses and patients. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing, 5,* 5-21.

Andersen, J. F. (1986). Instructor nonverbal communication: Listening to our silent messages. In M. Civikly (Ed.), *Communicating in college classrooms: New directions for teaching and learning* (pp. 41-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Andersen, P. A. (1985). Nonverbal immediacy in interpersonal communication. In A. W. Siegman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), *Multichannel integrations of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 1-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Andersen, P. A. (1999). *Nonverbal communication: Forms and functions.* Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Andersen, P. A., & Bowman, L. L. (1999). Positions of power: Nonverbal influence in organizational communication. In L. K. Guerrero, J. A. DeVito, & M. L. Hecht (Eds.), *The nonverbal communication reader: Classic and contemporary readings* (pp. 317-334). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Archer, D., & Akert, R. M. (1977). Words and everything else: Verbal and nonverbal cues in social interpretation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 443-449.

Argyle, M., Alkema, F., & Gilmour, R. (1971). The communication of friendly and hostile attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1,* 385-402.

Aries, E. J., Gold, C., & Weigel, R. H. (1983). Dispositional and situational influences on dominance behavior in small groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44,* 779-786.

Babad, E., Bernieri, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1989). Nonverbal communication and leakage in the behavior of biased and unbiased teachers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,* 89-94.

Baron, R. A. (1978). Invasions of personal space and helping: Mediating effects of invader's apparent need. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14,* 304-312.

Baron, R. A., & Bell, P. A. (1976). Physical distance and helping: Some unexpected benefits of "crowding in" on others. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6,* 95-104.

Behling, D. U., & Williams, E. A. (1991). Influence of dress on perceptions of intelligence and expectations of scholastic achievement. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 9*(4), 1-7.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:03 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Benson, P. L., Karabenic, S. A., & Lerner, R. M. (1976). Pretty please: The effects of physical attractiveness on race, sex, and receiving help. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12,* 409-415.

Berger, C. R. (1987). Communicating under uncertainty. In M. R. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 39-62). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berger, C. R. (1994). Power, dominance, and social interaction. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (2nd ed., pp. 450-507). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Berger, J., Conner, T. L., & Fisek, M. H. (1974). *Expectation states theory: A theoretical research program.* Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Berger, J., Ridgeway, C. L., Fisek, M. H., & Norman, R. Z. (1998). The legitimation and delegitimation of power and prestige orders. *American Sociological Review, 63,* 379-405.

Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1980). Status organizing processes. *Annual Review of Sociology, 6,* 479-508.

Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 193-281). New York: Oxford University Press.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. H. (1978). *Interpersonal attraction* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bickman, L. (1971). The effect of social status on the honesty of others. *Journal of Social Psychology, 85,* 87-92.

Bickman, L. (1974). The social power of a uniform. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4,* 47-61.

Blanck, P. D., & Rosenthal, R. (1992). Nonverbal behavior in the courtroom. In R. S. Feldman (Ed.), *Applications of nonverbal behavioral theories and research* (pp. 89-115). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: John Wiley.

Brandt, R. (1988). How service marketers can identify value-enhancing service elements. *Journal of Services Marketing, 2,* 35-41.

Brockner, J., Pressman, B., Cabitt, J., & Moran, P. (1982). Nonverbal intimacy, sex, and compliance: A field study. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 6,* 253-258.

Brownlow, S. (1992). Seeing is believing: Facial appearance, credibility, and attitude change. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 16,* 101-115.

Brownlow, S., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (1990). Facial appearance, gender, and credibility in television commercials. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 14,* 51-60.

Bull, R., & Robinson, G. R. (1981). The influences of eye-gaze, style of dress, and locality on the amounts of money donated to a charity. *Human Relations, 34,* 895-905.

Buller, D. B. (1987). Communication apprehension and reactions to proxemic violations. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 11,* 13-25.

Buller, D. B., & Aune, R. K. (1988). The effects of vocalics and nonverbal sensitivity on compliance. *Human Communication Research, 14,* 301-332.

Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1986). The effects of vocalics and nonverbal sensitivity on compliance. *Human Communication Research, 13,* 126-144.

Buller, D. B., LePoire, B. A., Aune, R. K., & Eloy, S. V. (1992). Social perceptions as mediators of the effect of speech rate similarity on compliance. *Human Communication Research, 19,* 286-311.

Burgoon, J. K. (1978). A communication model of personal space violations: Explication and an initial test. *Human Communication Research, 4,* 129-142.

Burgoon, J. K. (1983). Nonverbal violations of expectations. In J. M. Wiemann & R. P. Harrison (Eds.), *Nonverbal interaction* (pp. 77-112). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K. (1991). Relational message interpretations of touch, conversational distance, and posture. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 15,* 233-258.

Burgoon, J. K. (1992). Applying a comparative approach to nonverbal expectancy violations theory. In J. Blumler, K. E. Rosengren, & J. M. McLeod (Eds.), *Comparatively speaking: Communication and culture across space and time* (pp. 53-69). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:04 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 12,* 13-21.

Burgoon, J. K. (1994). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (2nd ed., pp. 229-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., & Aho, L. (1982). Three field experiments on the effects of conversational distance. *Communication Monographs, 49,* 71-88.

Burgoon, J. K., Bengtsson, B., Bonito, J., Ramirez, A., Jr., & Dunbar, N. E. (1999, January). *Designing interfaces to maximize the quality of collaborative work.* Paper presented at the Hawaii International Conference on Computer and Systems Sciences, Maui, HI.

Burgoon, J. K., Birk, T., & Pfau, M. (1990). Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility. *Human Communication Research, 17,* 140-169.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Hale, J. L., & deTurck, M. A. (1984). Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. *Human Communication Research, 10,* 351-378.

Burgoon, J. K. Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1996). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burgoon, J. K., & Burgoon, M. (2001). Expectancy theories. In W. P. Robinson and H. Giles (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology* (2nd ed, pp. 79-101). Sussex, UK: Wiley.

Burgoon, J. K., Coker, D. A., & Coker, R. A. (1986). Communicative effects of gaze behavior: A test of two contrasting explanations. *Human Communication Research, 12,* 495-524.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (1998, February). *Interpersonal dominance as a situationally, interactionally, and relationally contingent social skill.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Western States Communication Association, Denver, CO.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (2000). An interactionist perspective on dominance-submission: Interpersonal dominance as a dynamic, situationally contingent social skill. *Communication Monographs, 67,* 96-121.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs, 55,* 58-79.

Burgoon, J. K., Johnson, M. L., & Koch, P. T. (1998). The nature and measurement of interpersonal dominance. *Communication Monographs, 64,* 308-335.

Burgoon, J. K., & Jones, S. B. (1976). Toward a theory of personal space expectations and their violations. *Human Communication Research, 2,* 131-146.

Burgoon, J. K., Kelley, D. L., Newton, D. A., & Keeley-Dyreson, M. P. (1989). The nature of arousal and nonverbal indices. *Human Communication Research, 16,* 217-255.

Burgoon, J. K., & Le Poire, B. A. (1993). Effects of communication expectancies, actual communication, and expectancy disconfirmation on evaluations of communicators and their communication behavior. *Human Communication Research, 20,* 75-107.

Burgoon, J. K., Le Poire, B. A., & Rosenthal, R. (1995). Effects of preinteraction expectancies and target communication on perceiver reciprocity and compensation in dyadic interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31,* 287-321.

Burgoon, J. K., Manusov, V., Mineo, P., & Hale, J. L. (1985). Effects of eye gaze on hiring, credibility, attraction and relational message interpretation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 9,* 133-146.

Burgoon, J. K., Newton, D. A., Walther, J. B., & Baesler, E. J. (1989). Nonverbal expectancy violations and conversational involvement. *Journal of Nonverbal Involvement, 13,* 97-119.

Burgoon, J. K., & Saine, T. J. (1978). *The unspoken dialogue.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Burgoon, J. K., Stacks, D. W., & Burch, S. A. (1982). The role of interpersonal rewards and violations of distancing expectations in achieving influence in small groups. *Communication, 11,* 114-128.

Burgoon, J. K., Stacks, D. W., & Woodall, W. G. (1979). A communicative model of violations of distancing expectations. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 43,* 153-167.

Burgoon, J. K., Stern, L. A., & Dillman, L. (1995). *Dyadic adaptation: Dyadic interactional pattern.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:05 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Burgoon, J. K., & Walther, J. B. (1990). Nonverbal expectancies and the consequences of violations. *Human Communication Research, 17,* 232-265.

Burgoon, J. K., Walther, J. B., & Baesler, E. J. (1992). Interpretations, evaluations, and consequences of interpersonal touch. *Human Communication Research, 19,* 237-263.

Butler, S., & Roesel, K. (1989). Research note: The influence of dress on students' perceptions of teacher characteristics. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 7*(3), 57-59.

Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62,* 713-715.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm.* New York: Academic Press.

Byrne, D., Ervin, C. R., & Lamberth, J. (1970). Continuity between the experimental study of attraction and real-life computer dating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16,* 157-165.

Cadotte, E. R., Woodruff, R. B., & Jenkins, R. L. (1987). Expectations and norms in models of consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research, 24,* 305-314.

Chaiken, S. (1979). Communicator physical attractiveness and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 1387-1397.

Chaiken, S. (1986). Physical appearance of social influence. In C. P. Herman, M. P. Zanna, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Physical appearance, stigma, and social behavior: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 3, pp. 143-177). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cooper, J., Darley, J. M., & Henderson, J. E. (1974). On the effectiveness of deviant- and conventional-appearing communicators: A field experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 937-949.

Culnan, M. J., & Markus, M. L. (1987). Information technologies. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 420-443). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Darley, J. M., & Cooper, J. (1972). The "Clean for Gene" phenomenon: The effect of students' appearance on political campaigning. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2,* 24-33.

Darley, J. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1980). Expectancy confirmation processes arising in the social interaction sequence, *American Psychologist, 35,* 867-881.

Davis, M. A. (1992). *Age and dress of professors: Influence on students' first impressions of teaching effectiveness.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.

DePaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1979). Ambivalence, discrepancy, and deception in nonverbal communication. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Skill in nonverbal communication: Individual differences* (pp. 204-248). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn, & Hain.

Dion, K. K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24,* 285-290.

Dovidio, J. F., & Ellyson, S. L. (1982). Decoding visual dominance: Attributions of power based on relative percentages of looking while speaking and looking while listening. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45,* 106-113.

Dovidio, J. F., & Ellyson, S. L. (1985). Patterns of visual dominance behavior in humans. In S. L. Ellyson & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Power, dominance, and nonverbal communication* (pp. 129-149). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Duck, S. (1994). *Meaningful relationships: Talking, sense, and relating.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Duck, S. (1998). *Human relationships* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellyson, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Corson, R. L., & Vinicur, D. L. (1980). Visual dominance behavior in female dyads: Situational and personality factors. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 43,* 328-336.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27,* 31-41.

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. In A. Inkeles, J. Coleman, & N. Smelser (Eds.), *Annual review of sociology* (pp. 335-362). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Ernest, R. C., & Cooper, R. E. (1974). "Hey Mister, do you have any change?": Two real world studies of proxemic effects on compliance with a mundane request. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1,* 158-159.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:06 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Escudero, V., Rogers, L. E., & Gutierrez, E. (1997). Patterns of relational control and nonverbal affect in clinic and nonclinic couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14,* 5-29.

Exline, R. V. (1963). Explorations in the process of person perception: Visual interaction in relation to competition, sex, and need for affiliation. *Journal of Personality, 31,* 1-20.

Feingold, A. (1992). Good-looking people are not what we think. *Psychological Bulletin, 111,* 304-341.

Fisher, J. D., Rytting, M., & Heslin, R. (1976). Hands touching hands: Affective and evaluative effects of an interpersonal touch. *Sociometry, 39,* 416-421.

Fisk, R. P., & Young, C. E. (1985). Disconfirmation of equity expectations: Effects of consumer satisfaction with services. In E. C. Hirschman & M. Holbrook (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research* (Vol. 12, pp. 340-345). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Foa, E., & Foa, U. (1974). *Societal structures of the mind.* Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Gifford, R. (1982). Projected interpersonal distance and orientation choices: Personality, sex, and social situation. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45,* 145-152.

Giles, H., & Chavasse, W. (1975). Communication length as a function of dress style and social status. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 40,* 961-962.

Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. (1991). Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In H. Giles, J. Coupland, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics* (pp. 1-68). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gitter, A. G., Black, H., & Fishman J. E. (1975). Effects of race, sex, nonverbal communication, and verbal communication on perceptions of leadership. *Sociology and Social Research, 60,* 46-57.

Glick, P., DeMorest, J. A., & Hotze, C. A. (1988). Keeping your distance: Group membership, personal space, and requests for small favors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 315-330.

Goldman, M., Kiyohara, O., & Pfannensteil, D. A. (1984). Interpersonal touch, social labeling, and the foot-in-the-door effect. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125,* 143-147.

Gottman, J., Markman, H., & Notarius, C. (1977). The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39,* 461-477.

Hall, J. A. (1980). Voice tone and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 924-934.

Hammermesh, D. S., & Biddle, J. E. (1994). Beauty and the labor market. *American Economic Review, 84,* 1174-1195.

Harris, M. J., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects: 31 meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 97,* 363-386.

Hayduk, L. A. (1983). Personal space: Where we now stand. *Psychological Bulletin, 94,* 293-335.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* New York: John Wiley.

Henley, N. M. (1995). Body politics revisited: What do we know today? In P. J. Kalbfleisch & M. J. Cody (Eds.), *Gender, power, and communication in human relationships* (pp. 27-61). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hensley, W. E. (1981). The effects of attire, location, and sex on aiding behavior: A similarity explanation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 6,* 3-11.

Heslin, R., & Alper, T. (1983). Touch: A bonding gesture. In J. M. Wiemann & R. P. Harrison (Eds.), *Nonverbal interaction* (pp. 47-75). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hickson, M. L., III, & Stacks, D. W. (1993). *Nonverbal communication: Studies and applications* (3rd ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology, 62,* 597-606.

Hornik, J. (1992). Tactile stimulation and consumer response. *Journal of Consumer Research, 19,* 449-458.

Hovland, C., Janis, I. L., & Kelly, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:07 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Imada, A. S., & Hakel, M. D. (1977). Influence of nonverbal communication and rater proximity on impressions and decisions in simulated employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62,* 295-300.

Jaworski, A. (1993). *The power of silence: Social and pragmatic perspectives.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jones, E. E. (1986). Interpreting interpersonal behavior: The effects of expectancies. *Science, 234,* 41-46.

Jones, S. E. (1994). *The right touch.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Jussim, L. (1990). Social reality and social problems: The role of expectancies. *Journal of Social Issues, 46,* 9-34.

Keating, C. F., & Heltman, K. R. (1994). Dominance and deception in children and adults: Are leaders the best misleaders? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 312-321.

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2,* 51-60.

Kimble, C. E., & Musgrove, J. I. (1988). Dominance in arguing mixed-sex dyads: Visual dominance patterns, talking time, and speech loudness. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22,* 1-16.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1974). Effects of nonverbal warmth on learning of Eskimo and White children. *Journal of Social Psychology, 92,* 3-90.

Kleinke, C. L. (1977). Compliance to requests made by gazing and touching experimenters in field settings. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13,* 218-223.

Kleinke, C. L., Bustos, A. A., Meeker, F. B., & Staneski, R. A. (1973). Effects of self-attributed and other-attributed gaze in interpersonal evaluations between males and females. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9,* 154-163.

Kleinke, C. L., & Singer, D. A. (1979). Influence of gaze on compliance with demanding and conciliatory requests in a field setting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5,* 386-390.

Konecni, V. J., Libuser, L. Morton, H., & Ebbesen, E. B. (1975). Effects of a violation of personal space on escape and helping responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11,* 288-299.

Krauss, R. M., Apple, W., Morency, N., Wenzel, C., & Winton, W. (1981). Verbal, vocal, and visible factors in judgements of another's affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40,* 312-319.

Kurklen, R., & Kassinove, H. (1991). Effects of profanity, touch, and subjects' religiosity on perceptions of a psychologist and behavioral compliance. *Journal of Social Psychology, 131,* 899-901.

Lamb, T. A. (1981). Nonverbal and paraverbal control in dyads and triads: Sex or power differences? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44,* 49-53.

Lambert, S. (1972). Reactions to a stranger as a function of style of dress. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 35,* 711-712.

Lawler, E. J. (1986). Bilateral deterrence and conflict spirals: A theoretical analysis. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes* (Vol. 3, pp. 107-130). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Lawler, E. J. (1992). Power processes in bargaining. *Sociological Quarterly, 33*(1), 17-34.

Lawler, E. J., & Bacharach, S. B. (1987). Comparison of dependence and punitive forms of power. *Social Forces, 66,* 446-462.

Leffler, A., Gillespie, D. L., & Conaty, J. C. (1982). The effects of status differentiation on nonverbal behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45,* 153-161.

Lefkowitz, M., Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1955). Status factors in pedestrian violations of traffic signals. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51,* 704-706.

Le Poire, B. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1994). Two contrasting explanations of involvement violations: Expectancy violations theory and discrepancy arousal theory. *Human Communication Research, 20,* 560-591.

Le Poire, B. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Usefulness of differentiating arousal responses within communication theories: Orienting response of defensive arousal within theories of expectancy violation. *Communication Monographs, 63,* 208-230.

Le Poire, B. A., & Yoshimura, S. M. (1999). The effects of expectancies and actual communication on nonverbal adaptation and communication outcomes: A test of interaction adaptation theory. *Communication Monographs, 66,* 1-30.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:08 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Lips, H. M. (1991). *Women, men, and power.* Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

McPeek, R. W., & Edwards, J. D. (1975). Expectancy disconfirmation and attitude change. *Journal of Social Psychology, 96,* 193-208.

Mehrabian, A., & Wiener, M. (1967). Nonverbal concomitants of perceived and intended persuasiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6,* 37-58.

Millar, F. E., & Rogers, L. E. (1987). Relational dimensions of interpersonal dynamics. In M. E. Roloff & G. E. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 117-139). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, N., Maruyama, G., Beaber, R. J., & Valone, K. (1976). Speed of speech and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34,* 615-624.

Molm, L. D., & Cook, K. S. (1995). Social exchange and exchange networks. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 209-235). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Neuberg, S. L. (1996). Expectancy influences in social interaction. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action* (pp. 529-554). New York: Guilford.

Newcomb, T. M. (1961). *The acquaintance process.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Noller, P. (1980). Gaze in married couples. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 5,* 115-129.

Noller, P. (1984). *Nonverbal communication and marital interaction.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Norman, R. (1976). When what is said is important: A comparison of expert and attractive sources. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12,* 294-300.

Pallak, S. R. (1983). Salience of a communicator's physical attractiveness and persuasion: A heuristic versus systematic processing interpretation. *Social Cognition, 2,* 158-170.

Pallak, S. R., Murroni, E., & Koch, J. (1983). Communicator effectiveness and expertise, emotional versus rational appeals, and persuasion: A heuristic versus systematic processing interpretation. *Social Cognition, 2,* 122-141.

Patterson, M. L. (1983). *Nonverbal behavior: A* functional perspective. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Patterson, M. L., Powell, J. L., & Lenihan, M. G. (1986). Touch, compliance, and interpersonal affect. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 10,* 41-50.

Pope, B., & Siegman, A. W. (1966). Ambiguity and verbal fluency in the TAT. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 30,* 239-245.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Berger, J. (1986). Expectations, legitimation, and dominance behavior in task groups. *American Sociological Review, 62,* 218-235.

Ridgeway, C. L., Diekema, D., & Johnson, C. (1995). Legitimacy, compliance, and gender in peer groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58,* 298-311.

Ridgeway, C. L., Johnson, C., & Diekema, D. (1994). External status, legitimacy, and compliance in male and female groups. *Social Forces, 72,* 1051-1077.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Walker, H. A. (1995). Status structures. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, & J. S. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 281-310). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 649-660.

Riggio, R. E., Tucker, J., & Throckmorton, B. (1988). Social skills and deception ability. *Personality and Social psychology Bulletin, 13,* 568-577.

Rogers, L. E., Castleton, A., & Lloyd, S. A. (1996). Relational control and physical aggression in satisfying marital relationships. In D. D. Cahn & S. A. Lloyd (Eds.), *Family violence from a communication perspective* (pp. 218-239). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rogers, L. E., & Farace, R. V. (1975). Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement procedures. *Human Communication Research, 1,* 222-239.

Rogers, W. T., & Jones, S. E. (1975). Effects of dominance tendencies on floor holding and interruption behavior in dyadic interaction. *Human Communication Research, 1,* 113-122.

Rogers-Millar, E. L., & Millar, F. E. (1979). Domineeringness and dominance: A transactional view. *Human Communication Research, 5,* 238-246.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:09 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Rosenberg, S. W., Kahn, S., & Tran, T. (1991). Creating a political image: Shaping appearance and manipulating the vote. *Political Behavior, 13,* 345-367.

Rosenthal, R. (1976). *Experimenter expectancy effects in behavioral research* (enlarged ed.). New York: Irvington.

Rosenthal, R. (1985). Nonverbal cues in the mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects. In A. W. Siegman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), *Multichannel integrations of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 105-128). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rosenthal, R. (1993). Interpersonal expectations: Some antecedents and some consequences. In P. D. Blanck (Ed.), *Interpersonal expectations: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 3-24). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., Dimatteo, M. R., Rogers, P. L., & Archer, D. (1979). *Sensitivity to nonverbal communication: The PONS test*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rubin, Z. (1970). The measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16,* 265-273.

Schwartz, B., Tesser, A., & Powell, E. (1982). Dominance cues in nonverbal behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45,* 114-120.

Segrin, C. (1993). The effects of nonverbal behavior on outcomes of compliance gaining attempts. *Communication Studies, 44,* 169-187.

Siegel, S. M., Friedlander, M. L., & Heatherington, L. (1992). Nonverbal relational control in family communication. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 16,* 117-139.

Siegman, A. W. (1987). The telltale voice: Nonverbal messages of verbal communication. In A. W. Siegman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), *Nonverbal behaviors and communication* (2nd ed., pp. 351-434). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Snyder, M. (1984). When belief creates reality. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 18, pp. 247-305). New York: Academic Press.

Snyder, M., Grether, J., & Keller, K. (1974). Staring and compliance: A field experiment on hitchhiking. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4,* 165-170.

Snyder, M., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1978). Behavioral confirmation in social interaction: From social perception to social reality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14,* 148-162.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 656-666.

Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1992). Social influence and the influence of the "social" in computer-mediated communication. In M. Lea (Ed.), *Contexts of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 30-65). London: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.

Stoner, G. M., Burgoon, J. K., Bonito, J. A., Ramirez, A., Jr., & Dunbar, N. (1999, May). *Nonverbal cues in mediated communication.* Paper presented to the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41,* 75-88.

Taylor, D. A., & Altman, I. (1987). Communication in interpersonal relationships: Social penetration processes. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 257-277). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups.* New York: John Wiley.

Tse, D. K., & Wilton, P. C. (1988). Models of consumer satisfaction formation: An extension. *Journal of Marketing Research, 25,* 204-212.

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research, 23,* 3-43.

Walther, J. B., Slovacek, C. L., & Tidwell, L. C. (1999). *Is a picture worth a thousand words? Photographic image in long-term and short-term computer-mediated communication.* Paper presented to the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). A model of communicative competence. *Human Communication Research, 3,* 195-213.

Willis, F. N., & Hamm, H. K. (1980). The use of interpersonal touch in securing compliance. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 5,* 49-55.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:10 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

Winter, D. G. (1973). *The power motive*. New York: Macmillan.

Woodall, W. G., & Burgoon, J. K. (1983). Talking fast and changing attitudes: A critique and clarification. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 8*, 126-142.

Woodruff, R. B., Cadotte, E. R., & Jenkins, R. L. (1983). Modeling consumer satisfaction processes using experience-based norms. *Journal of Marketing Research, 20*, 296-304.

Workman, J. E., Johnson, K. K., & Hadeler, B. (1993). The influence of clothing on students' interpretative and extended inferences about a teaching assistant. *College Student Journal, 27*(1), 119-128.

Zahn, G. L. (1973). Cognitive integration of verbal and vocal information in spoken sentences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9*, 320-334.

Zuckerman, M., Hodgins, H., & Miyake, K. (1990). The vocal attractiveness stereotype: Replication and elaboration. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 14*, 97-112.

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:10 AM

Color profile: Disabled
Composite Default screen

D:\Books\DILLARD\1ST SET-th
Monday, March 04, 2002 10:58:10 AM