INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in “sectioning” the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University Microfilms International
300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
Stimel, Carolyn Ann

SELF PRESENTATION IN ORDER TO ATTRACT A DATING PARTNER

The Ohio State University

Ph.D. 1982

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106
SELF PRESENTATION

IN ORDER TO ATTRACT A DATING PARTNER

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of the Ohio State University

By
Carolyn Stimel, B.S., M.A.

The Ohio State University
1982

Reading Committee:
Lyle Schmidt, Ph.D.
Don Dell, Ph.D.
Timothy Brock, Ph.D.

Approved By

Lyle D. Schmidt
Advisor
Department of Psychology
VITA

1976  R.S., The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, Major - Psychology

1978  M.A., The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, Major - Counseling Psychology

1978-1979  Teaching Associate, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1979-1980  Clinical Psychology Intern, Northampton VA Medical Center, Northampton, Massachusetts

1980-1982  Clinical Psychologist, Florida State Hospital, Forensic Service, Chattahoochee, Florida
TABLE OF CONTENTS

VITA .................................................. ii

LIST OF TABLES ....................................... v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION ...................................... 1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

   Interpersonal Attraction and Self-Presentation ... 6
   Choice of Marital and Dating Partners ............. 10
   Sex Differences in Dating Partner Preferences ... 14
   Nonverbal Behavior and Interpersonal Attraction .. 22
   Sex Differences in Nonverbal Behavior ............. 26
   Variables and Hypotheses .......................... 31

III. METHODOLOGY

   Generation of Participant Tapes .................... 36
   Generation of Role-playing Tapes ................. 41
   Content Analysis .................................. 43

IV. RESULTS

   Subject Demographics .............................. 49
   Presentation of Data ................................ 49
   Reliability of Ratings ............................. 52
   Hypothesis Testing ................................ 60
   Correlational Data ................................ 63
   Role-play Participants ............................ 64

V. DISCUSSION

   Limitations of Data ................................ 65
   Discussion of Content Variables .................... 68
   Discussion of Nonverbal Variables .................. 73
   Implications for Future Research .................... 76

APPENDICES

   A. Summary of Video-taped Oral Presentation ... 81
   B. CRP: Information Regarding the Video-taping .. 85
   C. Briefing Prior to Taping ....................... 87
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Transcript: Male, Female.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Instructions to Subjects: SB-1.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Tape Rating Manual</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Rating Sheet</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

1. Subject Age and Education: Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges 50
2. Additional Subject Demographic Data (Percentages) 51
3. Content of Self Presentations: Percentages of Subjects Who Verbalized in Each of Seventeen Content Categories 53
4. Subject Religious Affiliations (Percentages) 54
5. Religious Preferences for Partner (Percentages) 54
6. Ratings of Nonverbal Variables by Sex: Means and Standard Deviations 55
7. Content of Self Presentations as a Function of Age: Percentages of Subjects Who Verbalized in Each of Seventeen Content Categories 56
8. CRP: Ratings on Nonverbal Variables by Age (Means and Standard Deviations) 57
9. Percent Agreement of Raters with Author 58
10. Correlations of Raters' and Experimenter's Ratings 59
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal attraction has a long history as an area of theoretical and empirical interest in psychology. One facet that holds personal and scientific interest for many of us is that of heterosexual attraction, including theories of romantic love and the factors that enter into choice of dating and marriage partners. Research in the area of romantic, premarital relationships has yielded a variety of theoretical models to explain and predict the course of heterosexual pairing. However, research designed to test these models has tended to yield only partial confirmation of theory. In their review of the literature on interpersonal attraction, Huston and Levinger (1978) state that:

Much more descriptive work on the nature and development of premarital relationships seems to be necessary before sophisticated explanatory models can be erected...understanding of the evolution of romantic relationships requires one to reach back to their beginning—to first impressions...(p. 137-138)

The present research is designed to examine those first beginnings of heterosexual pair formation. It is a descriptive study of how people behave when they are "on display" and hoping to attract a member of the opposite sex. Thus, the research is essentially concerned with the presentation of self by an individual in order to attract a dating partner.

The raw data for the present study is derived from a longitudinal research project on heterosexual compatibility currently being conducted at the Ohio State University by Dr. Timothy Brock and his colleagues.
The project is designed as a video-dating service in which individuals are videotaped for three minutes. These videotapes are then shown to members of the opposite sex who decide whether they would like to date the individual. A more detailed explanation of the project and its procedures is given in Chapter III.

The videotaping project (called the Compatibility Research Project or CRP), was designed to examine how couples form and how relationships progress over time. With the steadily increasing divorce rate and a corresponding increase in the number of single persons of all ages, many individuals find it difficult to meet available, compatible strangers of the opposite sex. A common complaint of the single person is that unless he or she wishes to explore the traditional singles' meeting places of bars and nightclubs, it is difficult to meet others. Thus, one purpose of the CRP was to provide an alternative means by which single persons could meet others seeking heterosexual relationships. Video-dating services, along with personal advertisements in newspapers, have begun to proliferate in the United States, especially in urban areas. The fact that many such services function on a commercial basis would indicate that they are meeting the needs of users. An interesting question arises as to whether the use of more structured acquaintance procedure, such as a video dating service, leads to more stable relationships than the haphazard means by which romantic partners usually meet. The standardized procedures of the CRP will allow the researchers to explore that issue.

In addition, studying the formation and course of heterosexual relationships yields valuable data for those who do counseling and therapy.
Interpersonal relationships, and heterosexual relationships in particular, are a common problem area for those seeking professional, therapeutic help. Clients often have concerns about meeting and interacting with the opposite sex. Research on heterosexual compatibility and self-presentation in the service of heterosexual attraction yields baseline data that can aid the clinician in assisting clients to develop satisfying heterosexual attachments.

For the purposes of the present study, we are concerned only with each individual's presentation of self on the three-minute videotape. The videotaping procedure is standardized and each participant is asked to verbally complete the following six sentence stems:

1. My marital and parental status is...
2. The sort of relationship I am looking for is...
3. With regard to religious philosophy I feel...
4. The age range of people I am interested in dating is...
5. My favorite leisure time activity is...
6. A person who wants to date with me would be better off knowing that I...

In addition, the individual is encouraged to add anything else that would be appropriate. The sentence stems used as participant prompts in the CRP were developed by Dr. Brock and his colleagues. They were designed to tap values and attitudes that previous research has indicated might be important to individuals seeking dating partners. The CRP administrator also conducted an informal survey, asking individuals what they would want to know about others if they were participants in a videodating service. The CRP researchers selected those content areas which seemed
most important to those surveyed and which in the literature seemed important in the search for dating partners.

The sentence stems were intended for use as guides by participants and to provide some structure in the videotapes. While participants were encouraged to add information, they were asked not to reveal their income, occupation, address or phone number. Omission of address and phone number was for the obvious reasons of participant protection and to allow researchers to track contacts made through the CRP. Income and occupation were omitted for two reasons. One was that this information could be easily falsified. However, the more important reason was that the CRP researchers felt it would be better to omit this information so that participants' choices of potential matches could be more on the basis of self-presentations and personality than on the more superficial criteria of income and/or occupation.

For the present study, a content analysis system was designed by the author to examine self-presentation with respect to the content of the individual's verbal statements and also his or her nonverbal behavior. The specific variables to be examined in the study were derived from various sources. One source was the relevant literature on a similar type of data-content analysis of "personal" advertisements in newspapers (Harrison and Saeed, 1977). Also, since the sentence stems had been developed and used prior to the data analysis, there were various types of verbal statements we would expect in response to these prompts. Nonverbal behavior variables were developed from the tremendous volume of literature available on the relation of nonverbal behaviors to interpersonal attraction and sex differences in such behavior. In addition, some
of the variables were selected on the basis of a preliminary viewing of a small sample of the videotapes by the experimenter and others involved in the project. Certain demographic variables were also coded.

A secondary purpose of the present research was to provide some indication of the generalizability of the results obtained from participants in the Compatibility Research Project. In order to accomplish this, volunteers from introductory psychology classes were recruited to role-play a videotaping according to procedures for participants in the compatibility project. No directional hypotheses were postulated a priori for possible differences between role-players and project participants. The tapes of role-players were also rated with the content analysis system.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Interpersonal Attraction and Self-presentation

The antecedents of interpersonal attraction (defined as attitudinal positivity) have been conceptualized in a variety of ways by researchers in the field. Early research in this area focused on defining the personal and interpersonal variables that lead to mutual attraction. Concurrently, a variety of theoretical models were developed to explain why people are attracted to some and not to others. Early naturalistic studies (e.g., Newcomb, 1956) demonstrated the importance of propinquity as a precursor of interpersonal attractiveness. As study in this area moved into the laboratory, research has concentrated more on those variables affecting first impressions (Huston and Levinger, 1978). Interestingly enough, even more recent research (see next section) has returned to field settings to examine continuing interpersonal relationships.

Research on variables affecting positive first impressions has yielded some distinctive data. Extensive research by Byrne and his colleagues (Byrne, 1961; Byrne, Gouax, Griffith, Lamberth, Murakawa, Prasad and Ramirex, 1970; Byrne, Lamberth and Ervin, 1970) shows that people tend to be more attracted to others whom they perceive as having similar attitudes and values, and that this finding holds across cultures. This finding is often viewed as stemming from a need for consensual validation of one's own attitudes (Festinger, 1959).

In addition, the role of physical attractiveness in interpersonal attractiveness has been examined. Possessing physical attractiveness leads to a more positive first impression in most situations (Byrne,
London and Reeves, 1968; Stroebe, Insco, Thompson, and Layton, 1971; Berscheid and Walster, 1974; Kleinke, 1975). Stroebe, Insco, Thompson and Layton (1971) found that physical attractiveness and attitude similarity interacted in somewhat different ways for males and females. For example, physical attractiveness was a more important variable for males than females in willingness to date, marry, or work with the other person. For females more than males, attitudinal similarity was more important in liking the other person and willingness to work with the other person. Both physical attractiveness and attitudinal similarity appear to have reinforcing properties that lead to attraction and attributions of social desirability (Rubin, 1973; Huston and Levinger, 1978).

The research on the transition from attraction based on first impressions to increased interaction with the other is not as specific. Huston and Levinger (1978) suggest that:

The person contemplating initiating an encounter must consider at least two factors; (a) the degree to which he finds the attributes of the potential partner attractive, and (b) the degree to which he anticipates they would find his attitudes attractive...(p. 127)

Goffman (1959) suggests that self-presentation strategies are used in response to situational demands in order to maximize benefits for the individual. Two studies examined the self-presentation strategies that may be selected for attracting another person. Blumstein (1975) developed a role-play study in which female confederates demanded that male subjects act in a certain way (submissive/dominant, serious/unserious) to either obtain a date or develop an exclusive dating relationship. The males were more likely to conform to the female's demands if the identity
demanded by the situation was not greatly discrepant with their own self-conception. While the data demonstrate that, to some extent, subjects were willing to cede non-central parts of their identity to obtain a desired goal, their self-conception placed some constraints on willingness to change one's self-presentation. However, this finding only occurred when subjects believed the bargaining conversation was private. When subjects believed the interaction was being observed by peers, they were more likely to conform to the female's requests regardless of the discrepancy with their own self-conception. Blumstein hypothesizes that, with an audience, goal attainment became a much more potent stimulus because failure to obtain the goal would be more embarrassing.

Shaw and Wagner (1975) also examined whether behavior in a situation is a function of the impression one wishes to make and how the attributes of the other person affect behavior. Experimenter effects somewhat confound the results of this study. Male subjects were led to believe they would be interacting with a physically attractive female, a physically unattractive female or a control female (physical attractiveness unknown). Prior to the interaction, subjects were asked to choose a low, medium or high status role (defined in terms of type of housing, total weekly spending money, kind of car, college major, social affiliations and family background) and to indicate which role was more consistent with their actual status. Subjects were more likely to choose a high status role if they anticipated interacting with the physically attractive female than if they believed they were to interact with an unattractive female or one of unknown attractiveness. Thus, the data appear to support an exchange theory that postulates that self-presentation may be manipulated
in response to perceived desirability of a goal.

The latter two studies would suggest that one cannot necessarily regard the video-taped presentations of participants in the compatibility research project as "valid" representations of either themselves or what they desire in a partner. If we assume that a participant's goal is to attract a partner, then we would expect them to act in such a manner as to maximize the probability of obtaining that goal. In this context, the expected behavior of the role-play participants in the present study becomes an interesting issue. Role-play participants would have little motivation to distort their self-presentations, as they are not actually expecting any dates. Thus they may be more honest about themselves and what they prefer in a partner. On the other hand, they would have less intrinsic involvement in the task of video-taping. Therefore, they may not reveal as much about themselves or their preferences in partners.
Choice of Marital and Dating Partners

Various theories have been advanced in psychological research to account for individuals' choice of dating and marital partners. I will not attempt an exhaustive review of the volume of research available on this topic. Instead, only that research and theory most pertinent to the present study will be presented.

Murstein (1976) makes the following categorization of theories of marital choice:

1. Psychoanalytically based theories, primarily based on the postulate of need complementarity.

2. Need complementarity theories which postulate homogenous cultural variables to act as initial screening factors. Once a relationship has passed these screening factors, the actual selection of a marital partner depends on psychological factors (similar to complementary needs).

3. Value theories which hypothesize that homogenous values may bring individuals into situations that allow interaction.

4. Process (and filter) theories that concentrate on the course and development of an acquaintance into a marital relationship. Filter theories propose a group of sequentially important filters that operate to screen out potential partners.

As an example of the latter, Kerkoff and Davis (1962) postulate that initially there is a screening for homogenous cultural variables. Once past this initial screening, the next screen is an assessment of value consensus. The final screen is perceived psychological compatibility. Exceptions may occur in the sequence if an unusual amount of
satisfaction occurs out of sequence. In a test of this theory, Kerkoff and Davis (1962) examined 94 couples considering marriage over a seven month period. They found that value consensus was significantly related to courtship progress toward permanence (marriage) in those couples who had been together less than 18 months. However, for couples who had dated for more than 18 months, need complementarity was significantly related to the couples' progress toward marriage.

Centers (1975) postulates an exchange theory by conceptualizing all interpersonal behavior as the use of others for self-gratification. He presents a theory of love in which individuals exchange need gratification. Centers postulates that the need most determinant in intersexual gratification is gendaric identity and role maintenance.

Murstein's (1976) Stimulus-Value-Role (SVR) Theory of dyadic relationships is an exchange theory in which it is hypothesized that partners in a relationship "trade-off" assets and liabilities. There are three categories of sequential influencing variables: stimulus (e.g., physical attractiveness), value comparison and role. This theory is designed to explain dyadic (dating) relationships but Murstein points out that marital choice probably involves additional (unspecified) factors beyond those involved in choice of dating partners. Basic components of SVR are equity of exchange and sequence. In addition, the individual's perceptual and expressive styles interact with all three stages. Murstein postulates that since men have the power in dyadic choice, they can seek physically attractive women to balance the power inequity. In his research using a sample of college student volunteers, he found that perceived physical
attractiveness of the woman by the man was the best predictor of courtship progress and thus suggests that courtship progress towards permanence may be more determined by the male than by the female.

Hill, Rubin and Peplau (1976) examined the factors that affected the relationships of dating pairs in their progress toward marriage or break-up. Having begun with 203 dating couples, they found that 103 of these couples were no longer dating at the end of two years. In investigating the differences between those couples who had remained together and those who did not, the authors explored a filtering hypothesis that would predict similarities in certain characteristics for those couples remaining together. They found matching to exist on age, educational plans, intelligence (as measured by SAT scores) and physical attractiveness (as measured by judges' ratings of photographs). Not correlated with permanence as a dating couple were social class (measured by father's educational attainment), religion, sex role traditionalism, religiosity or desired family size. These researchers conclude that there may be a complex sequence of filtering that occurs such that social and stimulus factors may be important even after attitudinal and value factors have been assessed.

White (1980) examined the relationship between physical attractiveness and courtship progress in 123 dating couples. A nine-month follow-up of the 51 males and 59 females for whom data were available revealed that objective ratings of the relative physical attractiveness of dating partners were significantly predictive of movement toward a more committed relationship by those couples who had been dating casually or seriously.
Also among the couples dating seriously or casually, those couples who had broken up in the intervening time period were more dissimilar in physical attractiveness than those couples still together. This finding was not true for those who had been cohabiting, engaged or married at the beginning of the study.

In further examining the role of physical attractiveness, Critelli and Waid (1980) found that in 123 dating couples, ratings of physical attractiveness were not significantly related to a measure of romantic love between the partners. However, those who perceived themselves as less physically attractive than their partner professed significantly greater love for the other.

The research and theory in the preceding two sections suggest that certain conditions exist in order for a relationship to begin. There must be some opportunity for interaction. Perceptions of shared values and attitudes facilitate the development of a relationship, and perceived physical attractiveness aids in the desire to interact. There is further matching on social and attitudinal variables in heterosexual pairings, although the exact sequence and importance of such factors are not yet clear.
Sex Differences in Dating Partner Preferences

Various means have been utilized in researchers' attempts to define how males and females differ in their preferences in regards to desired characteristics of dating partners. There appears to be less data available on how these preferences may vary with age.

Curran (1972) examined the relationship between an individual's stated preferences for a dating partner (questionnaire data) and their preferences as evidenced through overt behavior. Prior to meeting their experimenter-arranged "computer date", subjects were asked to indicate their preferences for personality and motivational characteristics of a date. Sex differences emerged in these preferences that reflected traditional sex roles. Females stated that they preferred males who were higher on the following factors: assertiveness, superego, career, parental, ego strength, dominance, and superego strength whereas males preferred females who scored highly on the mating erg, narcissism, guilt proneness and radicalism. However, there was little relationship between what subjects stated as preferences and what they actually considered attractive in their arranged dates. The data suggest caution in accepting stated preferences as predictors of interpersonal attraction in a dating situation.

Touhey (1972) examined two dimensions of attitude similarity (sexual and religious attitudes) in relation to heterosexual compatibility. His data indicate that females were more attracted to males with similar religious attitudes, whereas males were more attracted to women with similar sexual attitudes. The method used was a computer date methodology with fifty dating pairs in each of four conditions: 1) sex dissimilarity,
2) religious dissimilarity, 3) sex similarity and 4) religious similarity.

Further exploration of attitude similarity in heterosexual attraction was conducted by Seyfried and Hendrick (1973). Hypothesizing that attraction is enhanced by complementarity of sex roles, each of their subjects evaluated a male and a female "phantom other" who allegedly had completed questionnaires revealing either traditionally male or female viewpoints. Strangers expressing masculine attitudes were preferred to those expressing feminine attitudes at a significant level. Also, strangers expressing attitudes appropriate to their sex were liked more than those expressing sex-dissonant attitudes. The results indicate that similarity of sex role attitudes leads to attraction for same-sex strangers. In opposite sex pairs, it was found that female subjects were significantly more attracted to masculine than to feminine males but male subjects were not more attracted to feminine than to masculine females. The authors attribute such results to the greater role flexibility for women that our culture may allow.

Various researchers have demonstrated that physical attractiveness is an important determinant in interpersonal attraction, including opposite-sex attraction (Dion, Berscheid, Walster and Walster, 1971; Walster, Aronson, Abrahams and Rottman, 1966). Further studies indicate that physical attractiveness is more a determinant for males being attracted to females than females to males (Murstein, 1976; Stuart, 1962; Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks, 1977). In addition, individuals considered to be physically attractive are evaluated more favorably on other dimensions than less physically attractive people (Miller, 1970; Byrne, London and Reeves, 1968). The relative physical attractiveness of one's companion will
"radiate" to oneself. For example, Sigall and Landy (1973) found that subjects rated males with an attractive girlfriend more favorably than they rated the same male with an unattractive girlfriend. The woman's attractiveness appeared to carry over to her companion in the perceptions of others.

Meiners and Sheposh (1977) attempted to discover whether the less "surface" quality of intelligence (operationalized as occupational status) would also have this radiating effect. Subjects viewed a videotape of a male and female together, with the attractiveness and intelligence of the female being varied. When seen with the more physically attractive female, the male was rated significantly more favorably on all ten dependent measures: overall impression, liking, friendly, likeable, exciting, physically attractive, energetic, intelligent, self-confident and talented. When the male was paired with the more intelligent female, he was rated significantly more intelligent, talented and self-confident.

Curran and Lippold (1975) matched computer date couples on physical attractiveness, height and age in two separate studies. The linear relation between the date's opinion of his or her partner's physical attractiveness and the attraction toward the partner accounted for over fifty percent of the variance in both studies. With the effects of physical attractiveness controlled, the relationships between attitude similarity and attraction (although statistically significant in one study) were minimal and not as strong as had been previously hypothesized. It must be noted that the variables were assessed after one meeting and may not reflect the effects of attitude similarity over longer time periods.
Coombs and Kenkel (1966) examined sex differences in dating preferences and subsequent satisfaction with computer arranged dates. Blind dates were arranged for 500 men and 500 women by computer matching of dating aspirations and personal characteristics. Prior to meeting their dates, subjects completed questionnaires regarding their preferences for dating partners. In general, women had high aspirations. Women were significantly more likely to desire that their dates be of the same race, same religion, have good dancing ability, high campus status, and high scholastic ability. In comparison, the only quality men were significantly more likely than women to desire in a date was physical attractiveness. After assessment of their matched date, women were significantly less likely than men to be romantically attracted to their date and less likely to be pleased with their dates. Women tended to have higher dating aspirations than men that were indicative of desiring a match that would meet with high social approval.

In regards to dating attitudes toward sex, Peplau, Rubin and Hill (1977) found in their two year study of 231 college age dating couples that women were significantly less favorable toward casual sex. When asked to provide open-ended descriptions of the best thing in their dating relationships, 16% of the men tended to mention the role of sex as opposed to 7% of the women. Women were also less likely to regard sex as a dating goal.

Stuart (1962) utilized a unique approach for studying complementary and homogenous needs in mate selection. A television show entitled "Chance for Romance" was aired for eight weeks, providing data on dating preferences. Despite the initial concern by the researcher regarding
peoples' willingness to utilize such an unorthodox (for the times) method of meeting a potential mate or dating partner, 4510 letters were received requesting applications to appear on the show. Participants on the program were roughly matched on religious, educational and socio-economic background. On the air, one person was interviewed and then introduced to three members of the opposite sex. Participants were left on their own to pursue further acquaintance if they wished. The median age of the population that appeared on the show was 36. Completed applications were obtained from 70 women and 43 men. When asked to list the most attractive attribute they could offer to the opposite sex, 44% of the men and 50% of the women designated their "personality". When asked what characteristics they sought in a partner, 45% of the men indicated appearance to be important compared to 11% of the women. For the quality of "beautiful" or "handsome", 5% of the men and 16% of the women considered it a desirable attribute in a partner. Twenty-four percent of the women desired sincerity in a partner, as opposed to 9% of the men. The four characteristics most frequently sought by men were: appearance (45%), intelligent (23%), cheerful and good humored (21%), and cultured (15%). The four characteristics most frequently sought by women were: cheerful and good humored (41%), intelligent (31%), considerate (26%), and sincere (24%).

Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks (1977) conducted an analysis of newspaper advertisements for dating and marital partners in one issue of the Single News Register. Unfortunately, the authors do not include the criteria for rating the categories in their published article. For all advertisers, approximately "one-third were marriage-minded, one third
emphasized a meaningful relationship, and the rest were interested in companionship or dating" (p. 29). In the advertisements, physical characteristics were often emphasized but this may have occurred because the advertisers had been instructed to state age, height and weight. The personality terms used by advertisers were scored by the researchers as to "likeableness". Only 7% of the self descriptors were rated by judges as less than neutral, or toward the negative end of the scale. For self-descriptors of physical appearance, 85% were positive. Negative qualities were given by 3% of the men and 6% of the women.

Traditional sex appropriate values were emphasized in the advertisements. Thirty-five percent of the men mentioned their own appearance as compared to 67% of the women. Similarly, 38% of the men specified appearance characteristics for their prospective partners whereas only 12% of the women did so. Men were more likely to mention status variables as self-descriptors, such as education (mentioned by 16% of the men, 8% of the women), occupation (46% men, 20% women) and financial status (19% men, 10% women). In the same vein, women were more likely to specify status variables for their prospective partners than men were. Nine percent of the women specified education characteristics (5% of the men), 20% of the women specified occupational characteristics (3% of the men) and 16% of the women specified financial status (4% of the men). Approximately half of the advertisers mentioned an optimal age for their partners, with men requesting women about 7 years younger than themselves and women wanting men about three years older than themselves.

The researchers conclude that the advertisements demonstrate bargaining mechanisms at work in the pursuit of dating partners. Advertisers
tended to make positive self-presentations, emphasized traditional sex-related attributes and specified "greater height, age, intellect, and status for men than for their female partners" (p. 30).

In a similar type of study, Harrison and Saeed (1977) performed a content analysis of personal advertisements placed by 400 men and 400 women. Results indicate that advertisers tended to offer or request characteristics that again fit typical sex role stereotypes. Advertisements were randomly selected by age of advertiser with equal numbers in each decade from 20 to 60 years of age. The ten dichotomous variables examined were: offers attractiveness (physical), seeks attractiveness, offers financial security, seeks financial security, offers sincerity, seeks sincerity, seeks photograph, seeks marriage, seeks older partner and seeks younger partner.

In the analysis of sex differences, eight of the variables showed significant differences dependent on the sex of the individual placing the ad. Women were more likely than men to offer attractiveness, seek financial security, seek older partners and seek sincerity. Men were more likely than women to seek attractiveness, offer financial security, seek younger partners, and express an interest in marriage. Three of the variables showed significant differences with age. Older advertisers tended to both offer and seek financial security more than their younger counterparts. Also, the tendency to seek an older partner (seen most strongly in younger women) tended to decline with age. This trend, while present for male advertisers, was applicable to only the minority (5%) of male advertisers who sought an older partner. Overall, the authors
found that advertisers' social desirability (defined as offered attractiveness, financial security and sincerity) was significantly related to the defined social desirability of the preferred partner.

In examining the intercorrelations of the variables, relationships were found between what advertisers offered and what they sought. Advertisers claiming to be attractive were more likely to seek attractive partners than those advertisers who did not mention their own attractiveness. Also, women who claimed to be attractive were more likely to seek financial security and their potential partner's photograph than those women who did not claim attractiveness. For women, seeking an attractive partner and an older partner were correlated whereas men seeking an attractive partner tended to specify a younger partner.

The authors conclude that their results support a matching hypothesis of pair formation and that the elements of social exchange are present in this data base. As Harrison and Saeed (1977) state:

Advertisers of each sex offered social assets characteristically associated with their own sex and sought social assets characteristically associated with the opposite sex, and for the most part, the characteristics offered and sought did not vary appreciably as a function of age. (p. 264)
Nonverbal Behavior and Interpersonal Attraction

There is a substantial amount of research on the interaction between nonverbal behavior and interpersonal attraction. Portions of that research relevant to the present study will be discussed in this section. Mehrabian and his colleagues have been responsible for much of the data available on the meaning of nonverbal behaviors and their relation to affiliation, status, and power. For example, one study by Mehrabian and Ferris (1967) compared the relative strength of facial expression and vocal communication (tone of voice) in conveying emotional attitudes. Results indicated that both the facial and the vocal channel communicated affect in a linear fashion, with the facial component carrying about one and one half times the weight of the vocal component. An early review article (Mehrabian, 1969) cited the following nonverbal behavior as conveying the evaluative attitudes of a communicator: distance, eye contact, body orientation, arms-akimbo position, and trunk relaxation. These behaviors, along with the degree of arm openness for female communicators and the asymmetry of arms and legs, also reflect status relationships between communicators.

Culturally determined implicit norms appear to dictate appropriate interpersonal distances for conveying positive or negative attitudes toward an addressee (Hall, 1959). In general (Mehrabian, 1969), greater eye contact appears to accompany positive attitudes between communicators, with a slight decrement for extremely liked addresses. Also, high status addressees receive more eye contact from lower status communicators and high status addressees receive less eye
contact from high status communicators. Research on body orientation suggests that males use a less direct body orientation with liked addressees and females use a very indirect orientation with disliked addressees, becoming less indirect as liking toward an addressee increases, and then becoming more indirect with very liked addressees.

The relative openness of arm or leg position does not show a clear relationship with attitude toward an addressee although there is some evidence that, for female communicators, openness of arms is related to positive feelings toward a male addressee. Similarly, only for female communicators does arm position appear to relate to status relationships. The degree of trunk relaxation (probably best measured by degree of asymmetry in arms and legs) appears to have a curvilinear relationship with attitude toward an addressee.

Further exploration of the above variables (Mehrabian and Friar, 1969) reveals that the most relevant nonverbal behaviors involved in communicating a positive attitude appear to be a small backward lean, close distance, and more eye contact. Less sideways lean and more eye contact accompany communication to high status addressees. This same study demonstrates a curvilinear relationship between degree of relaxation and attitude toward addressee, while the relationship for status is linear.

In addition to studying the relation of nonverbal behaviors to attitudes and status, Mehrabian and Williams (1969), in a series of three experiments, examined nonverbal behavior in relation to intended and perceived persuasiveness. In these role-playing experiments,
intended persuasiveness and perceived persuasiveness were significantly related. The following behaviors enhanced persuasiveness: more intonation, more speech volume, higher speech rate, more facial activity, more gestures, more eye contact, small reclining angles, increased head nodding and less self-manipulation. In general, nonverbal cues which enhance persuasiveness tend to be those which also indicate positive attitudes toward the addressee.

Later integrative work by Mehrabian (1970a, 1972) suggests that three factors underlie nonverbal behavior: 1) Evaluation, denoted by immediate positions and postures, e.g. positive evaluation indicated by a closer position, forward lean, eye contact and a direct orientation, 2) Potency (status), indicated by postural relaxation, and 3) Responsiveness, indicated by facial and speech activity.

Similar lines of research by other experimenters tend to support the findings reported above. For example, Rosenfield (1966a, 1966b) compared nonverbal behavior of subjects instructed to seek approval and others instructed to avoid approval. Approval seekers smiled more often, had fewer negative head nods and had significantly longer speeches and utterances. Approval seeking women gestured more than approval avoiding women.

The role of facial expression in communicating affect has been found to be significant also (Buck, Miller, Savin and Caul, 1972). Argyle (1975) proposes that facial expression communicates three dimensions: personality characteristics, emotions and interaction signals. In a recent series of experiments, Ekman, Friesen, O'Sullivan
and Scherer (1980) examined the relative weight of facial, body
and speech cues in communicating affect. The results of this study
indicate that neither face, body nor speech cues alone are consistently
more accurate predictors of judgements made that are based on all
three channels together. Relative importance of each channel was
dependent on the situational context (honesty versus deception).
The data suggest that, when communicators were being deceptive,
ratings based on only the speech channel correlated most highly
with ratings by observers who saw all three channels. This was
not true for "honest" communicators, in which case correlations
varied according to the scale being rated.
Sex Differences in Nonverbal Behavior

In addition to studying the interaction between nonverbal behavior and interpersonal attraction, researchers have discovered that males and females differ in nonverbal behavior display. In a classic article, Birdwhistell (1970) discusses differences in male and female nonverbal behavior in the context of gender identification and response. This concept has been explored and pictorially illustrated by Goffman (1976) in a naturalistic study of gender displays in advertising. Scheflen (1965) described sex differences in "quasi-courtship" behavior that may occur in psychotherapy sessions.

More rigorously empirical lines of research examine the differences between the sexes on more molecular types of nonverbal behavior. In Harper, Weins and Matarazzo's (1978) review of the research in this area, the following sex differences are reported. Compared to males, females are more likely to maintain closer interpersonal distances, smile more, laugh more, hold their hands together or clasp them, fold their arms, pat their hair, and look at their conversation partner more often. Males are more likely than females to speak more frequently, speak longer utterances, use filled pauses, and use "pointing out" gestures.

Frances (1979) did an extensive study of sex differences in fifty-four nonverbal behaviors, based on videotapes of 88 dyadic conversations. Half of the dyads were composed of same sex strangers and half of opposite sex strangers. She found that the sex of a subject but not the sex of the conversation partner had a statistically significant effect on many of the nonverbal behaviors as rated
by judges for duration and/or frequency. Some of the subjects' nonverbal behaviors also tended to vary with their self-ratings on personality variables. Male subjects tended to speak longer utterances than female subjects. Both male and female subjects who took longer speaking turns described themselves in more aggressive terms than those subjects with shorter speaking turns. Males used many more filled pauses (e.g., "ahs", "ums", etc.) than females. On laughing and smiling variables, females emitted these behaviors much more than males. Males who did laugh and smile more than other males described themselves as:

More sociable, friendly and affiliative than men engaged in less smiling and laughing... In contrast, the female subjects who laughed and smiled more tended to describe themselves as more uncomfortable in the experimental situation and as generally more retiring and deferent than women who smiled and laughed less. (p.529)

Women spent more time gazing at their conversational partner (regardless of their sex) than men. Men had significantly more postural shifts (in leg and seat position) than women. Frances suggests that this finding may be due either to the female role expectation of greater attentiveness (and thus less postural restlessness) or to sex differences in dress and the resulting limitations on movement for women.

Less inclusive studies reveal other sex differences in nonverbal behavior, such as females utilizing more facial displays of emotion than men (Buck, Miller and Caul, 1974), males interrupting more in conversation (Zimmerman and West, 1975), men occupying more personal space than women (Weitz, 1976; Melson, 1977), and males initiating touching females more than vice versa (Summerhayes and Suchner,
Bugental (1971), examining father/mother interactions with their children, found that fathers' smiles tended to coincide with their uttering positive statements, whereas mothers' smiles had little relation to the evaluative content of their speech.

McKenna and Denmark (in press) point out that most studies of sex differences in nonverbal behavior reach conclusions similar to Frances (1979):

Women display more nonverbal behaviors associated with affiliation, subordination and dependency (smiling, nodding, eye contact, upright posture and so on), and men display more nonverbal behaviors which convey messages of status and power (such as relaxed posture and lower eye contact). (p. 1)

Inevitably, discussion of sex differences in nonverbal behavior lead to various interpretations of the findings. Most often, interpretation involves the differential influences of culturally and/or biologically derived sex roles and differences in personality, leading to different nonverbal expressions of thoughts and feelings. For example, Lippa (1978) examined observers' perceptions of masculinity and femininity, and the role of nonverbal expressive cues in their perception. Observers' ratings of videotaped stimulus persons' masculinity or femininity showed that nonverbal cues were utilized and that observers utilizing different types of cues (e.g., ratings based only on bodies or only on faces) tended to agree in their judgements.

LaFrance and Carmen (1978, 1980) investigated the influence of sex role orientation (masculine, feminine, or androgynous) on subjects' displays of "masculine" or "feminine" behavior. Smiling and gazing were defined as feminine behaviors by the experimenters.
whereas interrupting and filled pausing were defined as masculine behaviors. Overall, women gazed more while speaking and smiled more while not speaking than males at a significant level. Males displayed more filled pauses and interrupted more than females, but not at a statistically significant level. Androgynous subjects displayed different nonverbal behavior than sextyped (masculine or feminine subjects). For some nonverbal behaviors, there were significant interactions between sex and sex-role orientation. Thus, sex-role orientation may affect the usual sex differences found in nonverbal behavior. Androgynous individuals tended to display a blend of "masculine" and "feminine" behaviors, depending upon the situational context.

In addition, there is evidence that identical nonverbal behaviors performed by a male and a female may be given different meanings by observers (McKenna and Denmark, in press; Henley, 1977; Reardon and Amatea, 1973). In a study by McKenna and Denmark (in press), dyads were videotaped in interaction (sound was not recorded). One actor portrayed high status, low affiliative nonverbal behavior while the other's behavior was designed to suggest a low status, high affiliative role. Sex of the actors playing the two roles was varied across videotapes. Ratings by observers indicated that the strongest factor (more powerful than gender) determining perceived status was the actors' nonverbal behavior. However, the status and power bases of the actors (experimentally defined as power to have another concede to a request) were perceived differently, dependent on gender.
Additional research has been done on the different use of language by males and females. Some have suggested that the differences are great enough to consider male and female languages as separate, while others question that the differences are that great (Lakoff, 1975; Key, 1975; Thorne and Henley, 1975; Henley, 1977). Thorne and Henley (1975) suggest that women tend to be addressed more by their first names, although there is little data to support this speculation (Henley, 1977).

In summary, there appear to be some clear differences in some types of nonverbal behavior of men and women. Henley (1977) interprets these differences in terms of power and status inequalities between the sexes. Others attribute them to culturally prescribed roles for males and females, that dictate different types of nonverbal behavior in the service of gender display (e.g., Birdwhistell, 1970; Coffman, 1976).
Variables and Hypotheses

The variables to be examined in the present study are listed below. More complete description of them is contained in Chapter III and Appendix F. The variables were derived from the research described previously that examined factors important for men and women in the search for dating partners. Nonverbal variables were derived from research in that field on sex differences in nonverbal movements and positions. Also, certain variables were available or expected in response to the already determined structure of the videotapes.

Demographic variables:

1. Age of subject.
2. Number of years of education subject has completed.
3. Whether subject is currently a student.
4. Sex of subject.
5. Race of subject.
6. Whether subject was born outside of the United States (operationalized by foreign accent).
7. Marital status of subject.
8. Number of children subject has.

The following variables concern revelations the subject makes about himself or herself and stipulations made about a preferred partner.

Revelations:

1. Offers financial security.
2. Offers sincerity.
3. Expresses interest in marriage.
4. Indicates a religious affiliation.
5. Indicates favorite leisure activities.
7. Describes himself or herself as unconventional.

Stipulations:
1. Seeks financial security.
2. Seeks sincerity.
3. Seeks physical attractiveness.
4. Seeks a sexual relationship.
5. Seeks to share activities.
7. Prefers a specific religious affiliation for partner.
8. Specifies age as not important in choice of partner.
9. Specifies an age for partner.

Two additional categories were examined that appeared to be differentially exhibited in viewing a small sample of the tapes prior to the content analysis. These were:
1. Whether the individual directly addresses the listener.
2. Whether the individual speaks of a potential relationship in terms of the future.

The following nonverbal variables were coded during the time the subject was speaking on the videotape.
1. Time spent responding to each of the six sentence stems.
2. Total time speaking.
3. Number of seconds spent smiling.
4. Number of smiles.
5. Number of self-manipulation movements.
6. Number of gestures.
7. Number of body movements.
8. Degree of arm asymmetry.
9. Degree of leg asymmetry.

In addition, raters were asked to make a subjective judgement of the subjects' levels of tension.

From previous research, we would expect many of these variables to differ according to the age and sex of the subject. The following hypotheses were generated:

Hypothesis #1: Men are more likely than women to offer financial security.
Hypothesis #2: Men are more likely than women to express an interest in marriage.
Hypothesis #3: Men are more likely than women to seek physical attractiveness.
Hypothesis #4: Men are more likely than women to seek a younger partner.
Hypothesis #5: Men are more likely than women to display greater arm asymmetry.
Hypothesis #6: Men are more likely than women to display greater leg asymmetry.
Hypothesis #7: Women are more likely than men to seek financial security.
Hypothesis #8: Women are more likely than men to seek an older partner.
Hypothesis #9: Women are more likely than men to smile.
Hypothesis #10: Women are more likely than men to engage in self-manipulation movements.

Hypothesis #11: Older subjects are more likely than younger subjects to seek financial security.

Hypothesis #12: Older subjects are more likely than younger subjects to offer financial security.

No a priori hypotheses were advanced for the remaining variables.

The hypotheses concerning revelations and stipulations in the present study were derived from research which suggests certain stable differences between males and females. The work of Harrison and Saeed (1977) and Cameron, Oskamp, and Sparks (1977) indicate sex differences exist in regards to either presenting oneself as financially stable or requesting a partner with that attribute. In general, it appears more likely that males will present themselves as offering financial security (Hypothesis #1) whereas females are more likely to request that their partner indeed have that attribute (Hypothesis #7). Similarly, there is a sex difference in the preferred age of one’s partner, with males more interested in younger women (Hypothesis #4) and females more attracted to older men (Hypothesis #8). The research by Harrison and Saeed (1977) also suggests that men will be more likely to express an interest in marriage (Hypothesis #2) which may also be consistent with Murstein’s (1976) contention that courtship progress may be most determined by the male.

The two hypotheses concerning age differences in offering and seeking financial security are derived from Harrison and Saeed (1977). Theirs
was the only study located that looked at potential changes in dating preferences over the life span.

In terms of the nonverbal variables examined in the present study, as postulated in Hypothesis #9, we would expect women to smile more frequently and longer than men (Harper, Weins and Mattarazzo, 1978; Frances, 1979; La France and Carmen, 1980). Harper, Weins, and Mattarazzo also suggest that women are more likely to engage in self-manipulation movements (Hypothesis #10). Frances' (1979) work indicates that, in terms of body positioning, men are more likely to maintain asymmetrical postures (Hypothesis #5 and #6).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Generation of Participant Tapes

The raw data for this research were available from a research project exploring heterosexual compatibility being conducted under the leadership of Dr. Timothy Brock at the Ohio State University. The project (the Compatibility Research Project) is a longitudinal study of the formation and course of heterosexual dating. Participants in the Compatibility Research Project (CRP) are solicited through mailings, posted fliers and radio/television advertisements which state the following:

Free video-dating being offered as part of long-term OSU research into male-female compatibility. Matching only by mutual choice. Participants must be at least age 18 and reachable by local phone.

The project is designed and advertised as a video-dating service that is operated for research purposes.

Potential subjects who call the project office expressing interest in the service are asked to schedule an appointment to view a ten minute videotape in which the project administrator explains the purposes and procedures of the CRP. The text of this videotape is contained in Appendix A.

After viewing the tape, questions about the project are answered by project assistants and the individual is invited to be a participant in the CRP. Persons who decide to participate are asked to complete consent forms and four instruments that yield information on personality,
socio-economic background, sexual experience and attitudes. After completion of these instruments, participants are given seven instruments to complete at home that yield information about personality, leisure activities and opinions about an "ideal" mate. They are also given information about the videotaping procedures (see Appendix B).

When the participant completes the take-home questionnaire, he or she may call the project office to schedule an appointment for a videotaping. Upon arrival for their videotaping, the individual returns the take-home questionnaires and the procedures for videotaping are reviewed. The videotapings are conducted in a private room with the participants and two project assistants present, one of whom functions as camera operator. The participant sits on a comfortable swivel chair on a slightly raised platform. To the immediate left is an Identification Board that is filled out with the assistance of the participant to display the following information:

1. Subject Identification Number: The first digit is 0 for females and 1 for males. The remaining six digits are the last six digits of the subject's social security number.

2. Subject age.

3. Subject height.

4. Subject weight.

5. Subject eye color.

6. Subject hair color.

7. Number of years of education the subject has completed. An ampersand is displayed if the subject is currently enrolled in school.
Filling in the I.D. Board allows the subject to become familiar with the surroundings. Project assistants are responsive to subjects' anxieties and make every attempt to help them relax. After completion of the I.D. Board, the taping procedures are reviewed a final time, while one of the project assistants demonstrates the equipment (see Appendix C). The standardized taping procedure is as follows:

Time Elapsed:

Start to 20 seconds: Camera is on a tight close-up shot of the I.D. Board, audio microphone is turned off.

20-70 seconds: Microphone is turned on and subject is cued to speak. The camera pans to the subject's face, the I.D. Board is rotated out of the picture, and the camera zooms back for a head to toe shot of the subject.

70-100 seconds: The camera zooms in for a waist to head shot of the subject.

100-120 seconds: The camera zooms in for a chest to head shot of the subject.

120-150 seconds: The camera zooms in for a full head shot and the I.D. Board is rotated back into the picture.

150-180 seconds: The subject is signalled that 30 seconds remain, and the camera zooms back so that both subject and I.D. Board are in the picture. The subject is cued when 10 seconds remain and at 180 seconds the camera is shut off. The audio microphone is turned off at whatever point the subject indicates he or she has finished speaking if this occurs before the 180-second shut-off.
After a tape is completed, it is viewed by the subject and the project assistants. Project assistants may request a re-taping if there are technical errors. The subject is encouraged to evaluate his or her performance to decide whether to use that tape as a final tape or to make another. Subjects are allowed to re-make their tapes as many times as necessary in order to create a satisfactory one.

During each taping, the subject is asked to respond to six open-ended sentence stems which are presented on a cue board. These stems are:

1. My marital and parental status is...
2. The sort of relationship I'm looking for is...
3. With regard to religious philosophy I feel...
4. The age range of people I am most interested in dating is...
5. My favorite leisure time activity is... (Subjects are told to regard this as plural)
6. A person who wants to date with me would be better off knowing that I...

Subjects are told they may add any further information they wish, but are asked to not reveal their name, address, phone number, occupation or income. Transcripts of two project participants are included in Appendix D as examples.

Once participants have been videotaped they are then permitted to schedule appointments for viewing videotapes of the opposite sex. Participants that have mutually indicated an interest in dating each
other are, on a monthly basis, given the names and phone numbers of their counterparts. As part of the CRP, follow-up research is pursued on the matched pairs.

For the purposes of the present research, the videotapes are viewed as presentations of self by the participants who are hoping to attract dating partners. Accordingly, all the videotapes of participants in the CRP since its inception in 1978 were utilized. There were available 80 tapes of women and 226 of men at the time of analysis.
**Generation of Role-playing Tapes**

In addition to the videotapes made by CRP participants, videotapes were recorded for the present research to investigate differences between "CRP" participants and volunteers who were asked to role-play as if they were participants in the Compatability Research Project. Sixty-three volunteers (33 female, 30 male) received credit in their introductory psychology course for their participation. Prior to volunteering, these subjects were informed on a sign-up sheet that the research concerned presentation of self and would involve their being videotaped for three minutes. Upon arrival for their scheduled appointment, the volunteers were given an instruction sheet (see Appendix E) that explained the purposes and procedures of the videotaping. Each individual then viewed the videotape of the project administrator explaining the CRP (Appendix A) in order to be familiar with the project's intentions. Any questions were answered by the experimenter. Subjects were assured that their tapes were only for research purposes and would never be used in the CRP project. However, subjects were encouraged to imagine themselves in the role of real participants and role-play their videotaping accordingly. Occasionally the volunteers sought guidance on how "CRP" participants responded during taping, but they were encouraged to use their own situation as a guide.

For the actual taping, the standard CRP format described above was followed, including subjects' option to remake their tapes until they were satisfied. Several chose to do so. Those assisting in the taping of the role-play subjects were either CRP project assistants or
persons trained in the standard procedure by the CRP project administrator.

Although every effort was made to follow standardized CRP procedures for role-play subjects, there were a few differences in procedure. Role-play subjects did not complete the extensive questionnaires of the CRP project, nor did they have as much time to review the procedures for taping and prepare their responses.
Content Analysis

The 306 participant and 63 role-play tapes were rated according to a content analysis system developed by the author to investigate the variables of interest. In order to assess the reliability of the content analysis system, two female undergraduate students who received independent study credit for their participation were recruited as raters. A manual for rating the tapes was developed (see Appendix F) and used for instructing the raters. The raters were given approximately 10 hours of training in the system using 15 randomly selected tapes for discussion of any differences in rating the variables. Each of the two volunteer raters then viewed and rated a separate set of 60 randomly selected tapes (15 CRP males, 15 CRP females, 15 role-play males and 15 role-play females). During rating, the raters and author viewed the videotapes on television monitors in separate cubicles. The author rated all 369 tapes. In addition, a psychologist rated 14 randomly selected tapes after discussion of the rating system with the author.

For the rating procedure, each videotape was viewed four times, using rating sheets designed by the author (see Appendix G). Raters were only to score that portion of the videotape prior to the time the microphone was shut off, i.e., while the subject was speaking. The reason for this procedure was the apparent discrepancy between individuals in what happened during the taping after the sound had been shut off. Although the subject was still on visual display, during this time they would often talk to the project assistants conducting the taping. Of course, this conversation would not be
heard on the tape. In many cases, the project assistants would initiate conversation so that the subject would not appear visibly uncomfortable or rigid during the silent portion. Due to the lack of control over what happened during this period, only the portions of the tapes with audio recording were analyzed. As a matter of interest, for many subjects there was a visible relaxation after the sound had been shut off.

During the first viewing of a tape, it was rated for the verbal content of the individual's speech and for some of the information on the I.D. Board. The variables rated and recorded on the first viewing were:

1. Identification Number
2. Age
3. Education: Recorded as number of years of education completed. Also the subject was recorded as a student or non-student.
4. Race: Coded as Black or White.
5. Sex
6. Foreign accent: Coded according to whether the subject spoke with an American or non-American accent.
7. Marital status: Coded as single, divorced, separated, widowed, married or "not mentioned".
8. Parental Status: Coded as number of children.
9. Offers financial security: Recorded when subject made statement(s) offering some kind of financial security or benefits to the potential partner.
10. Seeks financial security: Recorded when subject made statements indicating that they were looking for financial security and/or benefits from a potential partner.

11. Offers sincerity: Recorded when subject made statements offering sincerity and/or moral virtue of a type that should prevent exploitation in an intimate relationship.

12. Seeks sincerity: Recorded when subject made statements indicating that they were seeking sincerity and/or moral virtue of a type that should prevent exploitation in an intimate relationship by a partner.

13. Expresses interest in marriage: Coded when the subject made explicit reference to desire for entering a lifetime, legally sanctioned relationship with one other person.

14. Seeks physical attractiveness: Coded when subject indicated the importance of their potential partner being physically attractive.

15. Seeks sexual relationship: Coded when the subject indicated their desire that sex play a role in a potential relationship.

16. Seeks to share activities: Coded when the subject indicated they were seeking someone with whom to share activities and/or interests. This could be a general statement to that effect or a specification of activities or interests they would like to share.

17. Seeks friendship: Coded when the subject indicated they were looking for a friendly or companion-type relationship.
18. Religious affiliation: Coded both as to whether subject indicated they had a religious affiliation and what that affiliation is.

19. Religious affiliation for partner: Coded as to whether they preferred a prospective partner to have a religious affiliation and which specific affiliation.

20. Age is unimportant: Coded as to whether subject indicated that age was or was not an important characteristic in a partner.

21. Age range specified: Recorded subject's preferred age or age range for a partner.

22. Leisure time activities: Subjects' stated leisure time activities were listed.

23. Direct address of other: Coded as to whether subject directly addressed the listener.

24. Describes relationship in future terms: Coded as to whether subject described or referred to a potential relationship in future terms.

25. Self-discounting: Coded according to whether the subject made negative statements about himself or herself.

26. Describes self as unconventional: Rated accordingly to whether subject presented himself or herself as conventional or unconventional.

Further description of the criteria for these variables is contained in the Rating Manual (Appendix E). Numbers 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 above were adapted from Harrison and Saeed (1977).

On the second viewing of the tape, raters timed the subject's responses to each of the six open-ended sentences with a stopwatch.
The stopwatch was started as the subject began to speak on the tape and time elapsed at transition points (i.e., beginning a new open-ended sentence or changing to the next topic) was recorded so that the amount of time spent on each subject area could be determined by making the appropriate subtractions.

On the third viewing of the tape, raters attended to the smiling behavior of the subject. The number of smiles were recorded with a smile defined as widening and upturning the corners of the mouth, often with teeth showing (LaFrance and Carmen, 1980). In addition, raters used a stopwatch to record the total number of seconds the subject was smiling during the audio portion of the tape.

During the fourth viewing of the tape, nonverbal behaviors of the subject were recorded. These were:

1. **Number of self-manipulative movements:** Self-manipulative movements were defined as a part of the body (usually a hand) directly in contact with another part of the body, e.g. scratching or rubbing.

2. **Number of gestures:** Gestures were defined as movements of the hands or fingers, excluding the self-manipulative movements described above.

3. **Number of body movements:** A body movement was defined as an instance of the subject changing his or her body orientation by more than 10 degrees. This included changes in trunk lean either forward, backward, or sideways. Due to the tendency of some subjects to rock virtually continuously in the swivel chair and the difficulty of recording these movements, this was not
coded for these subjects.

For subjects that did not make major changes in their arm and/or leg position during the audio portion of the taping, the following two variables were rated:

4. Arm Asymmetry: Rated on a four-point ordinal scale ranging from symmetrical arm position (coded as 0) to extreme asymmetry (coded as 3).

5. Leg Asymmetry: Rated on a four-point ordinal scale ranging from symmetrical position of the legs with both feet flat on the floor and insteps touching (coded as 0) to extreme asymmetry of the legs with one or both feet partially lifted off the floor (coded as 3).

The above criteria for rating nonverbal behavior were adapted from Mehrabian (1972).

The last variable to be rated required raters to use their subjective judgement to assess the subject's level of tenseness, using a five-point scale ranging from very tense (coded as 0) to very calm (coded as 4).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Subject Demographics

Tables 1 and 2 contain demographic data on Compatibility Research Project (CRP) participants and the role-play subjects. The CRP group has a mean age of 27.87, whereas the mean age of the role-play group is 22.17 ($t = 37.34$, $df = 367$, $p < .001$). In addition, the CRP females are significantly older than the CRP males ($t = 4.29$, $df = 304$, $p < .001$). The CRP group has a significantly greater mean number of years of education (15.64 compared to 13.31 for the role-play group, $t = 6.71$, $df = 367$, $p < .001$). The role-play group is composed entirely of students, and this is reflected in the restricted range of marital and parental status they report. In addition, the role-play women were 36% Black as compared to the 4% Black women in the CRP group. This indicates a sampling difference that could not be corrected in the time span during which this study was conducted. Although more males than females displayed a foreign accent, the difference is not statistically significant ($X^2 = 3.07$ with Yates correction for continuity, $df = 1$, $p > .05$).

Presentation of Data

In the initial ratings, most of the content variables (revelations and stipulations) were coded as one of four ratings: Yes (the person revealed, specified or exhibited the variable), No (the subject specifically disclaimed the importance of the variable), Maybe (the subject implied the importance of the variable), although the rater
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRP Females (N=80)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18-62</td>
<td>11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRP Males (N=226)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>11-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CRP (N=306)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27.87</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>11-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role-Play Females (N=33)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18-51</td>
<td>12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role-Play Males (N=30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18-42</td>
<td>12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Role-Play (N=63)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18-51</td>
<td>12-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2**

**Additional Subject Demographic Data (Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRP Female</th>
<th>CRP Male</th>
<th>CRP Total</th>
<th>Role-Play Female</th>
<th>Role-Play Male</th>
<th>Role-Play Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Accent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRP Female</th>
<th>CRP Male</th>
<th>CRP Total</th>
<th>Role-Play Female</th>
<th>Role-Play Male</th>
<th>Role-Play Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parental**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRP Female</th>
<th>CRP Male</th>
<th>CRP Total</th>
<th>Role-Play Female</th>
<th>Role-Play Male</th>
<th>Role-Play Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One child</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
did not feel it was explicit), and Not Mentioned. For purposes of statistical analysis and data presentation, these categories were collapsed into two: a Yes category which included ratings of Maybe and a No category which included ratings of Not Mentioned. One exception to this is that the category of those who explicitly denied interest in marriage was retained. Table 3 presents the author's ratings of percentages by sex on the content variables. Tables 4 and 5 contain the data on religious affiliations and religious preferences. Table 6 contains the ratings of the nonverbal variables by sex. Tables 7 and 8 contain the ratings on the variables by age group. All tables contain the experimenter's ratings.

**Reliability of Ratings**

Tables 9 and 10 present the reliability data, comparing each rater's judgements to the author's ratings. The author rated all 306 CRP and 63 role-play tapes. Raters #1 and #2 (volunteer undergraduate students) each rated a separate randomly selected subset of 60 tapes. Rater #3 (psychologist) rated a subset of 14 tapes. On the demographic variables (education, student status, race, foreign accent, marital status and parental status) there were instances of disagreement on two subjects, one with Rater #3 on student status and one with Rater #1 on parental status. Percent agreement on the nominally rated variables with Rater #1 and #2 tended to be fairly high, the lowest being 88% agreement. With Rater #3 (who rated fewer tapes and had less training in the rating system) the lowest percent agreement was 64. The lowest correlations of Experimenter's ratings with
| Content of Self Presentations: Percentages of Subjects Who Verbalized in Each of Seventeen Content Categories |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CRP | Role-Play | |
| | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| **Offers financial security** | 8 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| **Seeks financial security** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| **Offers sincerity** | 23 | 28 | 32 | 10 | 18 | 28 |
| **Seeks sincerity** | 30 | 39 | 32 | 23 | 33 | 29 |
| **Expresses interest in marriage** | 13 | 15 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| **Denies interest in marriage** | 10 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 15 | 21 |
| **Seeks physical attractiveness** | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 8 |
| **Seeks sexual relationship** | 7 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Seeks to share activities** | 29 | 39 | 31 | 43 | 36 | 40 |
| **Seeks friendship** | 30 | 45 | 35 | 23 | 33 | 29 |
| **States religious affiliation** | 32 | 41 | 35 | 37 | 52 | 44 |
| **Religious preference for partner** | 10 | 8 | 18 | 20 | 12 | 32 |
| **Partner's age not important** | 5 | 3 | 8 | 43 | 12 | 27 |
| **Directly addresses other** | 42 | 41 | 36 | 53 | 42 | 48 |
| **Discusses future of relationship** | 33 | 29 | 31 | 37 | 48 | 43 |
| **Self-discounts** | 38 | 28 | 35 | 33 | 30 | 32 |
| **Describes self as unconventional** | 9 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
TABLE 4

Subject Religious Affiliations
(Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRP</th>
<th>Role-Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian (unspecified)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Mentioned</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5

Religious Preferences for Partner
(Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRP</th>
<th>Role-Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian (unspecified)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Mentioned</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
Ratings of Nonverbal Variables by Sex: Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP</th>
<th>Female (N=80)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Male (N=226)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Female (N=33)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Male (N=30)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Speaking (seconds)</td>
<td>112.01</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>116.96</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>114.48</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>125.43</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Smiling (seconds)</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Smiles</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Self-manipulation Movements</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.76(29)</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Gestures</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Body Movements</td>
<td>3.83(75)</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.60(213)</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.45(31)</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>8.41(27)</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Leg Asymmetry</td>
<td>1.06(67)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.10(186)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.10(29)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.81(26)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Arm Asymmetry</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.21(214)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.36(28)</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Tension</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Leisure Activities</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAdditional numbers in parentheses indicate smaller N because some subjects were unable to be coded in that category.
Table 7

Content of Self Presentation as a Function of Age:
Percentages of Subjects Who Verbalized
in Each of Seventeen Content Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-23 (N=111)</th>
<th>24-29 (N=104)</th>
<th>Older than 29 (N=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers financial security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks financial security</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers sincerity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks sincerity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses interest in marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denies interest in marriage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks physical attractiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks sexual relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to share activities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks friendship</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States religious affiliation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious preference for partner</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's age not important</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly addresses other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses future of relationship</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-discounts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes self as unconventional</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
CRP: Ratings of Nonverbal Variables by Age (Means and Standard Deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>18-23 (N=111)a</th>
<th>Age: 24-29 (N=104)</th>
<th>Age: Older than 29 (N=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Speaking (seconds)</td>
<td>111.58 27.19</td>
<td>115.63 27.62</td>
<td>120.70 26.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Smiling (seconds)</td>
<td>13.96 14.87</td>
<td>20.29 24.70</td>
<td>18.17 20.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Smiles</td>
<td>4.24 3.07</td>
<td>4.08 2.40</td>
<td>4.52 2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Self-manipulation Movements</td>
<td>4.34 5.33</td>
<td>5.07 5.69</td>
<td>5.38 6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Gestures</td>
<td>4.94 7.14</td>
<td>5.17 7.08</td>
<td>3.44 5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Body Movements</td>
<td>4.32(100) 6.17</td>
<td>5.35(98) 6.66</td>
<td>5.80(90) 6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Leg Asymmetry</td>
<td>.95(91) .82</td>
<td>1.02(86) .86</td>
<td>1.39(76) .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Arm Asymmetry</td>
<td>2.27 .79</td>
<td>2.35(98) .84</td>
<td>2.56(89) .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Tension</td>
<td>2.71 .56</td>
<td>2.83 .69</td>
<td>3.00 .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Leisure Activities</td>
<td>5.07 2.27</td>
<td>5.12 2.06</td>
<td>5.64 2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAdditional numbers in parentheses indicate smaller N because some subjects were unable to be coded in that category.
### TABLE 9

Percent Agreement of Raters with Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater #1 (N=60)</th>
<th>Rater #2 (N=60)</th>
<th>Rater #3 (N=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers financial security</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks financial security</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers sincerity</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks sincerity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses interest in marriage</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks physical attractiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks sexual relationship</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to share activities</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks friendship</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States religious affiliation</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious preference for partner</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's age not important</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly addresses other</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses future of relationship</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-discounts</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes self as unconventional</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Arm Asymmetry</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Leg Asymmetry</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Tension</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10

Correlations of Raters' and Experimenter's Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater #1</th>
<th>Rater #2</th>
<th>Rater #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Range Sought</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leisure Activities</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on 1st sentence stem</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.85(.0005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;2nd&quot;</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;3rd&quot;</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;4th&quot;</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.59(.0419)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;5th&quot;</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;6th&quot;</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time Speaking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time Smiling</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.61(.0214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Smiles</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.81(.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Self Manipulations</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.64(.0136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Gestures</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Body Movements</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.43(.1455)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations p < .0001 unless different probability given in parentheses.
Raters #1 and #2 occurred on the nonverbal variable of number of smiles (.67 and .77, respectively). Again, the reliability with Rater #3 was less, the lowest being .43 for number of body movements. In general, the reliability data on the demographic and nominally rated content variables appears quite acceptable. The correlational reliability data on the nonverbal variables indicate that agreement of the Experimenter with Raters #1 and #2 is also high enough to indicate that the rating system yielded reliable information. The reliability data comparing the Experimenter and Rater #3 is not as satisfactory. This result is probably due to the fact that Rater #3 did not receive as much training in the rating system by the Experimenter.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis testing was performed on data from participants in the CRP and role-play subjects.

**Hypothesis #1:** Men are more likely than women to offer financial security. Five percent of the CRP women and 8% of the CRP men offered some type of financial security ($\chi^2 = .588, p = .44$). There was no significant difference between the sexes on this variable. Only one role-play subject (a female) offered financial security. Therefore, statistical testing is not appropriate.

**Hypothesis #2:** Men are more likely than women to express an interest in marriage. Fifteen percent of the CRP women and 13% of the CRP men expresses an interest in marriage with a nonsignificant difference between the sexes ($\chi^2 = .239, p = .62$). Ten percent of the male role-play subjects and 9% of the female role-play subjects expressed an interest in marriage, which is a non-significant sex
Hypothesis #3: Men are more likely than women to seek physical attractiveness in a partner. Among CRP participants, only one female (1%) and eight males (4%) specified physical attractiveness in a partner. Because of the small number of cases, a statistical test may not be valid ($\chi^2 = 1.085, p = .30$). Ten percent of the male role-play subjects and 6% of the female role-play subjects indicated they were seeking a physically attractive partner. There was no significant difference between male and female role-play subjects on this variable ($\chi^2 = .33, p > .05$).

Hypothesis #4: Men are more likely than women to seek a younger partner. This variable was transformed for analysis by using the lower bound of the specified age range for a partner and subtracting it from the subject's age. Analysis of variance for CRP data indicates that men are significantly more likely to specify a younger partner ($F = 26.30, df = 1, p < .0001$). The role-play men were also significantly more likely to seek a younger partner than the role-play women ($F = 4.2, df = 53, p < .0001$).

Hypothesis #5: Men are significantly more likely to display greater arm asymmetry than women. Analysis of variance on this variable yields a nonsignificant result for CRP participants ($F = .17, df = 1, p > .7199$) and role-play subjects ($F = .45, df = 1, p > .10$).

Hypothesis #6: Men are significantly more likely than women to display greater leg asymmetry. Analysis of variance yielded a significant sex difference in the direction opposite to that predicted for
CRP participants ($F = 37.60, df = 1, p < .0001$) and role-play subjects ($F = 12.36, df = 1, p < .001$).

**Hypothesis #7:** Women are significantly more likely than men to seek financial security. Only one CRP woman (1%) and no CRP men specified financial security for their partner. Only one role-play subject (female) sought financial security. Therefore, statistical testing is not appropriate.

**Hypothesis #8:** Women are more likely than men to seek an older partner. In order to analyze this variable, it was transformed for each subject by subtracting each subject's age from the upper bound of the age range he or she specified for a partner. There was a significant difference for sex in CRP participants ($F = 85.49, df = 1, p < .0001$) and role-play subjects ($t = 3.30, df = 53, p < .01$).

**Hypothesis #9:** Women are more likely than men to smile. Analysis of variance for the total number of smiles by CRP men and women showed a significant effect for sex ($F = 42.75, p < .0001$) as did ANOVA for the proportion of number of smiles to total time spent speaking ($F = 51.06, p < .0001$). When the variable was defined as total time spent smiling ($F = 6.62, p < .01$) and the proportion of total time spent smiling to total time spent speaking ($F = 10.51, p < .0013$), ANOVA revealed significant differences by sex at the .05 level. In all tests, CRP women exhibited more smiling than men. For role-play subjects, there was a non-significant sex difference for number of smiles ($F = 1.16, p > .05$), but a significant sex difference for total time spent smiling ($F = 2.308, p < .025$).
Hypothesis #10: Women are more likely than men to engage in self-manipulation movements. The mean number of such movements for CRP males was 4.95 and for CRP females was 4.78. Analysis of variance yielded no significant sex difference ($F = 0.05$, $p > 0.18$, $df = 1$). Nor was there a significant sex difference in role-play subjects ($F = 1.203$, $p > .05$).

Hypothesis #11: Older people are more likely than younger people to seek financial security. As stated previously, only one person in the entire sample specified financial security in a partner. Thus, statistical testing is not valid for this variable.

Hypothesis #12: Older people are more likely than younger people to offer financial security. In order to test this hypothesis, the sample of 306 subjects was divided into three age groups: age 18-23 ($N = 111$), age 24-29 ($N = 104$) and older than age 29 ($N = 91$). Statistical testing with a complex chi square yielded a nonsignificant difference between groups ($X^2 = 0.176$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$).

Correlational Data

Pearson product-moment correlations among the ordinal and interval ratings for CRP participants were examined for additional information. Those significant at the .001 level included: subject age x age range specified for partner (.45, $n = 266$), subject age x time speaking on first sentence stem (.41, $N = 306$), age range specified for partner x time speaking on first sentence stem (.22, $N = 266$), age range specified for partner x total time smiling (.21, $N = 306$), total time speaking x number of smiles (.20, $N = 306$), number of gestures x total time speaking (.26, $N = 306$), level of tension x number of body movements
A gross comparison of role-play subjects with CRP participants was made by presenting three different subsets of twenty videotapes to three volunteers: two PhD. psychologists and one doctoral graduate student in psychology at Ohio State University. These three judges were aware of the basic outlines of the study and were asked to indicate whether they thought each of the twenty videotaped subjects they viewed was an actual CRP participant or a role-play subject. Each set of twenty tapes (unknown to the judges) contained 10 CRP participants and 10 role-play subjects. The graduate student and one of the psychologists were correct in 70% of their judgements (probability of 70% or more correct by chance = 0.0577), while the other psychologist was correct in 50% of his judgements (probability of 50% or more correct by chance = 0.5881). Thus, none of the judges was able to do significantly better than chance (at the .05 level) at distinguishing CRP from role-play subjects. These results are contaminated by the first judge's (graduate student) awareness (expressed after rating) that all role-play subjects were taped in the summer and thus were wearing summer clothing. In addition, subjects not listed as current students or who had more than fifteen years of education were more likely to be CRP participants than the role-play psychology undergraduates. For the other two raters, subjects that met these criteria were omitted from the sampling process.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Limitations of Data

Some limitations on the generalizability of the results of this study must be noted. The subject pool in the Compatibility Research Project at the time this study was conducted was relatively young, with very few people in the later decades of life. In addition, the CRP females were older than the CRP males. At the time of the content analysis almost three times as many males as females had volunteered for the project. In the process of self-selection, it appears that young male students were most likely to utilize the videodating service to meet potential dating partners. It would be interesting to compare this finding with similar situations, such as personal advertisements in newspapers, to determine if women are generally less likely to publicly declare their availability or if the videodating procedure is a factor in women's non-participation. Harrison and Saeed (1977) indicate that in six months of a weekly tabloid, personal advertisements were placed by 495 women and 592 men.

The CRP, at the time of this study, also tended to attract a high proportion of students (46% of the women, 64% of the men). This is no doubt due to the fact that the project was being conducted at the Ohio State University and under its auspices. The majority of participants were students, had never been married, and did not have children. The CRP women exhibited more variety in their marital and parental status than the males. Of course, it must be noted that marital and
parental status are based entirely on self report. In viewing the tapes, there were some participants who described themselves as "single" but later made statements that indicated they were technically in another category (e.g., they would refer to a prior marriage). For categorization purposes, raters used the more accurate category, but it is difficult to know how many participants manipulated such presentations effectively.

One possible limitation in generalizing from the results of this study is the fact that data from CRP participants are based on self-presentations by people willing to participate in a research project in order to attract others. Participation in the project requires a fairly substantial amount of both time and self disclosure, not only in the videotaping and subsequent viewing of other's tapes, but also in the lengthy questionnaires. One indication of the representativeness of the CRP sample was provided in a personal communication from Dick Buttermore, CRP project administrator, who reported that CRP participants' responses on the California Psychological Inventory (one of the personality measures used in the CRP questionnaires) had been compared with the responses of 59 students enrolled in an undergraduate psychology course. Statistical testing revealed no significant differences between the means of the psychology student and CRP participants on any of the 18 subscales of the instrument.

The use of volunteer undergraduate psychology students in the role-play videotapings was intended to provide a comparison sample of subjects who had not volunteered for the full project. The role-play
subjects entered the study with the knowledge that they would be videotaped and that their participation would not last longer than one hour. Thus they presumably had less investment in the process and in their self-presentation.

The nature of the role-play group does not make it an altogether satisfactory comparison sample. All the role-play subjects were students. They were younger than CRP participants and less often married previously. They also had less education and (especially the women) reflected a different racial balance. The percentages of foreigners appear to be comparable in the groups. The role-play subjects were recruited from an introductory undergraduate psychology class that tends to attract a substantial proportion of the university's undergraduates. Thus, the role-play subjects are probably fairly representative of the population of undergraduate students. Overall, it is important to note that the subjects in this study tend to reflect a relatively young, education-oriented population. Thus, any generalizations must be made with these factors in mind.
Discussion of Content Variables

In examining the revelations and stipulations made by subjects, several interesting points arise. Turning first to the hypotheses generated for this study, we see some contrasts to previous research on similar data.

In the research of Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks (1977) and Harrison and Saeed (1977), men tended to offer financial security and women requested that a dating partner have financial resources. However, in the present study, financial security was rarely mentioned by subjects. In contrast, Harrison and Saeed (1977) report that 38% of their sample offered financial security and 37% sought it. At first glance, we might decide that financial security is not an important factor for subjects in their search for dating partners. However, there is a potential confounding factor because participants in the present study were explicitly instructed not to mention their income. This instruction presumably inhibited any references to financial standing. Too few individuals sought financial security for statistical testing and there was not a significant sex difference in offering financial security.

Previous research would lead us to believe that men and women may differ in their willingness to express interest in a marital relationship. However, there was not a significant difference between men and women on this variable. Approximately 13% of CRP participants indicated some interest in marriage, and thus seemed to be using the video-dating service for the goal of finding potential marriage partners.
On the other hand, 92% of CRP participants explicitly disclaimed any marital plans or goals.

The role of physical attractiveness in dating situations has been well documented (e.g., Walster and Walster, 1971; Murstein, 1976; Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks, 1977). However, in examining the data in the present study, the search for physical attractiveness does not appear to occur, as it was sought by only 4% of the men and 1% of the women in the CRP. However, this unexpected finding may be an artifact of the design of this study. Subjects were aware that they would have a chance to see potential dates on videotape before committing themselves to making actual contact. Thus, they may not have felt any need to specify how partners should look. It may also be that knowledge that their own videotape would be viewed inhibited their making demands about how a partner should look.

Hypotheses four and eight seem to illustrate that the traditional sex differences in preferred ages of dating partners continue to exist. Men were significantly more likely to seek a younger woman whereas women were significantly more likely to seek an older man. However, it should also be noted that, in response to the prompt about preferred age range of a date, 30% of the CRP men and 20% of the CRP women explicitly denied the importance of age as a factor. Those who did talk about a preferred age tended to describe anticipated shared experiences and expectations as the reason for their preference.

Examining the remaining content variables, for which no specific hypotheses were generated, yields some interesting findings on what
subjects revealed about themselves and what type of relationships they were seeking. Sincerity, both offered and sought, appears important enough to be explicitly mentioned by almost one-third of the sample. The desire for a sexual relationship was verbalized by seven percent of the males and four percent of the women. However, the desire to meet someone with whom to share activities was expressed by 32% of the participants and the goals of a friendship was also stated by 32% of the participants. Further research could involve these variables in analysis.

One of the open-ended sentence prompts concerned religion (With regard to religious philosophy I feel...). For many subjects, this did not appear to be an important factor in the dating process, except to the extent that many indicated their desire not to be subjected to proselytizing. Five percent of the males and eight percent of the females indicated some type of religious preference for a partner, mostly Catholic or Jewish. Thus, for a majority of the sample, religion did not appear to be a consideration in dating. It is possible that religion emerges as an important factor in partner selection later in the process, i.e., as the relationship becomes more serious.

On the other content variables, there appear to be some possible sex differences. Males appear more likely to use the direct form of address (42%) than do females (21%), as might be inferred from Brown (1965) and Henley (1977). Males also appear to discuss a potential relationship in future terms more often and to make self-discounting statements about themselves. The variable of describing oneself as
unconventional turned out to be rather weak.

The two hypotheses regarding age differences (Numbers 11 and 12) used the financial security variables. Statistical testing for age differences in offering financial security was nonsignificant, and too few subjects verbalized seeking financial security for this category to be used in statistical testing. The data in Table 8 indicate that few differences occur with age on these variables. One exception is the increase in stating an interest in marriage that occurs with age (4% of the youngest age group, 13% of the middle group, and 25% of the older subjects). Corresponding to this is an apparent decrease with age of those who deny marriage goals. The correlational data also indicate that the specified age range for a partner becomes broader as one gets older (r = .45, p < .001).

One of the potential limits to generalizability mentioned previously was the fact that the data on CRP participants are from a group of subjects who had volunteered for an extensive video-dating procedure. Comparison with the role-play subjects was designed to provide an indication of how typical the CRP participants might be. Thus, it is significant that three judges, aware of the nature of the study, were unable to do better than chance at distinguishing role-players from CRP participants in samples of 20 videotapes. Statistical testing for the hypotheses does not reveal substantial differences between the role-play subjects and CRP participants. In addition, examining the data in Tables 3 and 6 yields few outstanding differences between the two groups. Role-players appear somewhat less likely to mention sincerity,
especially to offer it. The role-players also appear less interested in marriage as a goal. The only glaring differences on the nonverbal variables between the two groups are the role-players' greater number of self-manipulation and body movements. This may be due to their having less time to prepare for their videotaping and plan their behavior. Alternatively, it may reflect more anxiety on their part.

In general, the two groups do not appear to differ much in their self-presentation, even though the role-play subjects presumably did not have as much investment in the results of their videotaping. Anecdotally, this may not have been true for all role-play subjects since a few requested to re-make tapes because they were not satisfied with their performance. One role-play subject, in particular, made four re-makes. When the experimenter ran out of time, the subject requested to come back for additional time (for which he knew he would not receive credit), at which time he finally made a tape that pleased him. Regardless, the lack of clear differences indicates that the self-presentations of the CRP group are probably fairly representative of the population of date-seekers, taking into account the demographic nature of the sample. The similarity of the CRP participants and role-play subjects indicates that, in a videotaping situation like that used in the CRP, these two groups displayed similar behaviors. The situation itself does not demand any special behaviors and both groups presented similar information about themselves and their preferences in dating partners.
Discussion of Nonverbal Variables

The hypotheses relating to nonverbal variables yielded mixed results. Contrary to previous research (Mehrabian, 1972), men did not display significantly greater arm asymmetry than women. Nor, as hypothesized, did males display greater leg asymmetry. Rather, there was a significant sex difference in the opposite direction. This may have resulted from women being likely to sit in crossed-leg position in the swivel chair. The hypothesis that women engage in more self-manipulative behaviors was not confirmed.

Similar to previous research (e.g., Frances, 1979) women were found to smile significantly more than men, both in absolute number of smiles and length of time smiling. This difference also was maintained when the smiling variables were analyzed relative to total time speaking. Various hypotheses have been proposed for the difference in smiling between men and women. Henley (1977) discusses it in the context of women thus displaying submissive postures. Alternatively, Frances (1979) and others have attributed it to sex differences in the propensity to display socially appropriate, affiliative behavior. In Frances (1979) study, those women displaying the most smiling and laughing admitted more feelings of being uncomfortable in the experimental situation. In the author's observation of the females' videotapes, this did appear to be the case for many. It would appear in examining the data on nonverbal variables that males were more likely to use gestures and to make more body movements.
Examining the correlational data reveals that a longer time spent responding to the first sentence stem ("My marital and parental status is..."") is significantly correlated with both speaker's age and age range specified for partner. These latter two variables are also significantly correlated with each other. These correlations are probably a result of older subjects taking more time to discuss their marital histories and/or talk about their children. Also, as individuals age, their preferred age range for partners broadens. Other correlations indicate that, the more time spent speaking during the videotaping, the more smiles and gestures an individual displayed. This is most likely due to the additional time available for rating nonverbal behaviors in those subjects who spoke longer. A higher number of body movements led to raters perceiving the individual as being tense and arm asymmetry tended to be associated with leg asymmetry.

Unfortunately, there were several problems associated with rating nonverbal variables in this study. The situation itself is artificial, in that the individual is speaking to a camera, with two project assistants (to whom the communication is not directed) behind it. The standardized sequence of camera shots during the tapings resulted in different portions of the subject being in view at different times. For example, sometimes the angle of the camera resulted in the subject's legs obscuring his or her hands. On waist-to-head shots, sometimes the subject's hands were in the picture and sometimes they were not. This would result in the length of time raters could observe gestures and self-manipulation movements varying across subjects. Thus, although
the sequence of shots was standardized, the subject's posture affected what could actually be viewed.

In addition, subjects tended not to use their entire three minutes for speaking. The mean speaking time for females was 112.01 seconds (S.D. = 27.59) and for males it was 116.96 (S.D. = 27.32). What this meant was that the later camera shots sometimes occurred while a subject was speaking. But, for subjects who did not speak as long, the later shots would occur after the audio had been shut-off. These portions would not be rated because of the previously mentioned lack of standardized procedure during the period when the subject was still in view but no longer speaking. Problems such as these raise questions about the accuracy of ratings on nonverbal variables of questionable utility.

Based on observation of all the tapes, it would also appear that other nonverbal variables might have been useful to examine. There were additional indications of anxiety and tension in numerous subjects. During that portion of the videotapes showing the subjects' feet, there were nervous feet and leg movements (e.g., foot shaking). Although some subjects appeared to express tension through body movements, other sat very stiffly in the chair, holding their bodies rigid. In addition, speech quality could have been used to provide some indication of the subject's nervousness. Some of their voices were noticeably shaky whereas others delivered their presentation in a mechanical-sounding voice. In general, it is doubtful that the nonverbal variables, as used in this study, made a substantial contribution to the results.
Implications for Future Research.

The data in this study (the videotapes of CRP participants) must be viewed as self-presentations in terms of what subjects want to reveal of themselves and how they define their preferred partner in an attempt to attract others. This does not necessarily mean that the videotapes represent subjects' true selves and preferences (Curran, 1972) although the videotapes represent how they try to attract others. The research of Byrne and his colleagues (Byrne, 1961; Byrne, London, and Reeves, 1968; Byrne, Gouax, Griffith, Lamberth, Murakawa, Prasad, and Ramirex, 1970) appears supported by the fact that a good portion of the sample explicitly indicated the desire to meet others with similar interests and/or the desire to engage in mutually enjoyable activities. Many of the anticipated shared activities were sports, although subjects did mention casual meetings for drinks or coffee. Some, which more frequently seemed to be females, indicated the desire to just talk. Also, subjects who discussed their reasons for seeking partners of a specific age or age range cited the importance of shared values and experiences as a factor. Subjects did not seem to define shared religious values as an important dimension of similarity.

The research of Shaw and Wagner (1975) indicates that males will manipulate their status in order to attract a preferred partner. Unfortunately, in this study, status variables (at least in terms of financial standing) were probably affected by the instructions given to subjects. In the author's opinion, the instruction to CRP participants not to mention their occupation or income places an artificial
constraint on the situation and somewhat removes it from the natural process of acquaintance.

Similarly, the design of the CRP may be the reason physical attractiveness did not emerge as an important variable in subjects' preferences. One suggested means of assessing the importance of physical attractiveness in this data pool would be to compare judges' ratings of each subject's physical attractiveness with the number of times they are chosen by others as a potential partner. Or, to go one step further, subject's physical attractiveness could be examined for the relation to number of actual contacts arranged through the videodating service.

The apparent lack of importance of religion in the present study is in accordance with Hill, Rubin and Peplau's (1976) finding that religion was not a factor in couples remaining together or breaking up. In view of this, that particular sentence prompt may not be an optimal one for the CRP. It does, as do the other sentence stems, give CRP participants a standardized topic to talk about, but may not provide useful information for participants in the search for dating partners.

Some researchers (Harrison and Saeed, 1977; Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks, 1977) have conceptualized the search for dating and marital partners as a social exchange (i.e., a market place) in which men and women bargain with their assets and liabilities in order to facilitate relationships. It has been hypothesized (Murstein, 1976) that men primarily present status variables (e.g., financial status, education and occupation) whereas women rely on physical attractiveness variables. Such a bargaining process does not appear as obvious in the present
research as it does in written self-presentations such as appear in personal columns in newspapers. However, one area in which bargaining is hypothesized to be the mechanism involves the fact that men seek younger women and women seek older men. It has been postulated that findings such as these come from men's ability to offer the status they usually accrue with increased age (i.e., in terms of moving up the occupational ladder) whereas women offer the physical attractiveness that is coupled with female youth in our society. Despite this finding, it should also be noted that 27% of the CRP participants explicitly disclaimed the importance of the age of a potential partner.

The participants in the CRP express various goals for their participation in the videotaping service. Thirteen percent of them expressed some interest in finding a marital partner whereas 9% explicitly indicated they were not interested in marriage. Six percent of the CRP sample expressed some interest in a sexual relationship. Thirty-two percent of the sample indicated they were looking for a relationship in which to share activities and/or interests. Thirty-two percent also indicated a desire for a friend or companion-type relationship. The desire for a marital-type relationship appears to vary with age. In retrospect, it would have been useful to develop a more precise rating system for categorizing the type of relationships subjects indicated they were seeking. For example, some subjects indicated a desire for a monogamous relationship (although not necessarily marriage) whereas others expressed an interest in multiple relationships and wanting to meet as many people as possible. It would also have been interesting
to examine how many subjects discussed past relationships, as some did.

In accordance with the data of Harrison and Saeed (1977) and Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks (1977) it appears that the majority of participants presented themselves in a positive light. However, 35% did make negative statements about their own attributes or abilities. It is unfortunate that the global rating system developed for that category did not allow further delineation of the types of self-discounting statements made, as this would provide further understanding of the role of negative self-descriptors and self-discounting in heterosexual self-presentation.

The content analysis system devised for the present study appears to be a beneficial tool in studying self-presentation. It was fairly inclusive for the verbal content of subjects' videotapes although there were some problems in rating nonverbal variables due to the nature of the tapes. A further and more complete use of the videotapes from the CRP would be to transcribe the tapes into a written form that would allow more detailed analysis. One way to improve the applicability of the videotapes for analysis of nonverbal behavior would be to utilize a sample of still shots from each subject's tape. This would allow more detailed investigation of subject's facial expressions and body positions. A further use of the data on self-presentation would be to examine how subject's self-presentation relates to their attractiveness to other participants, i.e., how often and by whom they are chosen as a preferred match.

As a final note, it appears that studies such as this in the social psychology realm continue to provide data that can be useful in counseling
and therapy. With heterosexual relationships and the anxiety relating to them being a topic of primary interest for many clients (Curran, 1977), studies examining the mechanisms at work in heterosexual dating provide important baseline data for the clinician. If we conceive of acquaintanceship as a skill (Duck, 1977), the more we learn about how people attempt to portray themselves in seeking a partner and what they prefer in a partner, the better able we are to assist clients in improving their own heterosexual relationship skills.
Appendix A

Summary of Video-taped Oral Presentation

Introduction

Welcome to the Compatibility Research Project. My name is Dick Buttermore and I'm co-researcher with Professor Timothy Brock, Department of Psychology here at Ohio State University. I'm going to explain briefly what the project is about and how, if you decide to become a participant, you will go through the steps of the procedure. The basic purpose of the research, in a nutshell, is to study male-female compatibility over time. This means that we will be following male-female relationships for months or years and will be doing this by telephone on an approximately monthly basis.

Procedure If you join the project, the steps of the procedures you'll go through are these: Today, you will be given four personality profiles to take here under our supervision. The information is strictly confidential and important to the study. Then you will be given a booklet to take home. It contains additional personality profiles and background questionnaires which you will complete at home. Complete instructions appear on the first page. When you finish these you will come back for your video-taping and you will find instructions on where to call also on the first page of this booklet. Please take your time with these take-home questionnaires. They will take at least four hours to complete. We recommend that you do only one or two of them at one sitting.

We will not accept any scheduling for the video-taping within five days of your taking this booklet home, so please take your time. Try to complete them in a relaxed atmosphere in a place that is quiet and private. The booklet is to be re-used so please don't write or mark anything in the booklet itself. Instead you'll be marking your responses on machine readable forms which you will find in a pouch in the back of the booklet. It contains all the response forms you'll need to respond to the various questionnaires. Again, this information is absolutely confidential and nothing but your project identification number will ever be connected with it.

Also in this pouch you will find a sheet with information and instructions about your video-taping. Included are the questions you will be responding to on tape so you will have time to consider how you want to answer them.

Video-taping The next step in the procedure occurs when you call the project phone and inform us that you have finished these take-home questionnaires. We will then schedule a time with you to return for your video-taping. It will be three minutes in length and you'll see it right after it's done. When you come in for your video-taping,
you will return the take-home questionnaire booklet and your completed response forms.

**Viewing** Next comes the viewing of participants of the opposite sex. We will be segregating the video tapes only by sex and age group. This means, for instance, all males from 18 to 22 will be in one group; females from 18 to 22 will be in another; males from 23 to 28 will be in another, etc. By calling the project phone, you will be given the schedule for viewing the various age groups and you decide which age group or groups you want to view. You tell us when you want to come in to do that viewing, and if there is an opening at that time, we confirm the appointment and reserve a viewing booth for you.

When you do the viewing, for every individual you see, you will indicate on a response form how interested you are in dating that individual by marking either "yes", "maybe" or "no". The "no" response will completely eliminate any possibility of a match. If, however, at some later viewing, you see the same individual and change your response to either a "yes" or a "maybe", then the possibility of a match will return.

**Matching** Once a month we will process all these viewer response forms. Whenever you have one or more matches, we'll call you with the name and phone number of not more than two matches per month. We'll also call the participant or participants you matched with and give them your name and phone number. It is then your choice to make contact with each other and to meet.

There are two other aspects of the viewing and match processing procedure you should be interested in. The first we have already touched on: if you want to change your response with regard to dating someone you viewed, you can do so at any later viewing, even a second viewing in the same month. Second, if you actually receive more than two matches per month, those matches will be kept on file and if those participants remain available, you will be called with those matches on a later month when perhaps you don't have two matches.

**Follow-up** The last aspect of the procedure is the follow-up. Following a match, we will be calling you on approximately a monthly basis to find out what you think and how you feel about the relationship. Following your first match, we will mail to you a small booklet of short questionnaires. When we call for the follow-up, we will ask you to give your responses to one or two of these. Again, this information is strictly confidential and nothing but your project identification number will ever be connected with it.

**Withdrawal** If the time comes when you feel your match or matches are totally adequate to meet your dating needs, and you don't want any additional matches, here's what you do. The last page of the follow-up booklet is the form you use to notify us that you don't want to receive any more matches. Just fill in the appropriate
information and put it in the mail to the address on the form and when it's confirmed, we will remove both your video-tape from further viewing and your project identification number from further match processing. Later, if your dating situation changes, you can rejoin the project without having to re-do all the personality profiles and background questionnaires, but you will have to do a new video-taping if you rejoin.

**Candor** Again, if you decide to become a participant, you will be given two personality profiles and two background questionnaires to complete here under our supervision. One of these asks specific questions about your sexual experience and requires candid responses. Some people may consider particular questions about their sexual experience to be too sensitive to answer. If you find this to be the case, just leave out the answer to that particular question. Again, all your responses are kept absolutely confidential.

**Not "Computer-Dating"** It seems that many people have it in mind that this is some kind of computer dating where a computer chooses your matches for you. This is not the case. This is not computer dating and we want you to appreciate and understand the difference. We do not choose a match for you. The only way a match occurs is by participants choosing each other when they indicate during a viewing either "yes" or "maybe" as the dating decision. If either says "no" as the dating decision, then no match exists. Both participants must respond to each other with either a "yes" or "maybe" to produce a match.

**Open Participation** It also seems that some people are under the impression that we are selectively controlling who becomes a participant and who doesn't. This is not true. We are not exercising any control over participation whatsoever beyond requiring that these procedures be followed. The project staff does not screen participants for character, morality, or physical or mental health. Please keep in mind that there may be risks stemming from the character, morality, or physical or mental health of participants you might meet. You are under no obligation to meet with any match you receive. You must decide, after speaking with a match by phone, if you want to meet that participant. If you do, you should exercise your best judgement in arranging where and when to meet.

**Follow-up** Again, when and if you receive your first match, a small booklet of follow-up questionnaires will be sent to you by mail. You won't need to mark anything in this booklet. Instead, when we call you for follow-up, you will just give us your response over the phone and we will record them on forms that we keep.

**Automatic Withdrawal** Lastly, we will be working to keep the videotapes up to date. We don't think you want to waste your time viewing participants who aren't active. So if a participant hasn't done any viewing for four months, he or she will be automatically withdrawn from further viewing and match processing.
That's the entirety of the procedure and the end of this general briefing. Now you can decide whether you want to become a participant. If you do, we certainly hope that your participation in the Compatability Research Project here at Ohio State University will be an interesting and rewarding experience for you.

If you have any further questions, please ask the project assistant who is conducting this briefing.

Thank you.
Appendix B

CRP Information Regarding the Video-Taping

Forty-five minutes are allotted for each participant's video-taping. The final product is three minutes in length, so there is plenty of time to do three or four or more "takes".

The first "take" can be considered to be purely for practice.

The questions you will be responding to are of the "fill-in-the-blank" type. In order that the research assistants not interfere with or affect the video-tapings, each individual will merely read the beginning of each question from "cue cards" and then complete it giving his or her viewpoint, attitude, etc.

For example, one card will read: "The age range of people I am most interested in dating is...". You will be reading this aloud during the video-taping and then adding aloud whatever your personal inclination happens to be.

The rest of the questions ask about:

a) The kind(s) of relationship you feel you are most interested in;
b) The leisure-time activities you personally prefer;
c) Your marital and parental status;
d) Your feelings and opinions regarding religious affiliation or philosophy; and
e) Some thing(s) unique about yourself that someone who wanted to date with you would be better off knowing.

You can view each of your video-tapings right after it's completed since we'll be playing it back right away to see if it was an adequate "take".

Three minutes doesn't seem to be very much time to respond to all these questions, but the vast majority of participants who have already been taped answered all the questions within one and a half minutes in their first "take"!

We recommend therefore, that you take your time responding to these questions, so that very little of your "tape" will be silent. Every participant's tape is three minutes long. When you've finished speaking, we turn off the sound. So if you only speak for two minutes, the third is silent because even though we turn off the sound, the visual recording continues until the three minutes is up.

Also, we recommend that you avoid wearing any extremely dark or light colored clothing for your taping. These colors produce very strong contrast on the screen and will detract from your appearance. Mid-tone colored clothing shows up the best on screen.

85
Lastly, when you've completed your video-taping, you'll receive a project identification card, information about the viewings, and a sample of the form you'll use when viewing so that you'll be familiar with it before actually using it. We have experienced great delays in processing these viewing forms because of numerous errors in their use, so the better you know how to use it, the quicker we can process it and call you with whatever "matches" might have occurred.

We thank you again for joining the Compatability Research Project.
Appendix C

Briefing Prior to Taping

Participant is seated on the stage and the ID Board filled out.

The whole taping is three minutes long, beginning to end. For the first 20 seconds the camera will be on the ID Board alone, with no sound on. Fifteen seconds into that 20 second period, we will give a count-down of "five, four, three, two, one, click".

The "click" is the microphone being turned on and the signal for the cameraperson to go from the board over to you. It will take the cameraperson a few seconds to get over to you, so don't start talking until the cameraperson "cues" you. (Demonstrate arm thrust forward with index finger extended and pointing at participant.) When you get the cue, then you begin responding to the cue cards. Read the statement on the card and then complete the statement with your own response. The first one is "My marital and parental status is...". This pertains to whether you're single, divorced, separated, etc., and whether you have any children. Then continue to the second. It is "The sort of relationship I'm looking for is...". You can consider any of these as plurals, such as "The sorts of relationships I'm looking for are..." if you like. The third is "With regard to religious philosophy or affiliation, I feel...". As soon as you finish reading this one, we'll turn the board around. We don't want you to think we're trying to rush you. We're just turning it so that when you've finished it, the next one will be in front of you and you can continue without interruption. By the way, if we forget to turn the board, just gesture to us or say "Board" and we'll turn it.

(Read the next one, explain, etc.)

The fifth one is "My favorite leisure time activity is...". This one should definitely be used as a plural that is, "My favorite leisure time activities are...". We had this one printed incorrectly.

The last one is "Someone who wants to date with me would be better off knowing that I...". This one's included to try to avoid obvious mis-matches. For instance, if you can't stand cigarette smoke and you got a match with a heavy smoker, it would be a waste of time for both of you. Or if you only like to go sky-diving on a first date, the other person would be better off knowing it! Now not everyone has something to say for this one, and if you haven't anything in particular to say about this one, just say so.

If you finish responding to these before the three minutes is up, you can add anything you want in the remaining time. The only thing we don't want you to mention are these five items: 1) your name; 2) your address; 3) your phone number; 4) your occupation; or 5) your income. When you're finished speaking, just say "That's all".
or "Thank you", or nod to us - and we'll turn off the sound. That's so that we don't all have to be quiet for the remainder of the three minutes, and we can talk back and forth without it being on the tape.

Now at the beginning, after the count-down when the camera goes from the board over to you, we'll be rotating the board out of the picture like this (demonstrate). And somewhere between 60 and 30 seconds before the end, we'll be rotating it back in (demonstrate). So don't be startled when you see this moving.

At 30 seconds before the end, if you're still speaking, we'll signal to you like this (demonstrate three fingers waving beneath the camera lens). At 10 seconds before the end, if you're still speaking we'll signal you like this (demonstrate cameraperson holding up and waving ten fingers above the camera). That means you really have to wrap it up quickly.

When it's done, we'll play it back right away so you can see it. You can consider the first one as just a practice. We've got 45 minutes, so we can do it over again several times. Each time we do it over, we record right over the last one, so we can't go back to the first if we've done a second, etc.

In the case where the participant wears eyeglasses, give the following instructions: "Since you're wearing eyeglasses, we want you to take them off after you finish reading the last question. The reason is - we've got all these small spotlights here rather than two or three large lights, and produce a whole bunch of white spots on people's glasses - sometimes such that it's very difficult to see what a person's eyes look like. So after you read the last question, just nonchalantly remove your glasses. If you forget, we'll signal you like this (demonstrate two hands repeatedly acting out the motion of taking glasses off). OK?"

"Any questions?"
Appendix D

Transcript - Male

Elapsed Time
(Seconds)

35  My marital status is that I'm divorced, no children

40  and the sort of relationship I'm looking for is one of casual acquaintances, just all around good time, maybe possible marriage.

55  I was educated as a Catholic but I'm not very open as far as religious beliefs.

68  The age group I would like to date is somewhere I'll say between 25 and 35.

75  My leisure activities involve all sorts of sports, pretty much involved in car racing: boating,

84  I like downhill skiing, water skiing, I play tennis.

90  I'm on a lot of recreational kind of events. I like four-wheel driving, camping, all that sort of outdoorsy type stuff.

102  some of the things that a person should know about me: I'm very active, I like to be busy all the time.

120  I am pretty much on the go all the time and I would like to know someone who is pretty ambitious and has good attitudes.

130
Transcript - Female

Elapsed Time
(Seconds)

33 My marital status is I'm divorced and I have one boy who is 19 and going to Ohio State.

40 The sort of relationship I'm looking for is one that's open with humor, where we can enjoy each other's company and just wait and see what happens from there.

57 No preconceived ideas as to how it is going to go,

62 With regard to religious philosophy, I feel that I'm probably the product of my Lutheran upbringing and I still adhere pretty much to the principles of the Lutheran church though I don't attend too regularly anymore.

85 The age range of people I'm interested in dating is I'd say between 35 and 50.

93 My favorite leisure time activities are: well, I'm an archeological buff and I read everything I can get my hands on there and classical music I like very much, but also rock. Socializing to a certain extent.

120 I like to be out with my friends. I think mostly reading is for my own quiet time.

128 A person who wants to date with me will be better off knowing that I smoke - trying to cut down but I haven't made it yet and aside from that I'll just say, well, "surprise".

150 I can't think of anything now that important that anyone would need to know ahead of time.

158
Appendix E

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS: SB-1

The experiment in which you are participating is part of a larger research project being conducted at OSU. The total project is called the Compatbility Research Project (CRP) and is designed to study how people are attracted to each other and how relationships develop. It is best described as similar to a video-dating service.

As a subject in this particular experiment, you will not actually be a participant in the video-dating project. Rather, we will be asking you to act as if you were a participant in the CRP.

The first thing you will do is view a short (10 minute) videotape that describes the CRP. As explained on the tape, one of the things that each participant in the CRP is asked to do is to talk about themselves for 3 minutes while being videotaped. Essentially, what we are asking you to do is to act as if you are a participant in the video-dating project. You will be asked to speak about yourself as you would if the tape was to be shown to the opposite sex for matching purposes. The first taping can be considered to be practice if you are not satisfied with it. You can view your video-taping after it's completed since we'll be playing it back right away to see if it was an adequate "take".

The questions you will be responding to during the taping are of the "fill-in-the-blank" type. In order that the research assistants not interfere with or affect the video-tapings, you will read the beginning of each question from "cue cards" and then complete it giving your view, attitude, etc.

For example, one card will read: "The age range of people I am most interested in dating is...". You will be reading this aloud during the video-taping and then add aloud whatever your personal inclination happens to be. The rest of the questions ask about:

a) The kind(s) of relationship you feel you are most interested in;
b) The leisure-time activities you personally prefer;
c) Your marital and parental status;
d) Your feelings and opinions regarding religious affiliations or philosophy; and
e) Some thing(s) unique about yourself that someone who wanted to date with you would be better off knowing.

Three minutes doesn't seem to be very much time to respond to all these questions, but the vast majority of participants who have already been taped answered all the questions within one and a half minutes in their first take. We recommend therefore, that you take your time responding to these questions, so that very little of your tape will be silent. Every participant's "tape" is three minutes...
long. When you've finished speaking, we turn off the sound. So if you only speak for two minutes, the third is silent because even though we turn off the sound, the visual recording continues until the three minutes is up.

The tape that is made of you WILL NOT be used in the video-dating project and will not be shown to anyone for matching purposes. Rather, it will be used by researchers at Ohio State for comparison with similar tapes. We would like to thank you for your cooperation. Please contact Carolyn Stimel at 422-1611 if you have any questions.
Appendix F

TAPE RATING MANUAL

Introduction

There are four main categories of behavior to be scored on each of the tapes. The first of these is the verbal content of the individual's speech. The second is the amount of time the individual spends on each topic area. The third category of behavior is the individual's smiling. The fourth category is their nonverbal behavior. Because of the complexity of scoring these types of behavior, they will be scored separately. That is, on the first viewing of the tape, you will be scoring the verbal content according to the categories described below. On the second viewing you will be recording the number of seconds the individual speaks on each topic. The tape will be viewed a third time to score the smiling behavior. On the fourth viewing, you will be scoring nonverbal behavior.

Each of the tapes is standard in format. At the beginning and end of each tape, there will be an Identification Board on view which contains demographic and personal information about the individual (hereafter referred to as "subject"). During the remainder of the tape, the subject is responding to a series of six sentence stems. This manual contains information on each category to be scored and how it is to be rated. Also included are examples of the statements that would be scored under each option. The order of the manual follows the listing of categories to be rated on the Rating Sheets (examples at the end of manual). It is hoped that most of the tapes will follow approximately the same chronological order so that the following listing of categories is similar to the order of the individual's statements. However, you may find that a statement is made at some point in the tape that is not listed as being under that question. In such a case, the statement should be scored in the appropriate category regardless of when it occurs. In order to do this, it will be necessary to be familiar with all the categories to be scored before you begin to rate a tape.

Each tape is three (3) minutes long. However, the individual is audio-recorded only as long as they are speaking. When they finish responding to the sixth question and have finished speaking, the audio recording is shut off while video-recording continues for the remainder of the three minutes. You will be scoring only that portion of the tape with audio recording (during which the individual is speaking).

On some of the categories you are offered the option of scoring the category as "unable to determine". This is to allow you to indicate uncertainty about what the individual has said or done. You are encouraged to avoid scoring this option unless you really cannot make a decision. Please add comments to the rating sheets that you feel
Procedures for Rating

First, put your name on each of the two Rating Sheets in the space marked "Rater".

First Viewing

On the first viewing, you will be scoring the content of the subject's speech according to the categories outlined below.

Demographic Information: Record the following information from the I.D. Board, which will be the first thing you view on the tape.
1. Subject Identification Number: This is a seven-digit number.
2. Subject age: Number of years.
3. Subject education: This is indicated in number of years.
   Include the ampersand (if present) in the space in parentheses on the Rating Sheet.

The following information will need to be scored at some point in your viewing.
4. Subject sex.
5. Subject race: Scored as:
   Black: Should be coded if the subject, in your best judgement, appears to be Black.
   White: Should be coded if the subject is not Black.
   For example, a Hispanic should be coded as White.
   Unable to determine: Code as indicated in Introduction.
6. Speaks with noticeable foreign accent: Scored as:
   Yes: Subject speaks with a noticeable foreign (defined as Non-American) accent.
   No: Subject does not speak with an accent.
   Unable to determine.

Question #1: My marital and parental status is...

7. Current marital status. Scored as:
   Single: Includes never married subjects or if individual indicates they are single and does not indicate a marital status that would better fit one of the other categories.
   Divorced: Subject indicates they are divorced and not currently married. Should be scored even if subject labels self as "single" but indicates a previous marriage.
   Widowed: Subject indicates spouse has died and they have not remarried.
   Married: Includes those who have re-married after a divorce.
   Not Mentioned: Should be scored if the individual gives no information regarding marital status.

8. Parental status: Scored as the number of children that the individual has or supports. Includes children they have had but
no longer have custody of or live with. Scored as one of the following three options.

No children.
Indicate number of children.
Not mentioned.

Question #2: The sort of relationship I am looking for is...

Each of the following categories (#9-17) may be scored according to the following three options:

Yes: Subject clearly specified or offers that attribute, indicates that it is important and/or desirable.
Maybe: Subject makes a vague reference to the attribute and/or states that it may be important but does not clearly specify whether it is or is not.
Not Mentioned: Subject does not mention anything that is related to the category.

In addition, categories #7, 10, 13, 14, and 15 may be scored as:

No: Subject clearly specifies that the attribute is irrelevant or not important.

9. Offers financial security: Subject makes statement(s) offering some kind of financial security or benefits to the potential partner. Will be indicated by key words such as: affluent, employed, financially independent or secure, generous, good provider, hard working, income, industrious, job, means, prosperous, secure, successful, wealthy, well-to-do, worker, working.
Examples: Yes: I'm a hard working person.
No: I'm not a wealthy man. I don't want to go out to expensive places, nothing fancy.

10. Seeks financial security. Subject indicates they are looking for financial security and/or benefits from a potential partner. Will be indicated by the same key words as #8.
Examples: Yes: I'd like to meet a hardworking, industrious person.
No: I don't care if we just sit and talk instead of going on expensive dates.

11. Offers sincerity. Subject makes statement(s) offering sincerity and/or moral virtue of a type that should prevent exploitation in an intimate relationship. Key words include: considerate, dependable, good character or morals, high morals, honest, loyal, one-man woman, one-woman man, sincere, trustworthy, truthful.
Examples: Yes: I'm a good person.
I offer total honesty in a relationship.

12. Seeks sincerity and/or moral virtue of a type that should prevent exploitation in an intimate relationship. The subject indicates that this is being sought in a potential partner or relationship.
It will be indicated by the same key words as #10.

Examples: Yes: I'm looking for a sincere relationship. Honesty in other people is important for me.

13. Expresses interest in marriage: Subject makes explicit reference to desire for entering a lifetime, legally sanctioned relationship with one other person. Key words include: husband, marriage, marriage-minded, married love, mate, matrimony, wife.

Examples: Yes: I'd like to meet someone I could eventually marry.

No: I have no interest in being a wife.

Note: This category does not include references to "permanent" or "serious" relationships if marriage is not mentioned.

14. Seeks physical attractiveness. Subject indicates the importance of a potential partner being physically attractive. Key words include: attractive, beautiful, cute, distinguished-looking, excellent figure, feminine, good-looking, masculine, nice-looking, pretty, shapely, sexy, sharp, stacked, stunning, well-built, well-proportioned.

Examples: Yes: Physical attraction should be an important part of compatibility - I'd prefer that you be cute.

No: Physical attractiveness doesn't matter. It's what's inside that counts.

15. Seeks sexual relationship. Subject indicates their desire that sex play a role in a potential relationship. Key words include: sex, physical intimacy, making love, going to bed, sleep with, sexual relations, fool around, make it, get it on.

Examples: Yes: I thing physical intimacy is important in a relationship.

No: I just want a platonic friendship.

16. Seeks person to share activities and/or interests with: Subject indicates that they are seeking someone with whom to share activities and/or interests. May be just a general statement to that effect or they may specify a particular activity they would like to share.

Examples: Yes: I'd like to find a tennis partner. I'm looking for someone to share life's experiences with.

17. Seeks friendship: Subject states they are looking for a person to be a friend. Key words include: friend, companion, confidant, pal, chum.

Examples: Yes: I would like to make some new friends. I really am looking for companionship.

Question #3: With regards to religious philosophy, I feel...
18. Subject is affiliated with a particular religion. Refers to whether the subject states that she/he is a member of a particular religion at present or follows a particular organized religion. Scored as:
Examples: Yes: Subject states s/he is a member of or follows a religion.
No: Subject states s/he does not identify with a particular religion.
Unable to determine: Subject does not make a clear statement about religious affiliation.
If the subject states they are affiliated with a particular religion and states which it is, list the religion in the blank provided on the Rating Sheet.

19. Specifies preferred religion for partner. Subject makes a statement about their preference for a potential partner's religion.
Yes: Subject states they prefer an organized religion for partner.
Examples: I'd probably get along better with a Christian.
No preference: Subject states they have no preference for partner's religion.
Examples: I really don't care what your religion is.
On religion, I'm open and tolerant.
Not mentioned: Subject does not indicate preference or non-preference.
If the subject specifies a religion for partner, list it in the blank provided. In some cases, a subject may state they prefer a partner of the same religion as themselves. In this case, list "same" for preferred religion.

Question #4: The age range of people I am interested in dating is...

20. Specifies age as not important: Refers to what the subject states about the importance of age in their preferred partner.
Yes: Subject states that age is not an important consideration in a partner.
Example: Age is not a factor in my relationships.
No: Subject states that age is important for a potential partner.
Example: I get along better with people in this age range because we'll have similar life experiences.
Unable to determine: Subject does not clearly make any statements about the importance of age for a potential partner or does not mention age preferences.

21. Age range specified for potential partner. Refers to the age or age range indicated as preferable for a partner. Scores as one of the following three options:
Bounds: List lower and/or upper age bound given by subject.
Older/Younger/Same as myself: If the subject does
not give a numerical age for partner, but specifies age relative to his/her own, place a check in the appropriate space or give the relative number of years. For example, a subject may state they prefer a partner to be within 5 years of their own age. In this case, you would place a "5" beside Older and a "5" beside Younger.

None specified: Subject does not make any clear statement about preferred age for partner.

Question #5: My favorite leisure time activity is...

22. Leisure time activities: Score by listing each leisure time activity that the individual mentions.

Question #6: A person who wants to date with me will be better off knowing that I...

Often, at this point in the tape, the subject may make statements relating to categories outlined in another section of this manual. In most cases, the individual will indicate in some way when they have finished speaking. You will not need to rate anything that happens during the time the individual is only being video-recorded after they have indicated they're finished speaking and the microphone has been shut off.

Additional categories: Likely to occur at any point in the tape.

23. Addresses the other: Subject refers to the other by direct address.
   Yes: Subject directly addresses the other.
   Example: Hi. Hello. Good evening. I'd like to get to know you. We can work out the details later.
   No: Subject does not address the listener.
   Unable to Determine.

24. Future terms: Subject discusses the potential relationships in future terms. May be indicated by statements regarding the possible outcome of a relationship or the activities they may engage in as a couple.
   Yes: Subject discusses potential future.
   Example: I'd like a relationship that starts as friends and gradually becomes more serious. I hope we can meet and do lots of things together.
   No: Subject does not discuss potential future.
   Unable to determine.

25. Self-discounting: Subject makes negative statements about his or her own attributes, interests, abilities, etc.
   Yes: Subject self-discounts.
   Example: I tend to be shy and hard to get to know.
I play piano, but not very well.
No: Subject does not self-discount.
Unable to determine.

26. Subject presents self as unconventional. Scored as:
   Yes: Subject describes self by terms such as: uncon­ventional, individual, different, unique, unusual, wild, crazy, novel, idiosyncratic, rare, extraordinary, strange, atypical, extreme, uncommon, radical, peculiar, strange, unorthodox, eccentric, original, modern, odd, bizarre, out-landish.
   Example: I like to do unusual things.
   No: Subject describes self as conventional. May be indicated by key words such as: conventional, traditional, normal, ordinary, regular person, typical, narrow-minded, conservative, run-of-the-mill, old-fashioned.
   Example: I like to stay home a lot and do ordinary things.
   Does not mention: Subject does not clearly describe self as conventional or unconventional.

At the end of your viewing for content, check to be certain that you have made a response in each category. If you have missed something, it can be checked on the next viewing.
Second Viewing for Timing

On the second viewing of the tape you will be recording the number of seconds the subject speaks on each of the six questions. In most cases, the subject will read each sentence stem and then complete it in turn. If a subject paraphrases the question(s), you will need to use your own judgement as to when s/he has changed topic areas. The most efficient way to time is to begin the stopwatch when the subject begins speaking on the tape. When they start each new question, record the time (i.e., the point on the stopwatch where the second hand is). Stop the stopwatch when the individual indicates they are finished speaking. Then do the appropriate subtractions and record the number of seconds spent on each question. Round off to the nearest second.

Note: If a subject does not immediately start with the first question, their "preface" material will be included in the time for the first question.

Third Viewing

On the third viewing, smiling behavior of the subject will be coded. You will only be coding the individual's smiling during the portion of the tape in which they are speaking.

1. Number of seconds smiling: Throughout this viewing you will need to time the number of seconds the individual spends smiling. A smile is defined as widening and upturning the corners of the mouth, often with teeth showing. Begin the stopwatch when the person smiles and stop it when they change expression to a non-smile. Do not reset the stopwatch. Repeat the process (re-start the stopwatch) if the subject smiles again. Record the total number of seconds the subject smiles throughout the audio portion of the tape. Round off to the nearest second.

2. Number of smiles: Using the definition of "smile" above, count the number of instances of smiles by the subject. There is room on the Rating Sheet for you to tally (or make a mark) each time the subject smiles. When finished rating, enter the total number.

Fourth Viewing

On the fourth viewing, you will be rating nonverbal behaviors of the subject. These are:

3. Number of self-manipulation movements: Self-manipulation movements are defined as a motion of a part of the body directly in contact with another part of the body. Examples are scratching or rubbing. Single brief movements in one direction are scored as one unit and cyclical movements are scored as one unit. For example, raising a hand to stroke one's hair and then replacing the hand in the lap would be scored as one unit. A brief (that is, less than five seconds)
scratching movement is scored once only. Score continuous movements (e.g., scratching) once every five seconds.

Note: Do not include any movement of the subject connected with their eyeglasses, whether taking them off or putting them on. Also, do not include any movements connected with holding notes.

4. Number of gestures: Gestures are defined as movements of hands or fingers, excluding the self-manipulation movements scored above. This includes side-to-side, forward-back and up-and-down movements. Cyclical movements (for example, raising and lowering a finger) are scored as one unit.

5. Number of body movements: A body movement is defined as an instance of the subject changing his/her body orientation by more than 10 degrees. This would include changes in trunk lean either forward, backward, or sideways. Brief cyclical movements (for example, a forward-back rock in less than five seconds) should be scored as one unit. Many subjects rock back and forth in the swivel chair. You should attempt to count the rocking movements until it begins to interfere with your rating of the other behaviors. In this case, indicate "rocking" on the Rating Sheet and do not try to compute a total.

For all of the above categories, you may tally during the viewing and then enter the total at the end of your rating.

The next two categories should be coded for individuals that do not make any significant arm and/or leg position shifts while being audio-recorded. If you are unable to code them, indicate so on the Rating Sheet.

6. Arm Asymmetry: This category is rated by assigning one of the following codes.
   0: Symmetrical position of the arms. For example, hands clasped at the midsection, arms folded symmetrically.
   1: Slight asymmetry in the position of the arms. For example, both hands resting on the lap, but one hand 2 to 5 inches more forward than the other, or one hand clasping the other at the wrist.
   2: Moderate asymmetry in the position of the arms. For example, one hand holds an elbow or the upper arm whereas the other hand is free.
   3: Extreme asymmetry in the position of the arms. For example, one arm in the lap and the other hooked over the back of the chair.

7. Leg Asymmetry: This is rated by assigned one of the following codes.
   0: Symmetrical position of the legs with both feet flat on the floor and insteps touching.
   1: Symmetrical stance of the legs with both feet resting flat on the floor and the insteps not touching.
   2: Asymmetrical stance of the legs with both feet resting flat on the floor, but one foot in a more forward position.
3: Asymmetrical stance of the legs with one or both feet partially lifted off the floor, as when there is a bend in the ankle and an edge of the foot is resting on the floor or when the legs are crossed.

8. Tense/Calm: The last category to be rated is based on your overall impression of the subject's behavior while being audio-recorded. Place a check in one of the five spaces that you think best describes the subject's behavior.

Tense: Defined as anxious, agitated, high-strung, jittery, on edge, rigid, stiff.

Calm: Defined as reserved, unconcerned, indifferent, cool, composed, relaxed.

This category is scored according to the following five options.

Very tense
Slightly tense
Neither tense nor calm
Slightly calm
Very calm
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RATING SHEET

Rater

1) Subject Number ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

2) Subject Age ___ ___ 3) Subject Education ___ ___ (___)

4) Subject Sex Male ___ Female ___

5) Subject Race Black___

White___

Unable to determine___

6) Foreign Accent Yes___

No___

Unable to determine___

7) Marital Status Single ____ Widowed___

Divorced___ Married___

Separated___ Not mentioned___

8) Parental Status No children___

Number of children___

Not Mentioned___

9) Offers financial security __________ ___ ___ ___

10) Seeks financial security __________ ___ ___ ___

11) Offers sincerity __________________ ___ ___ ___

12) Seeks sincerity ___________________ ___ ___ ___

13) Interest in marriage ___________________ ___ ___ ___

14) Seeks physical attractiveness __________ ___ ___ ___
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Not Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15) Seeks sexual relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Seeks to share activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Seeks friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Affiliated with religion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Prefers religion for partner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Age not important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to determine or not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Age specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounds: Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative to self: Older</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Leisure time activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Addresses the other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Future terms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Self-discounting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Describes self as unconventional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #1: My marital...</td>
<td>Beginning Time</td>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2: The sort of relationship...</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3: With regards to religion...</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4: The age range...</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #5: My favorite leisure...</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #6: A person who wants to...</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ends Speaking ______________

1) Number of seconds smiling ______ total
2) Number of smiles ______ total
3) Number of self-manipulation movements ______ total
4) Number of gestures ______ total
5) Number of body movements ______ total

6) Arm Asymmetry Unable to code____ code___
7) Leg Asymmetry Unable to code____ code___

8) very tense slightly tense neither calm slightly calm very calm
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